

What Dr. Fiesler says is certainly not true of our soldiers generally but it is true of the significantly large numbers who yielded to the brainwashing.

x

I don't suppose anybody knows for sure just what has come over so many of our young Americans.

They don't seem to believe in what we used to call the homely virtues and the eternal verities.

They know all about the faults of our country and the weakness of our economic system but we don't seem impressed with the fact that we still have the finest civilization this world has ever known.

These young people knit their brows and shake their heads over the social injustices in a nation that does not automatically provide economic security.

Angry young men write about the tyranny of conformity and hard work.

What these people are expressing, without knowing it, is their reluctance to take on the responsibilities of freedom.

Freedom is for strong men and, with it, must go self-reliance.

But most people can acquire the strength when they acquire a full appreciation of freedom.

The difficulty of appreciating freedom is greater for the American people than any other people on earth because we enjoy so much of it with so little effort.

We have a tendency to see only the burdens of freedom.

But there is good news for those who don't believe that freedom isn't worth the effort: of all our responsibilities it is the easiest to get rid of—all we have to do is elect the men who are all too eager to take over the problem of making our economic decisions.

What can one say to a man who is weary of being free?

You should remind him that every adult, as a child of God, has the moral responsibility to be free.

As a matter of fact the idea of personal freedom came from the teachings of Jesus.

The entire Western World is rooted in these teachings.

That is why communism must attack Christianity.

Communism is a form of emotional dependency upon somebody or something else and the desire for security through obedience.

To the Communists, Christianity and self-reliance are synonymous.

Their weapon against them is fear—the fear of personal failure—the fear that drives the individual backward to the childish instinct for security.

But the self-reliant Christian is not defeated by fear.

He has, in his religion, a mother, a father, a partner, a counselor, and a comforter.

There is, for him a different type of security through obedience—the security that comes from obedience to God's will.

With God at his side the most deserted of men do not feel alone, the most beleaguered men do not feel fearful, because he has the strength and courage that overcomes panic and despair.

He does not fear economic hardship because in a Christian society there is always Christian charity.

xi

To sum it all up what I am really trying to say to you all is that a good index of America's belief in liberty, self-government, and self-reliance is the strength of America's belief in God.

And if faith in God is the foundation of our civilization, the strength of our civilization depends upon the strength of that faith.

That is why, in spite of any of the superficial signs of character deterioration that may occupy some of the headlines today, I cannot believe that the American dream is failing, because Christian faith is growing.

It may sound odd for a politician to say that good government is to a great extent a religious problem, but good character is a religious problem, and good government depends upon the good character of its citizens.

There is evidence to back up the correlation between Christianity and character: Not one of the American prisoners in Korea who had deeply religious convictions were successfully brainwashed by the Communists.

xii

If America's problem were a highly intellectual one, I would have less hope for our future, because mass education at the intellectual level is difficult.

But it is not an intellectual problem—it is merely a matter of commonsense motivated by good character.

Most people know what they are doing wrong; in fact they feel a little guilty about it.

And it is the American conscience that, I believe, will guarantee our future.

It needs a little prodding, but it is still a healthy conscience.

It needs a lot of self-appointed missionaries to talk as I have been talking, and I believe those missionaries will appear.

I hope that right here, in this audience, a few of them may have been enlisted even as I spoke. Good luck and may God bless you always.

SENATE

THURSDAY, JUNE 4, 1959

Rev. Joseph S. Johnston, D.D., minister, Reveille Methodist Church, Richmond, Va., offered the following prayer:

Breathe on us, Breath of God,

Fill us with life anew,

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

Father, in the brief compass of this day we cannot do everything. But we can do something. Help us to know what are the important things, and to do them.

Save us from loss of life through the careless use of time, the waste of energy, the mishandling of our opportunities; keep our thinking straight and true; and when we grapple futilely with problems that seem immense, remind us that in Thee is wisdom adequate for every need. Thou hast dignified our lives by giving us significant work to do; save us from the foolishness of trying to do it without Thy aid. Let these moments of prayer be meaningful moments of waiting in which we attune our life to Thy purposes, and then as coworkers with Thee move forward to establish the reign of Thy will where we are.

In the name of Jesus Christ, we pray.
Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceed-

ings of Wednesday, June 3, 1959, was dispensed with.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

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

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

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

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed a bill (H.R. 7454) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1960, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H.R. 7454) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1960, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

LIMITATION OF DEBATE DURING MORNING HOUR

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

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

AGREEMENTS FOR RECOGNITION OF SENATORS IN ADVANCE

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I should like to raise a question with the distinguished majority leader.

I observe that yesterday a Member of the Senate reserved 30 minutes of time today after the taking of the vote on the bill authorizing appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. I would suggest that if we fall into the habit of reserving time ahead, although the amount thus reserved could be for longer or for shorter periods, it could run well into the future. As a practice, I am afraid that would certainly destroy the flexibility of Senate operations.

I would be reluctant always to object to such a request—knowing, of course, that, within reasonable limits, a Senator is able to obtain the floor at almost any time. But I believe that a practice of reserving time 1 day or 2 days ahead would present some difficulties. So I make this suggestion for the consideration of the majority leader.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I am delighted to have the distinguished minority leader present his

personal viewpoint. I quite agree with him that it would be better if such requests were not made. Of course, when they are made, unanimous consent is required; and at such a time each Senator who cares to exercise his responsibility as a Member of the Senate can object.

Had I been in the Chamber yesterday at the time when the request was made, I would have asked that it not be made. However, I was not in the Chamber at the time. I am sure the Senator from Illinois would have done the same—although I remember, I believe, that on occasions the Senator has asked me to follow that practice for some of the Members on his side of the aisle.

I do not believe the public interest will be hurt a great deal, either one way or the other.

If a Senator obtains consent to be recognized for a specific length of time, Senators who wish to hear his remarks can be present at that time; Senators who do not wish to hear his remarks will then be on notice that they need not be present. In any event, a Senator who wishes to address the Senate can obtain recognition.

However, generally speaking, I share the viewpoint of the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I bring up the matter only because it is a little awkward, and sometimes it is offensive, to object to a request by a Senator.

If a common practice of that sort were to develop, it would present difficulties. So, if it can be discouraged, I think that will be helpful.

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

REPORT ON NUMBER OF OFFICERS ON DUTY WITH DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY AND ARMY GENERAL STAFF

A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a report of the number of officers on duty with the Department of the Army and the Army General Staff on March 31, 1959 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT PRIOR TO RESTORATION OF BALANCES, DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

A letter from the Administrative Assistant Attorney General, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report prior to restoration of balances, Department of Justice, as of May 25, 1959 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Government Operations.

IMPROVEMENT OF ADMINISTRATION OF TRANS- FERS OF CERTAIN REAL PROPERTY

A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to improve the ad-

ministration of transfers of certain real property for wildlife or other purposes by repealing the act of May 19, 1948, and incorporating the essential provisions thereof in the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Government Operations.

AUTHORIZATIONS FOR COAST GUARD TO ACCEPT, OPERATE, AND MAINTAIN A DEFENSE HOUSING FACILITY AT YORKTOWN, VA.

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the Coast Guard to accept, operate and maintain a certain defense housing facility at Yorktown, Va., and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

OPINION IN CASE OF ALMA BLABON, ET AL. V. THE UNITED STATES

A letter from the Clerk, U.S. Court of Claims, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, the court's opinion in the case of *Alma Blabon, et al. v. The United States*, rendered on June 3, 1959 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF CERTAIN ALIENS

Two letters from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of orders suspending deportation of certain aliens, together with a statement of the facts and pertinent provisions of law pertaining to each alien, and the reasons for ordering such suspension (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

GRANTING OF STATUS OF PERMANENT RESI- DENCE TO CERTAIN ALIENS

A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of orders entered granting the applications for permanent residence filed by certain aliens, together with a statement of the facts and pertinent provisions of law as to each alien, and the reasons for granting such applications (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

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

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A resolution of the Legislature of the State of Florida; to the Committee on Appropriations:

"HOUSE MEMORIAL 1657

"Memorial to the Congress of the United States to provide sufficient funds for commencement of construction of the West Coast Intracoastal Waterway from the Caloosahatchee River to the Anclote River, Fla., at the earliest possible time

"Whereas the Florida Legislature has heretofore created the West Coast Inland Navigation District by legislative action in 1947, which legislative authority has been from time to time amended; and

"Whereas Congress has heretofore authorized this project and did in the last Congress appropriate \$135,000 for advance planning and engineering; and

"Whereas the Corps of Engineers of the U.S. Army has reported that it will be able to economically use \$1,400,000 for immediate commencement of construction; and

"Whereas studies have indicated that the project is economically feasible and is in the best interest of the citizens and taxpayers of the particular area involved and of the State of Florida in general and of com-

merce generally in the United States and further justified on the basis of national defense needs in having an inland waterway connecting the great port of Tampa to the already established waterway system of the eastern United States; and

"Whereas local interests have raised more than \$1,500,000 in local taxes to meet local commitments and now stand ready and able to carry out requirements for local interests, and the Legislature of the State of Florida having just extended the taxing authority of the West Coast Inland Navigation District for an additional 10 years to insure full cooperation and participation by local interests in the completion of this great project: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Legislature of the State of Florida, That the Congress of the United States be and it is hereby requested to provide at the earliest possible time \$1,400,000 as found by the Corps of Engineers of the U.S. Army may be economically expended at this time for commencement of construction of the West Coast Intracoastal Waterway from the termination of the existing cross Florida waterway at the mouth of the Caloosahatchee River, to the Anclote River, Fla., during the next fiscal year and that such funds be provided from time to time thereafter as may be needed to pursue this project expeditiously to completion; be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this memorial be dispatched to the President of the United States; to the President of the U.S. Senate; to the Speaker of the U.S. House of Representatives; to each of the ablest congressional delegations in the U.S. Congress, the Florida delegation; to the Chief of Engineers, Corps of Engineers, Washington, D.C., and to the Governor of the great State of Florida." (Filed in office secretary of state June 1, 1959.)

A resolution of the Legislature of the State of Florida; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"SENATE COMMITTEE SUBSTITUTE FOR HOUSE MEMORIAL 190

"Memorial to the Congress of the United States to pass a joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States reserving to the States exclusive control over public education.

"Whereas on January 27, 1959, Senator TALMADGE, of Georgia, and others introduced a joint resolution in the Senate of the United States proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, reserving to the States exclusive control over public schools; and

"Whereas Congressman ROBERT L. F. SIKES, of Florida, on the 29th day of January 1959, introduced a joint resolution in the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States, proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, providing that the judicial powers of the United States shall not give the Supreme Court of the United States the power to overrule, modify or change any prior decision of that Court construing the Constitution of the United States or an act of Congress promulgated pursuant thereto; and

"Whereas the Legislature of the State of Florida is in accord with the purpose and intent of these resolutions: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Legislature of the State of Florida, That the Congress of the United States is requested to pass the joint resolutions known as Senate Joint Resolution 32 and House Joint Resolution 201 of the 86th Congress, and that the Congress do move with all possible haste to adopt the said resolution and submit to the respective States for ratification the proposed amendment; be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this memorial be dispatched to the President of the

United States; the Vice President of the United States; to the Honorable LYNDON JOHNSON, majority leader in the Senate of the United States; to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States and to SPESSARD HOLLAND and GEORGE A. SMATHERS, of Florida; and to Congressmen ROBERT L. F. SIKES, WILLIAM C. CRAMER, CHARLES E. BENNETT, A. SYDNEY HERLONG, JR., JAMES A. HALEY, DANTE B. FASCELL, PAUL G. ROGERS, and D. R. (BILLY) MATTHEWS." (Filed in office secretary of State May 25, 1959.)

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Texas; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

"SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 1

"Whereas on the 19th day of May 1959, James Hoffa, president of the Teamsters Union, in a speech at Brownsville, Tex., threatened the Congress of the United States with a primary strike all across the Nation that will straighten out the employers for once and for all if Congress imposed restrictive labor laws; and

"Whereas such a threat of a nationwide strike constitutes a reprehensible code of conduct so typical of Hoffa and his gangsters; and

"Whereas such conduct threatens the very foundation of our democratic form of government and maligns and degrades the Congress of the United States; and

"Whereas the citizens of the United States through their duly elected Members of Congress are entitled to remedial legislation that would protect them from such lawless and irresponsible union leaders who, by their threats, are in fact denying the supremacy of government over their nefarious activities; and

"Whereas the people of this great Nation are entitled to and must demand legal protection from such demagogues and maligners of our Constitution, laws, and our Congress; and

"Whereas the laboring men and women are patriotic law-abiding citizens and should be protected from a gang of labor racketeers headed by Hoffa; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate of the State of Texas, of the first called session, the House of Representatives concurring, call upon the Members of Congress to enact restrictive and remedial legislation that will afford protection to the people of the United States against such enemies of our Government as reflected by the threats of Hoffa and his hoodlums; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be mailed to the members of the Texas delegation in the Senate and the House of Representatives; a copy to Senator JOHN L. McCLELLAN; and a copy to the Vice President of the United States, RICHARD M. NIXON.

[SEAL]

"BEN RAMSEY,

"President of the Senate.

"WAGGONER CARR,

"Speaker of the House.

"CHARLES SCHNABEL,

"Secretary of the Senate.

"DOROTHY HALLMAN,

"Chief Clerk of the House."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii; to the Committee on Banking and Currency:

"SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 90

"Whereas the comfort and well-being of many members of the armed services and their families call for an early completion of the Capehart housing projects within the city and county of Honolulu; and

"Whereas it is has come to the attention of this body that there have been work stoppages and slowdowns at such projects, thus delaying early completion: Now therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate of the 30th Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, the

House of Representatives concurring, That the committees on Capehart housing of the Senate and the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States be and they are hereby respectfully requested to conduct an investigation of work stoppages and slowdowns of Capehart housing projects within the city and county of Honolulu, and particularly at Kaneohe, Oahu, Hawaii, and ascertain the reasons for such stoppages and slowdowns; be it further

Resolved, That certified copies of this concurrent resolution be transmitted to JOHN A. BURNS, Delegate from Hawaii to the Congress of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the President of the Senate and the respective chairmen of the committees of Capehart housing in the Senate and House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States."

RESOLUTIONS OF ORGANIZATIONS OF STATE OF NEW YORK

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the Long Island Federation of Women's Clubs, Inc., relating to governmental expenditures, and a resolution adopted by the State Restaurant Liquor Dealers Association of New York, Inc.

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

RESOLUTION FROM LONG ISLAND FEDERATION OF WOMEN'S CLUBS, INC., BELLEROSSE, N.Y.

Whereas a rising tax rate adds to the cost of Government, of consumer goods and of services; and

Whereas such increases contribute to inflation: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Long Island Federation of Women's Clubs, Inc., in convention assembled this 15th day of May 1959, urges our elected Representatives to resist the trend toward mounting governmental expenditures, and to work toward the restoration of a sound fiscal policy; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the following: Dwight D. Eisenhower, President of the United States; Richard M. Nixon, Vice President of the United States; majority and minority leaders of the U.S. Senate and House of Representatives; Members of the Senate and House elected from Long Island; Nelson A. Rockefeller, Governor of New York; majority and minority leaders of the New York State Senate and Assembly; members of the New York State Senate and Assembly elected from Long Island.

Mrs. HAROLD A. BAUMAN,
Chairman.

RESOLUTION OF STATE RESTAURANT LIQUOR DEALERS ASSOCIATION OF NEW YORK, INC.

Whereas the 20 percent cabaret tax was one of the levies imposed as a temporary expedient at the time of the outbreak of war; and

Whereas said tax is a detriment to the economic stability of that segment of the restaurant industry which furnishes entertainment for its patrons; and

Whereas over 40,000 musicians and employees could be put to work immediately upon repeal of this onerous burdensome tax: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the board of governors of the State Restaurant Liquor Dealers Association of New York, Inc., in meeting assembled at Garden City, Long Island, N.Y., this 19th day of May 1959, go on record as calling for the immediate repeal of this unjust tax; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to appropriate Members of Congress and to the President of the United States.

ANTHONY VISCIGLIO,
President.
DONALD J. RICK,
Secretary.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. HILL:

S. 2105. A bill to amend the laws relating to Saint Elizabeths Hospital so as to fix the salaries of the Superintendent, Assistant Superintendent, and first assistant physician of the hospital, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. ERVIN:

S. 2106. A bill for the relief of Emiko Nagamine; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHURCH:

S. 2107. A bill to amend section 1 of the Act of January 2, 1951, prohibiting the transportation of gambling devices in interstate and foreign commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. (See the remarks of Mr. CHURCH when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. NEUBERGER:

S. 2108. A bill to provide for assistance to the Klamath County School District, Oreg., in the construction of a high school building on the Klamath Indian Reservation; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BYRD of West Virginia (by request):

S. 2109. A bill for the relief of Edwin A. Haddad; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. BEALL:

S. 2110. A bill to authorize the Department of Defense to indemnify its contractors against nuclear and other unusually hazardous risks, to limit the liability of contractors so indemnified, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. ELLENDER (by request):

S. 2111. A bill to amend section 602 of the Agricultural Act of 1954; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. JACKSON (for himself, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. EASTLAND, Mr. ENGLE, Mr. BUTLER, Mr. STENNIS, and Mr. YARBOROUGH):

S. 2112. A bill to prohibit the importation into the United States of polluted shellfish; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. McNAMARA:

S. 2113. A bill for the relief of George K. Caldwell; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PROXMIRE:

S. 2114. A bill for the relief of Mathilde Basenach; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUTLER:

S. 2115. A bill to amend chapters 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, and 8 of the Immigration and Nationality Act; and

S. 2116. A bill for the relief of Aristivis Koukounaris; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ENGLE:

S. 2117. A bill to amend section 304 of the Tariff Act of 1930 to require that all cast iron soil pipe and fittings imported into the United States be marked with the name of the country of its origin; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. MAGNUSON (by request):

S. 2118. A bill to amend section 4488 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, to au-

thorize the Secretary of the Department in which the Coast Guard is operating to prescribe regulations governing lifesaving equipment, firefighting equipment, muster lists, ground tackle, hawsers, and bilge systems aboard vessels, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

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

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 2119. A bill to provide automatic free insurance for members of the Armed Forces; to the Committee on Finance.

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

S. 2120. A bill to authorize the establishment of the Washington's Western Lands National Monument in the State of West Virginia; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

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

By Mr. RANDOLPH:

S.J. Res. 105. Joint resolution providing for participation by the United States in the West Virginia Centennial Celebration to be held in 1963 at various locations in the State of West Virginia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

CONCURRENT RESOLUTIONS

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey submitted the following concurrent resolutions, which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. Con. Res. 44. Concurrent resolution relative to the strengthening of the scientific and technological progress of the free nations through cooperation of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization; and

S. Con. Res. 45. Concurrent resolution relative to the establishment of an informal advisory committee of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

(See the above concurrent resolutions printed in full when submitted by Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey, which appear under a separate heading.)

RESOLUTION

Mr. O'MAHONEY submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 128); which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Resolved, That the final report of the Theodore Roosevelt Centennial Commission be printed, with illustrations, as a Senate document.

PROHIBITION OF TRANSPORTATION OF GAMBLING DEVICES IN INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, I am about to introduce a bill, and I ask unanimous consent that I may be allowed to speak on it for 5 minutes.

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

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, since 1951 a Federal law has prohibited the transportation of certain gambling machines in interstate and foreign commerce. The Johnson Act of that year has effectively controlled the slot machine devices known colloquially as one-armed bandits.

The hearings of the Select Committee on Improper Practices of Labor and Management last year established that the ingenuity of the gamblers has proved equal to the challenge of the Johnson Act. The time has come for a tightening of the Federal law to cope with the new electronic and mechanical devices which are in reality nothing more nor less than horizontal slot machines.

I am introducing today a bill to make two important changes in the Johnson Act. The first is to add the "bingo" or "in-line" pinball machines to the controlling definitions in the act, and the second is to close an obvious loophole which has been used by gambling machine manufacturers to defeat the purposes of the act ever since it became law.

The testimony before the McClellan committee about the "bingo" or "in-line" machines established that these machines, which are made to look like amusement-type games, in reality give increased odds on the insertion of additional coins and have foolproof payoff systems which operate by means of meter devices to record the payment of free games in cash or merchandise. The witnesses before the McClellan committee showed that these machines have all the fast play gambling features of the one-armed bandit and some new ones besides. Although it is illegal to operate them in every State except Nevada and part of Maryland, there nevertheless are approximately 100,000 of them in use throughout the country, and it is estimated that the gross revenues from their illegal operation are in excess of a quarter of a billion dollars a year. This is the money which feeds the cancer of organized crime in this country.

Mr. President, the proposed new definition would include any machine which, by the operation of a chance element, gives a player any change in playing odds for successive plays or any recorded credit.

This last provision separates the gambling machines from the amusement machines. Gambling machines must perform three functions: Take the player's money, apply an element of chance, and control the return consideration or prize. The subterfuge machines which are not now controlled by the Johnson Act because no coins, coupons or other tangible evidence of winning are involved, are set so that the owner of the location can clear the machine of accumulated free-game credits in such a way as to leave a record in the machine of the number of free games so cleared. This is an essential element of the operation in order that the owner of the device and the location owner can account between themselves as to the winnings paid out by the location owner to the player of the machine. If there is no recording of this information and the games can only be played off, then the device is for amusement only and would not be subject to my amendment or the original Johnson Act.

Gambling is a key element in the crime syndicates which operate in this country. The Johnson Act ought to be tightened up in the way suggested.

In addition to this amendment, a second proposed amendment follows a change recently made in the Federal gambling tax law—title 26, United States Code Annotated, section 4462—by providing that machines which otherwise fall in the gambling category do not literally have to be coin operated.

Mr. President, it is my understanding that the Attorney General has recommended legislative action along these lines. I am informed, however, that the bill which he has sent to the Congress is one which has been questioned by responsible law enforcement officials as technically insufficient to meet the ingenuity of the manufacturers of these evil machines. I believe the bill I am offering will get the job done.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed in the Record at this point in my remarks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 2107) to amend section 1 of the act of January 2, 1951, prohibiting the transportation of gambling devices in interstate and foreign commerce, introduced by Mr. CHURCH, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, 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 subsection (a)(2) of the first section of the Act entitled "An Act to prohibit transportation of gambling devices in interstate and foreign commerce," approved January 2, 1951 (64 Stat. 1134), is amended to read as follows:

"(2) any machine or mechanical device designed and manufactured to operate by means of insertion of a coin, token, or similar object and designed and manufactured so that when operated it may deliver, as the result of the application of an element of chance, any money or property, any change in playing odds on successive operations, or any credit recorded beyond the immediate duration of the play of such machine or device; or"

Sec. 2. That subsection (a)(3) of the first section of the Act of January 2, 1951 (64 Stat. 1134) is renumbered "(4)", and is further amended by the insertion of a new subsection (a)(3) reading as follows:

"(3) any machine or mechanical device which is similar to machines described in subparagraphs (a)(1) or (a)(2), and is operated without the insertion of a coin, token or similar object; or".

AMENDMENT OF SECTION 4488 OF REVISED STATUTES, RELATING TO REGULATION GOVERNING CERTAIN EQUIPMENT FOR VESSELS

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, by request, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend section 4488 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, to authorize the Secretary of the Department in which the Coast Guard is operating to prescribe regulations governing lifesaving equipment, firefighting equipment, muster lists, ground tackle, hawsers, and bilge systems aboard vessels,

and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent that the letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, requesting the proposed legislation, be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letter will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2118) to amend section 4488 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, to authorize the Secretary of the Department in which the Coast Guard is operating to prescribe regulations governing lifesaving equipment, firefighting equipment, muster lists, ground tackle, hawsers, and bilge systems aboard vessels, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

The letter presented by Mr. MAGNUSON is as follows:

OFFICE OF THE
SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY,
Washington, D.C., May 22, 1959.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE.

SIR: There is transmitted herewith a draft of a proposed bill to amend section 4488 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, to authorize the Secretary of the Department in which the Coast Guard is operating to prescribe regulations governing lifesaving equipment, firefighting equipment, muster lists, ground tackle, hawsers, and bilge systems aboard vessels, and for other purposes.

The purpose of this proposal is to revise the archaic and preclusive regulations relating to lifesaving appliances on ocean, lake, and sound steamers and foreign vessels through a consolidation and a broader application of certain statutes which relate to lifesaving appliances, firefighting equipment, muster lists, ground tackle, hawsers, and bilge systems aboard vessels.

Items contained in the International Convention for Safety of Life at Sea, 1914, were adopted as regulations by the Congress and enacted into law by the act of March 4, 1915. The 1914 convention was never put into force due to the hostilities during World War I. With the later ratification of the 1929 and 1948 International Conventions for the Safety of Life at Sea, the provisions of Revised Statutes 4488 should have been amended to reflect the changes in lifesaving appliances these conventions had adopted. Rather than amending the law, the requirements of the conventions were established through promulgation of regulations pursuant to the enabling provisions of Revised Statutes 4488.

The detailed statutory regulations of Revised Statutes 4488 are archaic today and restrict the progress of science and industry as it applies to safety of life at sea. The proposal would be a return to the basic enabling statute without its encumbering regulations but with its substantive amendments and a consolidation of other laws closely related and falling within the scope of the subject matter covered. A memorandum attached sets forth in greater detail the need for and the nature of this proposal.

It would be appreciated if you would lay the proposed bill before the Senate. A similar proposed bill has been transmitted to the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

The Department has been advised by the Bureau of the Budget that there is no objection to the submission of this proposed legislation to the Congress.

Very truly yours,

T. GRAYDON UPTON,
Acting Secretary of the Treasury.

MEMORANDUM RE PROPOSED BILL TO AMEND SECTION 4488 OF THE REVISED STATUTES, AS AMENDED, TO AUTHORIZE THE SECRETARY OF THE DEPARTMENT IN WHICH THE COAST GUARD IS OPERATING TO PRESCRIBE REGULATIONS GOVERNING LIFESAVING EQUIPMENT, FIREFIGHTING EQUIPMENT, MUSTER LISTS, GROUND TACKLE, HAWSERS, AND BILGE SYSTEMS ABOARD VESSELS, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

As originally enacted Revised Statutes 4488 was essentially an enabling act, leaving the details of specifications and methods to regulations promulgated by the Board of Supervising Inspectors (now the U.S. Coast Guard). This act was amended by the act of March 2, 1889, which required the carriage of line-carrying projectiles and the means of propelling them. It was again amended by the act of March 3, 1905, which required that a life preserver be carried on board for each person permitted on board; also, this amendment contained provisions penalizing those manufacturing, selling or intending to sell, unsafe lifesaving appliances or fire prevention equipment.

Due to the hostilities of World War I, the International Convention for Safety of Life at Sea, 1914, was never put into force. However, the Congress adopted certain items of this convention as regulations amending Revised Statutes 4488 (act of March 4, 1915). At that time similar requirements were also adopted to cover domestic vessels other than those in river service. These latter were covered broadly, the detailed requirements being left to regulations of the supervising inspectors.

With the ratification of the 1929 International Convention for Safety of Life at Sea, the changes in lifesaving appliances (lifeboat equipment, increased buoyancy in life jackets and ring buoys, increased number of ring buoys, etc.) required were not incorporated in Revised Statutes 4488 as substantive law. The changes were instead reflected in regulations promulgated by the Board of Supervising Inspectors pursuant to the enabling authority contained in Revised Statutes 4488. This resulted in regulations which were in many respects incompatible with the law authorizing them, yet consistent with international agreement.

The confusion was compounded upon ratification of the 1948 International Convention for Safety of Life at Sea. For instance, Revised Statutes 4488 sets forth details for lifeboats with external buoyancy and collapsible sides, whereas the 1948 convention permits only internal buoyancy and fixed sides. Revised Statutes 4488 requires an oceangoing cargo vessel to have 100 percent lifeboatage, whereas the 1948 convention calls for 200 percent. As with the 1929 convention, no attempt was made to amend the details of Revised Statutes 4488, particularly the regulations contained therein. Coast Guard regulations issued under authority of the enabling portion of Revised Statutes 4488 implemented the requirements of the 1948 convention.

Inasmuch as the greater portion of the regulations contained in Revised Statutes 4488 serve only to hamper an intelligent and progressive administration of safety requirements as dictated by changing modern demands, abolishment of the regulations is long overdue. An enabling act with penalty provision included will permit adherence to international obligations and allow the flexibility so sorely needed. Protection from arbitrary or capricious regulations is adequately provided for through the Administrative Procedure Act.

The following statutes are either inadequate or unnecessary by reason of limited applicability due to advances achieved in science and industry or their supersession by later laws of broader scope. They should be repealed.

Revised Statutes 4470 (46 U.S.C. 463): This statute relates to requirements for steam

smothering systems. Regulations governing fire prevention and fire extinguishing are promulgated presently under the broad authority of the act of October 9, 1940 (54 Stat. 1028; 46 U.S.C. 463a). The statute is no longer necessary.

Revised Statutes 4471 (46 U.S.C. 464): This statute relates to fire pumps on steamers carrying 50 or more passengers, and on steamers carrying passengers which also carry cotton, hay, or hemp. It further requires sprinklers on vessels of wooden construction. The statute is archaic and its requirements are considerably below present standards set by the Coast Guard in regulations promulgated under the act of October 9, 1940 (54 Stat. 1028; 46 U.S.C. 463a). The statute is not necessary.

Revised Statutes 4479 (46 U.S.C. 472): This statute relates to the carriage of portable fire extinguishers on steamers. It is in effect an act authorizing promulgation of regulations but of limited scope. The statute is inadequate and unnecessary.

Revised Statutes 4481 (46 U.S.C. 474): This statute relates to lifesaving equipment for certain river vessels. It requires, among other things, that each passenger vessel should have at least one "metallic lifeboat". The statute as written precludes use of plastic or composition lifeboats. It has limited application and has not been employed by the Coast Guard in regulating lifesaving equipment aboard river steamers. It is archaic and unnecessary.

Revised Statutes 4482 (46 U.S.C. 475): This statute relates to the carriage of life preservers for passengers and crew on board river steamers. Floats are authorized in lieu of life preservers. The statute will be unnecessary in the event of enactment of the instant proposal.

Revised Statutes 4483 (46 U.S.C. 476): This statute relates to the carriage of fire buckets, axes and water barrels on board passenger-carrying river steamers. It is archaic. The provisions of the statute relating to fire buckets and water barrels is no longer enforced and fire axes are required on board all vessels pursuant to the provisions of the act of October 9, 1940 (54 Stat. 1028; 46 U.S.C. 463a).

Revised Statutes 4492 (46 U.S.C. 490): This statute relates to the carriage of fire buckets, axes, water barrels, life preservers and yaws on board barges carrying passengers while in tow of any steamer. The statute is archaic. Its standards are below those prescribed by the Coast Guard in regulations governing lifesaving and fire-fighting equipment aboard vessels generally. The statute is too restrictive in its coverage.

Act of October 9, 1940, section 2(a) (54 Stat. 1028; 46 U.S.C. 463a): This statute is in effect an act enabling the promulgation of regulations by the Board of Supervising Inspectors (now the Coast Guard) governing fire prevention and fire protection. Inasmuch as Revised Statute 4488 in its present form contains some fire protection requirements, combining the two statutes will eliminate the need for this one.

Act of May 28, 1908, section 11 (35 Stat. 428; 46 U.S.C. 396): This statute requires sea-going barges to carry certain appliances (lifeboat, anchor, chain and preservers) of a kind approved by the Coast Guard. The statute is restrictive, precluding the prescription of more modern equipment. The statute lacks the flexibility necessary to adequately administer a safety program aboard this type of vessel.

PROPOSED WASHINGTON'S WESTERN LANDS NATIONAL MONUMENT IN WEST VIRGINIA

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a

bill to authorize the establishment of the Washington's Western Lands National Monument in West Virginia. My able colleague, the junior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD], joins in sponsoring this measure.

It is our belief that our State is possessed of many historical and scenic shrines and lands which can be given additional and official recognition.

To some degree, Mr. President, the State of West Virginia has been a part of the country which has been overlooked by millions of Americans who travel from metropolitan and congested cities to the countryside for rest and recreation—and a stimulus from a past when pioneers opened for civilization a beautiful land. In our mountains and valleys, and along our rivers, there are historical values which need to be preserved in our National Park Service domain.

George Washington is believed to have owned, through grants and otherwise, some 35,000 acres of land in what is now West Virginia. These lands were along the Ohio and Great Kanawha Rivers. The proper preservation and marking of these areas, with facilities to serve millions of our fellow citizens, can well be accomplished on the western borders and adjacent areas of West Virginia.

Mr. President, in the eastern panhandle of our State, we have the Harpers Ferry National Monument. Here in Jefferson County is a facility which is being visited by more and more persons each year. In 1956 there were some 115,000 individuals who came to see and then to appreciate the beauties of the landscape, the places of historical significance, and the landmarks so closely related to the War Between the States. A year later the number had increased to approximately 170,000. In 1958 the total was nearly 271,000.

It was my privilege, when a Member of the House of Representatives, to author the bill to establish the Harpers Ferry National Monument. I was pleased to read in today's Washington Star, in the interesting column conducted by The Rambler, of his journey to that historic area. He wrote, in part, as follows:

Oh, the ride to Harper's Ferry. It was delightful.

This is the centenary year of John Brown's raid. He and his followers captured the town on October 26, 1859. That was a year and a half before the Civil War and had a lot to do with bringing it on.

Most of the old part of the town is owned by Uncle Sam, and the National Park Service is doing its best to restore it. The arsenal and the armory, the objects of the John Brown raid, are gone, probably forever, destroyed by retreating Confederates.

But they have restored the house of Robert Harper, who arrived in 1747 and started the ferry across the Potomac and a row of early 19th century houses alongside. They will be occupied by NPS staff members.

They have torn down some buildings because they were not there in 1859. They have removed tons of rubble and trash. The deserted city is neat and tidy for visitors who will crowd it this fall.

Frank Anderson, the National Park Service ranger in charge, guided us up the steps to St. Peter's Roman Catholic Church, a stone

Gothic structure which is now a chapel of a parish in nearby Charles Town. Almost alongside it are the ruins of St. John's Episcopal Church, destroyed by fire decades ago.

The stone steps continue to the rock commanding the view of the confluence of the Potomac and the Shenandoah, of which Thomas Jefferson said, "The scene is worth a voyage across the Atlantic. Yet here, as in the neighborhood of the Natural Bridge, are people who have passed their lives within a dozen miles and have never been to see these monuments of a war between the rivers and mountains which has shaken the earth to its center."

Mr. President, on the eastern border of West Virginia, we have a truly great national shrine. It is practical to proceed to the passage of legislation to carry forward a national monument on the western border of our beautiful and beloved State.

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

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

The bill (S. 2120) to authorize the establishment of the Washington's Western Lands National Monument in the State of West Virginia, introduced by Mr. RANDOLPH (for himself and Mr. BYRD of West Virginia), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, 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 for the purpose of establishing an area of national historical importance for the benefit of the people of the United States, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to acquire certain land or interest in land (including structures and improvements thereon) in the State of West Virginia for national monument purposes. The land so acquired shall be selected by the Secretary of the Interior from lands formerly owned by George Washington which are commonly referred to as Washington's Western Lands, and from other historic sites within the area.

SEC. 2. (a) The property acquired under the provisions of the first section of this Act shall be designated as the Washington's Western Lands National Monument and shall be set aside as a public national memorial to commemorate the historic role played by George Washington in the expansion of the frontiers of the United States. The National Park Service, under the direction of the Secretary of the Interior, shall administer, protect, and develop such monument, subject to the provisions of the Act entitled "An Act to establish a National Park Service, and for other purposes", approved August 25, 1916, as amended and supplemented, and the Act entitled "An Act to provide for the preservation of historic American sites, buildings, objects, and antiquities of national significance, and for other purposes", approved August 21, 1935, as amended.

(b) In order to provide for the proper development and maintenance of such national monument, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to construct and maintain therein such markers, buildings, and other improvements, and such facilities for the care and accommodation of visitors, as he may deem necessary.

SEC. 3. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act.

STRENGTHENING OF NORTH ATLANTIC TREATY ORGANIZATION

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, the NATO alliance is 10 years old. Leaders from NATO countries are now gathered in London to talk about the next 10 years, and ways to strengthen the Atlantic Community of Nations.

As a military deterrent, the NATO alliance has in large part served its purpose. No Communist advance has been made in Europe since its creation. While some question the adequacy of conventional forces under NATO's command as a deterrent to brush fire wars, the overall military development has been the most successful aspect of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. But it is clear that the military development of NATO, which grew out of fear of Soviet advance, has proven to be a much more cohesive cement for the NATO alliance than the more constructive aspects of economic, political, and scientific cooperation.

Clearly, article 2 of the NATO pact was designed to authorize broad cooperation in nonmilitary fields. With this in mind, I am submitting, for appropriate reference, two concurrent resolutions. The first proposes that it is the sense of the Congress that the NATO organization be strengthened in the sphere of scientific cooperation and development. It specifically proposes that the following be considered:

The establishment of a NATO University and Scientific Research Institute, jointly organized, managed, and financed by all members of NATO, to provide advanced training to scientists from NATO countries, conduct special research projects, and provide for the exchange of scientific knowledge throughout the Atlantic Community; the creation of an adequate scholarship fund for students to this NATO University and other universities in NATO countries; the establishment of a scholarship fund for young students from underdeveloped areas of the world, to contribute to the technical advancement of these areas and to give these students training in the political, social, and cultural atmosphere of the NATO nations; provision for a freer exchange of scientific and technical information among the NATO countries; the creation of a register of scientific and technical manpower for the Atlantic Community; and the creation of a NATO fund for research projects in military application and basic research, which have common interest or value to the governments and peoples of the Atlantic Community.

The second concurrent resolution proposes the strengthening of NATO in the informational field. It specifically suggests that:

It is the sense of the Congress that the President of the United States invite the other governments which are parties to the North Atlantic Treaty to establish an informational advisory committee of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. This committee shall be composed of outstanding publishers, editors, writers, educators, and artists of the member countries. The committee shall meet annually, or at such other times as may be deemed desirable or necessary, by the North Atlantic Council. The functions of the committee shall be to render advice

and counsel to the member governments on programs and projects which may more effectively combat Communist propaganda or emphasize the principles and ideals of Western democracy to the nations of the free world, and to stimulate, organize, and conduct under private auspices information and cultural activities which will contribute substantially to the promulgation of the ideology of free civilization as opposed to the ideology of the Communist orbit.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a statement I have prepared explaining these concurrent resolutions be printed in the *RECORD* at this point, along with the text of the two concurrent resolutions.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The concurrent resolutions will be received and appropriately referred, and, under the rule, will be printed in the *RECORD*; and, without objection, the statement will be printed in the *RECORD*.

The concurrent resolutions, submitted by Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey, were received and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, as follows:

S. Con. Res. 44. Concurrent resolution relative to the strengthening of the scientific and technological progress of the free nations through cooperation of the NATO organization.

Whereas the Communist bloc has made clear its determination to achieve ultimate domination of the entire world, including the United States of America; and

Whereas the Communist rulers hope to achieve this goal by attaining gradually an overwhelming preponderance of political, military, and economic power; and

Whereas a major element in the Communist program for world domination is its plan to achieve a general superiority over the United States and the remainder of the free world in the various fields of science and technology; and

Whereas science and technology represent the basic foundation of a nation's military and economic power; and

Whereas the Communist bloc has demonstrated during recent years an alarming growth in its scientific and technological capabilities; and

Whereas the economic, scientific and technological progress of the free nations, although potentially enormous, has been seriously impeded by the fact that these nations have pursued their individual programs and projects on a national basis; and

Whereas the parties to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization have declared themselves "determined to safeguard the freedom, common heritage, and civilizations of their peoples, founded on the principles of democracy, individual liberty, and the rule of law", and have joined together to resist all forms of Communist aggression and expansion; and

Whereas these member nations of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization possess a major part of the scientific and technological potential of the free world; and

Whereas the parties to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization can no longer afford to disperse their scientific and technological efforts in a manner which would permit the Soviet Union and the vassal forces of international communism to gain ground in the vital scientific and technological race: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That it is the sense of the Congress that the President be urged to invite the governments signatory to the North Atlantic Treaty to join with the United States Government in exploring the feasibility of adopting the following measures as means by which the purposes set forth in

article 2 of that treaty may be more fully effectuated:

1. The establishment of a permanent North Atlantic Treaty Organization (hereinafter referred to as NATO) University and Scientific Research Institute, jointly organized, managed, and financed by all the members of NATO, for the purpose of (A) providing advanced training to scientists from the NATO countries and other areas sharing NATO's interest in freedom and social progress; (B) conducting and directing special scientific and technical research projects and programs of mutual interest to the NATO countries; (C) providing for the exchange and dissemination of scientific knowledge throughout the Atlantic community, and the encouragement of a common effort toward scientific and technological advancement which will be sufficient to maintain for the indefinite future the scientific and technological superiority of the free world over the Communist bloc; and (D) assuring that there will be made available to all free peoples the multiplied scientific and technical benefits accruing from this combination of effort and resources.

2. In addition to the fellowship program already being conducted by NATO, the creation, by joint contributions from all the members of NATO, of an adequate scholarship fund to provide scholarships to the NATO University or other approved universities in nations which are members of NATO for promising young scientific and technical students from such nations, to be chosen on the basis of competitive examinations.

3. The establishment of a fund, jointly managed and financed by the NATO members, for the provision of scholarships to young students from the underdeveloped areas of the world, for the purpose of contributing to the technical advancement of such underdeveloped areas, and insuring that outstanding students from these areas will receive their training in an atmosphere of freedom and will be made familiar with the political, social, and cultural values of the NATO nations.

4. The adoption of a directive to the Science Committee of NATO that such committee undertake the formulation and recommendation to member countries of policies and procedures designed to provide, with a minimum detriment to security requirements, for a freer exchange of scientific and technical information among the member countries of NATO with a view to assuring the maximum declassification and dissemination of useful information throughout the Atlantic community.

5. The creation and maintenance by NATO of a NATO-wide register of scientific and technical manpower, in order to provide a basis for the assessment and maximum utilization of the human potential of the Atlantic community.

6. The creation of an adequate NATO fund, based on common financing by all the NATO governments, for the purpose of encouraging and subsidizing scientific and technical research projects, both in the field of military application and in the field of basic research, which have common interest or value to the governments and peoples of the Atlantic community.

S. Con. Res. 45. Concurrent resolution relative to the establishment of an informal advisory committee of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

Whereas the current contest between the forces of Communist imperialism and the peoples of the free world is largely a struggle of words and ideas, a struggle of education and culture, and a struggle of knowledge and intellect; and

Whereas the Soviet propaganda machine, by virtue of an enormous expenditure of effort in propaganda activities and by virtue of a total disregard of factual considera-

tions, has achieved certain outstanding successes in this continuing struggle; and

Whereas the ultimate survival of free civilization may depend to a very great extent upon the ability of free peoples to communicate their ideas and principles to one another; and

Whereas the peoples and governments of the Atlantic Community have a common interest in resisting the spread of Communist imperialism and in making known to the remainder of the world the essential principles and values upon which their civilization is based; and

Whereas the governments of the member countries of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization have already pledged themselves to cooperation in political, social, and cultural activities; and

Whereas the informational, educational, cultural and artistic activities of the countries within the North Atlantic Community are, by virtue of the essential character of the societies of such countries, conducted primarily by private individuals and institutions; and

Whereas the ability of the free societies of the North Atlantic area to compete effectively with Communist propaganda depends to a very great extent upon the initiative and imagination demonstrated by these private individuals and organizations in the educational, informational, cultural, and artistic fields: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That it is the sense of the Congress that the President of the United States invite the other governments which are parties to the North Atlantic Treaty to establish an informational advisory committee of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. This Committee shall be composed of outstanding publishers, editors, writers, educators, and artists of the member countries. The Committee shall meet annually, or at such other times as may be deemed desirable or necessary, by the North Atlantic Council. The functions of the Committee shall be to render advice and counsel to the member governments on programs and projects which may more effectively combat Communist propaganda or emphasize the principles and ideals of Western Democracy to the nations of the free world, and to stimulate, organize and conduct under private auspices information and cultural activities which will contribute substantially to the promulgation of the ideology of free civilization as opposed to the ideology of the Communist orbit.

The statement presented by Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR WILLIAMS OF NEW JERSEY

The NATO alliance is 10 years old. Leaders from NATO countries are about to gather in London to talk about the next 10 years and ways to strengthen the Atlantic community of nations.

As a military deterrent, the NATO alliance has in large part served its purpose. No Communist advance has been made in Europe since its creation. While some question the adequacy of conventional forces under NATO's command as a deterrent to brush-fire wars, the overall military development has been the most successful aspect of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. But it is clear that the military development of NATO which grew out of fear of Soviet advance has proven to be a much more cohesive cement for the NATO alliance than the more constructive aspects of economic, political, and scientific cooperation.

Fear of aggression caused NATO in its first decade to devote most of its energy to defense purposes. This same fear brought Greece and Turkey into the alliance, and

thereby extended NATO into the eastern Mediterranean.

But today, the threat of military advance is not the only aspect of the Communist offensive.

Khrushchev's announced goal to overtake the West in scientific development and economic accomplishment, his clear willingness to use a disproportionate share of the Soviet's economic means to penetrate the uncommitted nations of the world, and the clear evidence of Soviet success in the scientific field constitute an equally dangerous challenge in the long run to our security than the hundred and seventy hostile army divisions poised in Eastern Europe.

Of course, this is not to suggest we can let down our military arm. The fact is we must be prepared to fight Communist imperialism on all levels. I sometimes hear debates as to whether the military or economic challenge is the most dangerous. This reminds me of posing the alternative to a man of whether he would rather die of shock or by bleeding to death. While some, with good grounds, question the adequacy of our overall military ability to deter Soviet aggression, whatever form it takes, my purpose here today is to discuss the other aspects of the Soviet challenge, and the potential contribution NATO can make in meeting these challenges.

Clearly, article II of the NATO Pact was designed to authorize broad cooperation in nonmilitary fields.

Many committees and subcommittees were set up to work out blueprints for cooperation. These blueprints have been drawn and are on file. They are wonderfully thought-through documents that will soon be available for research on Ph. D. theses, but in my judgment, it's about time we put them to work.

Without exaggeration, I think that if we do not provide more constructive types of cement to hold the NATO Alliance together, there is very serious danger that NATO in the next decade will decline and possibly even disappear. If we do not move forward in the NATO Alliance in providing new means of holding it together, in my judgment we will slip backwards.

As a Member of the House of Representatives, I submitted a resolution suggesting a series of ways to strengthen nonmilitary cooperation under the NATO Alliance. Since then, much has been accomplished, particularly in fields of scientific development and political coordination.

As the famous report of the NATO Committee of Three on Non-Military Cooperation said in 1956, "The fundamental fact is that the nation-state, by itself and relying exclusively on national policy and national power, is inadequate for progress or even for survival in the nuclear age. As the founders of the North Atlantic Treaty foresaw, the growing interdependence of states politically and economically, as well as militarily, calls for an ever-increasing measure of international cohesion and cooperation. Some states may be able to enjoy a degree of political and economic independence when things are going well. No state, however powerful, can guarantee its security and its welfare by national action alone."

On the political level there has been a good deal more consultation than in the past. The habit of collective discussion seems to be growing, and that is certainly a healthy development. But much more needs to be done.

I am submitting today for appropriate reference two concurrent resolutions, one dealing with some ideas for scientific cooperation among the NATO members, the other dealing with cooperation on the level of our informational activities.

The concurrent resolution dealing with scientific cooperation proceeds from the rather well-established assumption that a

widening of scientific cooperation and interchange of knowledge among the NATO countries would serve to hasten scientific advance.

In addition, it proposes the establishment of a NATO University and Scientific Research Institute to be jointly organized, managed, and financed by all the members of the NATO alliance. This university would first of all serve as an additional symbol of NATO cooperation. In addition, it could serve the very practical purpose of providing advanced training to scientists from all NATO countries, and other areas sharing NATO's interest in freedom and social progress.

Some may say that existing national facilities for scientific training are adequate and they should be strengthened, rather than establishing a new Institute. However, in my judgment, we need to do both. The evidence of Soviet advance is too clear to warrant any halfhearted measures.

As Norman F. Ramsey, scientific adviser to the Secretary General of NATO, stated recently, "The problem of science in the Atlantic Community remains a challenge. Much has been done by national efforts and by international enterprise. Compared to the past, the scientific and technical cooperation now existing among the NATO nations is impressive. Yet, compared to what is needed to be done, when we think of the swift advance of Russian research—even if Russia has yet to catch up with the West in most subjects—then our efforts are still too slow footed. The present is a beginning but the challenge still remains."

In addition to establishing a NATO University, the concurrent resolution suggests that the present fellowship program conducted by the NATO organization, which anticipates 400 fellowships next year, be supplemented with an adequate scholarship fund to provide scholarships to the NATO University or other approved universities for promising young scientific and technical students throughout the NATO area to be chosen on the basis of competitive examinations. Again, of course, the scholarship fund would be supported by joint contributions from all members of NATO.

Also, the concurrent resolution proposes the establishment of a scholarship fund for young students from underdeveloped areas, either to the NATO University or to other approved NATO country universities, for the purpose of contributing to the technical advance of the underdeveloped areas of the world, and also to insure that these promising young people receive their training in an atmosphere of freedom, and are made familiar with the political, social, and cultural values of the West.

The concurrent resolution further proposes that the Science Committee of NATO be urged to set up a freer exchange of scientific and technical information among the member countries and to come up with recommendations to the member governments for policies and procedures which would assure the maximum degree of declassification and dissemination of useful information throughout the Atlantic Community. Of course, this would be confined by needed security considerations.

In addition, the concurrent resolution proposes to the President that we explore with our NATO allies the creation of a NATO-wide register of scientific and technical manpower, and further that we explore the creation of an adequate NATO fund based on common financing for encouraging and subsidizing scientific and technical research projects, both in the field of military application and in the field of basic research.

Mr. President, this concurrent resolution suggests a series of ideas for consideration by the Congress. I am hopeful that after adequate discussion and thought some version of this concurrent resolution could be agreed to as a recommendation to the President, thereby indicating the concern of the Congress in this most important area.

Mr. President, this concurrent resolution is in accord with one of the major recommendations of the President's Committee on Scientists and Engineers in their December 1958 report. This recommendation urged the coordination of scientific activities between the countries of the free world. It reads as follows: "The Federal Government at the White House level assume the responsibility for coordinating and stimulating the Nation's efforts in the development and utilization of highly trained manpower * * * the coordination of governmental and private efforts abroad further to develop and better to utilize the pool of highly trained manpower available to us and the friendly nations so as to promote the most effective arrangements for maximum utilization of these resources."

Following sputnik there was a great national awakening to the challenge we face in the scientific sphere in the years ahead. I am fearful, however, Mr. President, that this national awakening has not resulted in sufficient action. We cannot wait any longer. Do we need a sputnik once a year to realize that this challenge is not something that can be discussed for a few months, and then pigeonholed?

It is long range and it is serious. Let us take the opportunity of the up-coming discussions in London to advance thoughts along this line.

Much is to be gained from more intensive and extensive cooperation among the NATO countries in the scientific field. I believe that a NATO University could serve the highly desirable purpose of mobilizing this potential for cooperation and put it to work.

My second concurrent resolution deals with the problem of adequately communicating the basic tenets of Western democracy and civilization to the underdeveloped areas of the world, and, indeed, to those who are now enslaved by Communist imperialism. It has been repeatedly said that the long-run contest between freedom and slavery will be ultimately won at the level of the war between ideas. One of the great strengths of our Western democracy is the diversity which exists between nation states in cultural development.

I would not suggest any effort to try to adopt a coordinated information program between the NATO countries. This would negate the very diversity that is our strength. But I do believe that the NATO countries could benefit greatly from a constant exchange of views on information programs and on the current Communist tactics in the informational field. Therefore, my concurrent resolution proposes the establishment of a NATO Committee to explore types of cooperation that might be appropriate in the information field.

There are, of course, many other ideas that have been advanced suggesting additional cooperation between the NATO community under article II of the alliance. But I think it's time that we do more than talk about article II. If we do not provide additional cohesion for the NATO Alliance I think we run the serious risk of seeing it wither on the vine in its second decade. We in the Atlantic Community are now facing the supreme test of our capacity to unite. Nothing less than our survival may be at stake if we fail in this test.

PRINTING OF FINAL REPORT OF THEODORE ROOSEVELT CENTENNIAL COMMISSION AS A SENATE DOCUMENT

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, the Theodore Roosevelt Centennial Commission, created by Public Law 183, 84th Congress, provided for an appropriate celebration during the year beginning

October 27, 1957, and ending on October 27, 1958. The report of the Commission is now ready, the work having been completed. The Commission will disband as soon as the report has been submitted.

The President of the United States is ex officio a member of the Commission, as is also the Speaker of the House of Representatives. Vice President NIXON is chairman, and I have the honor of being vice chairman of the Commission. The membership included the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. MUNDT), Representative STEVEN DEROUNIAN, and Representative LEO O'BRIEN, both of the State of New York. The members at large throughout the United States are: Mrs. Hazel H. Abel, Nebraska; C. Norman Brunsdale, North Dakota; Hal Davies, North Dakota; Hermann Hagedorn, director and secretary, New York; Mrs. Sherman Post Haight, Connecticut; Herbert Millen, Pennsylvania; Lowell Stockman, Oregon; Oscar S. Straus II, New York.

The career of former President Theodore Roosevelt and the centennial celebration are such that the report should be printed as a Senate document.

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

The resolution (S. Res. 128) was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved, That the final report of the Theodore Roosevelt Centennial Commission be printed, with illustrations, as a Senate document.

ADDITIONAL TIME WITHIN WHICH CERTAIN STATE AGREEMENTS UNDER SECTION 218 OF THE SOCIAL SECURITY ACT MAY BE MODIFIED—AMENDMENT

Mr. McCARTHY (for himself and Mr. HUMPHREY) submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to the bill (H.R. 213) to provide additional time within which certain State agreements under section 218 of the Social Security Act may be modified to secure coverage for nonprofessional school district employees, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

NATIONAL ECONOMIC COUNCIL FOR SECURITY AND PROGRESS—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILL

Under authority of the order of the Senate of May 28, 1959, the names of Senators KEATING, PASTORE, YOUNG of Ohio, BYRD of West Virginia, BEALL, MUSKIE, and BARTLETT were added as additional cosponsors of the bill (S. 2080) to establish a National Economic Council for Security and Progress to provide planning and to coordinate programs to meet the Communist challenge in the economic sphere, introduced by Mr. WILEY on May 28, 1959.

NATIONAL WILDLIFE DISEASE LABORATORY—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILL

Under authority of the order of the Senate of June 1, 1959, the names of

Senators MAGNUSON, MURRAY, MORSE, HUMPHREY, and NEUBERGER were added as additional cosponsors of the bill (S. 2086) to provide for the establishment of a National Wildlife Disease Laboratory, introduced by Mr. ALLOTT (for himself and Mr. CARROLL) on June 1, 1959.

AUTHORIZATION FOR COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE TO SUBMIT REPORTS

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce be permitted until midnight tonight to file reports.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, reserving the right to object—and I shall not object—I inquire whether the minority was consulted with regard to the request.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I request permission for the filing of both majority reports and minority views.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Washington? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

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. HILL:

Address delivered by him on the subject "The International College of Surgeons and the Health of Our People," at Huntsville, Ala., May 21, 1959.

By Mr. DOUGLAS:

Address entitled "Balancing the Moral Budget," delivered by Senator HUMPHREY at the 18th annual Century Club dinner of Harlem YMCA, at New York City on May 25, 1959.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey:

Address by Senator RANDOLPH, delivered at the Memorial Day services, at Franklin, W. Va., May 30, 1959.

Article written by Congressman CORNELIUS E. GALLAGHER, member, Foreign Affairs Committee, House of Representatives, entitled "Berlin: City of Crisis Where Free Germans Must Trade With Communists."

By Mr. BYRD of West Virginia:

Statement on proposed legislation to expand the distribution of food to the needy, made by him before the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry on June 4, 1959.

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

Memorial Day address delivered by Representatives GEORGE M. RHODES, of Pennsylvania, at Womelsdorf, Pa.

By Mr. CLARK (for himself and Mr. SCOTT):

Statement regarding forthcoming dedication of Albert Einstein Medical Center, Philadelphia.

SEVENTY-FIFTH ANNIVERSARY OF UNION STOCKYARDS CO. OF OMAHA

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, the Union Stockyards Co. of Omaha was established in 1884—75 years ago. This diamond jubilee was observed by an Omaha Chamber of Commerce public affairs luncheon on May 21, on which occasion Mr. A. Z. Baker, president of

the American Stockyards Association, delivered an address.

The founders of the company were honored. The company itself was commended for its steadfast and competent service to the livestock industry. These efforts, together with the cooperation of the entire community, and of the livestock raisers and feeders of Nebraska and her neighbors, have brought to my home city the rightful and proud title of "World's Largest Livestock Market and Meatpacking Center."

In joining the many who recognize and commend this three-quarter century achievement, I should like to pay tribute to the present management of the Union Stockyards Co., and especially to Harry B. Coffee, who has served as its president for the past 16 years.

Many of my colleagues personally remember and know him as a onetime Congressman from Nebraska's big Fifth District—from 1935 to 1943. He made a notable contribution to national legislation by his independence and vigor. He was a westerner and a cattleman of the first order. But overall, he was an American citizen interested in the advancement and improvement of his country's well-being along proven, historical, and constitutional lines.

That is still his credo. That is why the Union Stockyards Co. has prospered and served so well. That is why Omaha, Nebr., and its neighbor States have become better places in which to live than they would have been without a man like Harry B. Coffee. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the address delivered by President A. Z. Baker, of the American Stockyards Association, entitled "Built on a Firm Foundation," be printed in the body of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

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

BUILT ON A FIRM FOUNDATION

(Address by A. Z. Baker, president, American Stockyards Association, at a public affairs luncheon of the Omaha Chamber of Commerce, May 21, 1959)

Upon the firm foundation laid by seven courageous and farsighted men just 75 years ago has been built a great institution which has helped to develop the vast livestock and meatpacking industry, and the resources of this community and these two neighboring States, as it has become the world's largest livestock market and meatpacking center.

You honor them and their successors in this celebration of the 75th anniversary of the establishment of the Union Stockyards Co., of Omaha, and you honor me in permitting me to join you on this happy occasion. You do well to especially honor the president of that company, Harry B. Coffee, for his outstanding service over the last 16 years in the development and management of this tremendous enterprise.

An anniversary is the occasion for a pause in the onward rush of time—to look back along the road we have traveled and see how far we have come and what we have built; to determine where we are and how well we are using our heritage to serve the present and safeguard the future; and to look forward as far as we can see to get a vision of what lies ahead and how we may carry on.

The Union Stockyards Co. has published a special and very attractive 75th annual

report in which it has recounted the early history of the industry, the laying of the foundation for Omaha's livestock market, and the laying of the foundation for Omaha's meatpacking industry. I am sure all of you have seen and perhaps had an opportunity to study the report; so it would be presumptuous of me to attempt to repeat or rephrase any part of it. However, from a lifetime in the livestock marketing and meatpacking business, I know how many people know so little about this great industry. Even those who use or serve it, and those who live nearby, sometimes seem to understand it the least. Because of its size and its ramifications, it seems to be all things to all men.

I recall the story of six blind men who went to see an elephant. The first approached the elephant, and, happening to fall against its broad and sturdy side, at once began to call "Why bless me; the elephant is very like a wall." And each in turn, touching a different part of the elephant, concluded that it was like a spear, a snake, a tree, a fan, and a rope. And so they disputed loud and long, each in his own opinion exceeding stiff and strong; though each was partly right, they all were in the wrong.

I suspect any six men viewing the world's greatest livestock market and meatpacking center would fail to understand or appreciate the immensity or the importance of the different segments of this huge industry.

One person might view its location and fail to appreciate the well-nigh ideal site upon which the foundation of Omaha's livestock market and meatpacking industry was laid. And yet you will appreciate the genius and foresight of the founders who laid the foundations alongside a great river; almost astride the boundary between two great livestock-producing States; in the very center of what was, and was to be, the greatest concentration of livestock production; almost exactly midway between the Atlantic and the Pacific coasts; and readily accessible from all directions. As a result of its convenient location and accessibility, last year livestock was received from 31 different States and from Canada, and forwarded to packers in 172 cities in 34 States and to livestock grazers and feeders in 21 States and Canada. In addition to this, the packers making up the meatpacking industry forwarded their products in all directions, perhaps to every State in the Nation and to many other countries.

From the farms of these 2 neighboring States of Nebraska and Iowa in 1958 were marketed 6 million cattle and calves, 19½ million hogs, and 2¼ million sheep and lambs. The cash received by farmers from the marketing of this livestock was nearly \$2½ billion, or nearly 22 percent of the cash received from farm marketings of livestock for the whole United States.

In the same year, the commercial slaughter of cattle and calves in these two States was nearly 17 percent of the total of the Nation; hog slaughter was nearly 22½ percent of the total; and sheep and lamb slaughter was nearly 15 percent of the total. The total live weight of all this slaughter amounted to 19.4 percent of the total for the United States.

Ninety percent of the total receipts of livestock at the Omaha Union Stockyards comes from the two adjoining States of Nebraska and Iowa, but the States of Wyoming, South Dakota, Kansas, Texas, Oklahoma, Colorado, Minnesota, and Montana also supply substantial numbers of livestock.

The total livestock receipts at the Omaha Union Stockyards in 1958 from Nebraska was equivalent to 59 percent of the total marketings of cattle and calves, 41 percent of the total marketings of hogs, and 46 percent of the total marketings of sheep and lambs from that State. The Omaha market received from

Iowa 17 percent of its total marketings of cattle and calves, and 11 percent of its marketings of hogs, sheep, and lambs.

Another person might be impressed by the physical structures and facilities which make up this giant industry. He might see only the modern, well-designed, well kept, and efficiently operated livestock marketing facilities spread over 200 acres providing "hotel accommodations" for the continuous stream of livestock coming to this market; the convenient receiving facilities for the prompt unloading of thousands of railroad cars and many more thousands of motor trucks with 124 rail chutes, 72 truck chutes devoted to this service; the 22 miles of alleys through which the livestock is driven to the pens of the consignees; the 6,339 pens in the cattle, hog, and sheep divisions into which livestock is yarded for feed, water, rest, preparation for sale, and sale to the best buyers; the modern scales upon which the livestock is weighed by employees of the stockyard company with utmost care and accuracy; the vast storage areas for holding the livestock until it is delivered to the buyer; the loading facilities for safe and prompt loading and shipping of the livestock and alleyways through which the livestock can be driven to the adjacent slaughterhouses; the 30 miles of railroad tracks operated by the subsidiary terminal railroad, the connecting link between the livestock market and meatpacking industry and the various railroads serving the community; or fail to see, because of the remarkable cleanliness that prevails, the 22 miles of water lines and 23 miles of sewers which serve the property. Perhaps first of all and always, he would see and be impressed by the imposing Livestock Exchange Building which houses the various agencies engaged in business at the world's greatest livestock market and meatpacking center. He might see all these things; but he might fail to appreciate their use.

He would see and be impressed with the extent of the huge meatpacking industry located adjacent to the livestock market and constituting the world's largest meatpacking center with 18 individual companies, including 4 large national packing companies slaughtering all classes of livestock, which slaughtered last year more than 5 million head of livestock. And here again seeing all these physical things, he might fail to realize that it is people who make them useful.

Another person viewing this great livestock market and meatpacking center composed of scores of independent agencies might fail to appreciate the functions which they perform and the services by which they are accomplished, for a terminal livestock market, typified by the market operated and conducted by the Union Stockyards Co. of Omaha, is a coordination of many independent specialized agencies performing well-defined and special functions, making up a unified market, serving the livestock industry on one hand and the slaughtering and meatpacking industry on the other.

There are 40 separate commission firms or market agencies registered and bonded by the U.S. Department of Agriculture engaged in the business of selling livestock on a commission basis at this market.

Then there are more than 30 major registered and bonded order buyers and dealers engaged in buying livestock on a commission basis for packers and feeders at other points or in buying and selling livestock for their own accounts.

In addition, there are a Livestock Exchange, a Traders' Exchange, a Livestock Foundation, and numerous other agencies engaged in various services for the industry.

Each of the 18 packers is an independent company or firm.

The 500 employees of the Union Stockyards Co. and its subsidiary, the employees

of the various agencies making up the market, and the hundreds of employees of the packing companies constitute a sizable part of this community. The income for goods produced and services rendered in this industry is a vital element in the economic life of the community.

The principal function of a livestock market, such as this one, is to convert livestock into dollars. To do this efficiently and effectively, it must assemble a large volume of all kinds of livestock from a wide area and attract buyers from the adjacent packing-houses and from other localities so that there will be an ample supply of the various kinds of livestock to meet the demands of the slaughtering industry and enough buyers wanting different kinds of livestock to absorb the entire supply at reasonable prices. In carrying out its function of converting livestock into dollars, the market undertakes to provide suitable facilities and every proper safeguard and condition enabling, encouraging, and requiring buyers and sellers to negotiate the conversion of livestock into the proper number of dollars under fair and favorable conditions so that the full number of dollars will be returned to the producer. The market is a public market to which any livestock producer may consign his livestock at any time for sale in open competition with other livestock producers to buyers who also are in open competition with other buyers; and to which all buyers may come and bid upon the livestock offered for sale. It is a competitive market with competition among sellers, among buyers, and even with other markets and marketing systems. It is a reliable market policed by the stockyard owner who is neither the seller nor the buyer but the third man in the ring, who provides the facilities and requires that they be used fairly, who weighs the livestock, and safeguards the livestock while in the stockyards. It is a regulated market under supervision and regulation by agencies of the U.S. Department of Agriculture to assure reasonable facilities, services, and charges and fair practices without discrimination in any respect.

Another major function of the market, which may not be appreciated by the casual observer, is the determination of values of livestock reflecting total and real supply and demand resulting from the negotiation in open competition between qualified, experienced, and well-informed sales agents representing the producers, and buyers representing the packers and slaughterers.

A third function is the communication of reliable information regarding prices and conditions of sale of livestock to producers to guide them in their production and marketing programs, to slaughterers to guide them in their day-to-day purchasing and slaughtering policies, to distributors to acquaint them with supplies of the different kinds and grades of meat, and even to the consumers to acquaint them with the immediate and prospective supplies of different kinds of meat to influence their buying and meat consumption.

Equally complicated and unappreciated are the functions of the slaughterer, the meat-packer, the processor, and the distributor who must move into consumptive channels all the livestock offered. Some packers limit their operations to a particular kind of livestock and to a particular trade with a selective demand and consequently follow selective livestock buying policies; some slaughter all classes and grades of livestock and undertake to find buyers for the product in one place or another; while some packers confine their operations in local areas, some distribute their products over the entire country and even into other countries.

The functions and services performed by this great livestock market and meatpacking center are public services benefitting the livestock industry, the consumers, and the

friendly community in which they are located.

Another person might fail to appreciate that the foundation for this great enterprise was laid in the past by people who recognized the need for a livestock market and a meatpacking center in this particular locality, who recognized the need for adequate structures to permit efficient operation of a livestock market and a packing industry; and who took steps to provide the physical facilities in which the business could be carried on and found the way to develop the industry and put the facilities into efficient and effective use. Because of the firm foundation, it has been possible to build an enduring structure.

Another person might fail to recognize the immensity of the present operations; but I am sure everyone of you is acquainted with the developments during the present era of some 16 years, and the aggressive management program which has brought this industry to its present status as the world's largest livestock market and meatpacking center.

In this 16-year period nearly 96½ million head of livestock have been marketed at the Omaha Union Stockyards. Although the volume of sheep and lambs has declined along with the decline in production, there has been a substantial increase in the volume of cattle receipts. Calf and hog receipts have changed very little. In spite of the large volume of hogs marketed at interior Iowa and southern Minnesota points, which has grown to more than 16 million head per year in this period, the Omaha market has maintained a rather constant volume of around 3 million head of hogs.

In this present period the company has met changed and changing conditions with changes in its facilities and services. It has met decentralization, disintegration, disharmony in marketing, and other conditions, by coordination of functions and operations. It has met competition of other markets, marketing systems, and marketing practices by improved and more effective services. It has met increased costs with increased efficiency. It has maintained and improved facilities and services, kept rates and charges to users within reasonable limits, and earned a modest net profit for its owners. The 75th annual report shows the soundness of its present operations.

A sixth person might not see the future of this great enterprise. He might wonder about the effect of so-called vertical integration; but he should understand that this market can match the advantages of integration with even greater advantages of coordination of independent specialized agencies, serving both the producer and the consumer as well as the intermediate marketing and processing agencies, while preserving the independence of the producer and the consumer to determine the conduct of their own enterprise.

He might wonder about the disintegration of the livestock marketing and meatpacking industry; and fail to appreciate that this particular livestock market and meatpacking center has been developed in the face of these conditions and can, by its efficient and effective service, meet, and even surpass, the less efficient and less effective services offered by disintegrated segments of the industry.

He might wonder about the possible shift of livestock production to other areas; and again fail to appreciate the opportunities for economical livestock production in the general area of this livestock market and packing center, with proper coordination of supply and demand, production and marketing to meet the challenges of other areas.

And he might wonder about the development of other systems of marketing; and fail to appreciate the vital service performed by this market throughout its history, and by similar markets in other sections of the

country, which has helped to develop, and will be needed even more in the future to preserve and maintain a healthy livestock industry, an efficient and effective competitive marketing system, a prosperous community, and an adequate supply of meat for all the consumers, at reasonable prices, in the days of the future.

The world's largest livestock market and meatpacking center has been built on a firm foundation; it is strong and healthy; but it must be understood and defended, if it is to prosper and contribute to the welfare of the livestock industry, the community and the Nation.

I hope unlike the six blind men, in every kind of meeting, when disputants convene, you will have an understanding of what each other means and talks about a stockyard each one of you has seen.

THE PRACTICE OF RELIGIOUS DISCRIMINATION AGAINST AMERICAN CITIZENS IN EMPLOYMENT

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, on May 18 of this year, an article appeared in the Washington Post and Times Herald, stating that pressures brought by the Government of Saudi Arabia are inducing certain American corporations to practice religious discrimination against American citizens in employment and in business dealings with other American firms. The article suggested that such discrimination may constitute violations of certain State laws. Most significantly, it was reported that our Department of State had told a New York State law-enforcement agency that religious discrimination by the Arabian American Oil Co. is a consequence of Saudi Arabia's attitude toward Jews, which in turn, is a consequence of tensions in the Middle East. It was reported that the Department advised the New York agency, the State commission against discrimination, that a finding by the commission that the employment policies of the Arabian American Oil Co. are in violation of New York law would prejudice the company's operations in Saudi Arabia and would probably adversely affect other U.S. interests there as well.

Mr. President, American diplomacy is but a tool designed to serve and safeguard our national honor, and secure the values of our country, including a cardinal principle of our creed—the belief in human dignity and equality. Always, the power our Nation has acquired in world affairs should be put to work in the cause of justice, not diminished by a confused appraisal of narrow, short-range expediency. Very properly, the United States is scrupulous about non-interference in the internal affairs of other nations. The United States should be equally scrupulous about the rights of the American people to be free, in our internal affairs, from foreign interference.

The Senate has a traditional policy on these fundamental questions, and has expressed itself time after time on them. The issues implicit in this matter of religious discrimination against American citizens are so significant that I believe the Senate and the public should have access to all available information.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that correspondence in which I have participated with the Department of State, consisting of four letters, be printed in the RECORD, following my remarks.

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

MAY 21, 1959.

HON. CHRISTIAN A. HERTER,
Secretary of State,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: On Monday, May 18, 1959, the Washington Post and Times Herald published a news article from United Press-International. According to the article, the Arabian American Oil Co. (ARAMCO), a U.S. corporation, does not employ or refuses to hire American citizens of the Jewish faith. ARAMCO's employment policy, the article reports, applies to positions in this country, as well as to positions in Saudi Arabia. In addition, the New York Supreme Court will decide shortly whether the employment policy of ARAMCO violates New York antidiscrimination statutes.

The news article indicates that ARAMCO has ceased its business relationships with certain American corporations in whose economic life Americans of Jewish faith play a significant role. The Philco Corp., which formerly sold electronic equipment to ARAMCO, is one such corporation, according to the press. Charges have been made that American corporations in which Jews may not play a significant role but which deal with businesses located in Israel have been placed under Saudi Arabia pressures and boycotts.

I am informed that the alleged policies of ARAMCO, enumerated above, are the consequence of actions or threatened actions by the Government of Saudi Arabia. If the article prepared by United Press-International is correct, Assistant Secretary of State Rountree intervened through correspondence he addressed to the New York State Commission Against Discrimination, which urged the commission to exempt ARAMCO from the operation of the New York antidiscrimination laws. Moreover, Mr. Lincoln White, press officer of the Department of State, is reported to have issued a press release in which he characterized Arab efforts to enforce economic sanctions against our fellow Americans of the Jewish faith as an outgrowth of conflict created between Israel and her Arab neighbors.

As you will appreciate—particularly in view of past action by the Senate on the basic questions involved in this matter—I regard the recent newspaper reports as being of great potential importance. In so saying, I am thinking not only of the consequences the situation as reported may have to the Jewish community, but also of other religious groups and of racial groups, too, which might be affected one day by a precedent arising from the Saudi Arabia-ARAMCO situation.

Accordingly, I am seeking all the available facts, in order to put the problem in the most appropriate perspective. Therefore, your comments or materials or documents, including the reported letter of Assistant Secretary Rountree and the reported press release or statement of Mr. White, would be of interest and assistance to me, if they can be made available.

With best wishes, I am
Sincerely yours,

E. L. BARTLETT.

JUNE 1, 1959.

HON. E. L. BARTLETT,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR BARTLETT: I have for reply your letter of May 21 to the Secretary of State

regarding certain allegations arising out of a case brought by the American Jewish Congress against the Arabian American Oil Co. in New York State.

As has been indicated in the press, the American Jewish Congress has appealed to the New York State Supreme Court an earlier decision of the New York State Commission Against Discrimination with respect to the Arabian American Oil Co. You will, I am sure, appreciate that it would not be appropriate for the Department to comment on the substance of a case which is currently before the courts of a State.

I attach for your information a copy of the letter which the Department, over the signature of Assistant Secretary Rountree, sent to the New York State commission. You will note that this letter was in response to inquiries from the commission and was intended to present the facts of the situation in Saudi Arabia as we understood them. It was not in any sense intended as a recommendation to the commission and was solely concerned with the situation in Saudi Arabia, without reference to the situation in New York State.

I also attach for your information a transcript of the comments which Mr. Lincoln White made to the press in this same matter. Mr. White did not issue a formal release nor did he comment on the relationship of this problem to the conflict between Israel and her Arab neighbors.

It is true, however, that the restrictions affecting persons of the Jewish faith which have arisen in certain countries of the Arab world are to a large extent the result of the tensions arising from this conflict. The United States has continually sought, both directly and through the United Nations, to lessen these tragic tensions. At the same time this Government has, as occasions for effective representation have arisen, impressed upon the foreign governments concerned our deep concern over the continuation for whatever reason of restrictions tending to curb the opportunities for trade and travel of any of our citizens. You may be sure that the Department does not acquiesce in or condone the actions of foreign governments which may tend to discriminate against groups of American citizens.

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM B. MACOMBER, JR.,
Assistant Secretary
(For the Acting Secretary of State).

SEPTEMBER 23, 1957.

MR. ELMER A. CARTER,
Commissioner, State Commission Against
Discrimination, New York, N.Y.

DEAR MR. CARTER: I refer to your letter of September 5 to Secretary Dulles concerning the verified complaint of the American Jewish Congress against the Arabian American Oil Co. With regard to the specific questions you asked the Secretary in this communication, the following replies are pertinent:

1. Saudi Arabia does not permit persons of the Jewish faith to work in Saudi Arabia.
2. Saudi Arabia requires a visa for entrance and does not issue visas to persons of the Jewish faith.
3. The United States does not discriminate in the issuance of passports among its citizens on grounds of race, color or creed.
4. Any finding by the Commission which would compel ARAMCO to employ persons of the Jewish faith in Saudi Arabia could hardly be made effective in view of the known attitude of the Saudi Government. Efforts by ARAMCO to implement such a finding would most certainly prejudice the company's operations in that country and would probably adversely affect other United States interests there as well.

The Department has long been aware of the difficult problems presented by the reluctance of the Saudi Government to permit individuals of the Jewish faith, regardless of nationality, to enter Saudi Arabia. The Department has on appropriate occasions made representations to the Saudi Government regarding this problem but continuing tensions in the area, largely resulting from the Arab-Israel conflict, have so far prevented any improvement in the Saudi attitude. This Government will continue to seek an improvement in this situation as opportunities to do so arise. In the meantime, any immediate change in current Saudi Arabian policies on this issue would not appear likely.

I trust that the foregoing will be helpful to you in your consideration of this matter.

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM M. ROUNTREE,
Assistant Secretary, Near East, South
Asian, and African affairs.

JUNE 3, 1959.

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

DEAR MR. MACOMBER: Your letter of June 1 regarding the restrictions which Saudi Arabia has sought to apply against Americans of the Jewish faith is appreciated. Although your letter does not discuss allegations that Saudi Arabia has applied economic sanctions against American corporations which hire Jews to work in the United States, against American corporations which are controlled or directed by Jews, and against American corporations which deal in Israel, it is responsive to my request for information regarding the role of the Department of State in the New York judicial proceedings against the Arabian American Oil Co. (ARAMCO). These proceedings result from a complaint by the American Jewish Congress that ARAMCO has violated New York law prohibiting discrimination in employment on the basis of religion.

Even without reference to the reported efforts of Saudi Arabia to interfere in the internal economic and political life of the American people, the refusal of Saudi Arabia to accept the admission of Jews to Saudi Arabia—even as part of our military components—is a serious matter that compromises our national honor. Of course, I am speaking in reference to the legitimate desire of American Jews to enter Saudi Arabia for tourist, business, educational, or public service purposes. I am glad that the Department of State recognizes the fundamental nature of the problem and is working toward its solution.

In a legal sense, however, your comment that Saudi Arabia's restrictions against American Jews is a product of conflict and tragic tensions between Israel and the Arab world is, of course, a nonsequitur. First, an armistice is in force between Israel and her Arab neighbors, and no conflict exists in a juridical sense, according to the United Nations. I recognize, however, that in an emotional sense, your statement may be correct, considered in reference to the irrational hates and fantasies in the Middle East. Second, it should be made clear that the existence of the State of Israel does not alter the legal status of our Jewish countrymen, and their right to treatment by foreign nations that is commensurate with treatment afforded other Americans. It is my fear that the Department of State, by attributing sanctions against some Americans to tensions in other parts of the world, may be giving an appearance—contrary to fact—of condonation of such sanctions. There is the danger, too, of a very serious precedent being established to the detriment of other groups of Americans.

I have noted with satisfaction your statement, in your letter of June 1 written for the

Department, that "it would not be appropriate for the Department to comment on the substance of a case which is currently before the courts of a State." That position is clearly the only proper one, under our system of government. Therefore, the failure of the Department to adhere to that position in respect to the proceedings before the New York State Commission Against Discrimination is very regrettable. The commission was established by the Legislature of New York, and pursuant to the New York statute, the commission has a quasi-judicial function. I am sure you will agree that if the Department had told the commission merely that the application of New York law was not a matter of Federal cognizance, much criticism and misunderstanding would have been avoided. Instead, the Department informed the commission, through Mr. Rountree's letter to Commissioner Carter, that a finding in the proceedings by the commission against ARAMCO "would most certainly prejudice the company's operations in that country and would probably adversely affect other U.S. interests there as well." This statement is susceptible only to the reasonable interpretation that it was intended as a recommendation by the Department. The statement, then, was not one "without reference to the situation in New York State" (as contended by you in your letter of June 1, 1959) because the ramifications of a possible finding by the New York commission against ARAMCO were the subject matter of the statement.

Finally, and perhaps most disturbing of all, is the fact that Mr. Rountree's letter misconstrues the nature of the New York proceedings and the relief sought by the American Jewish Congress. The commission was not faced with a request that ARAMCO be compelled to take Jewish employees to Saudi Arabia. In view of the Saudi Arabian visa policy, such a request would have been a futile one, calling upon the commission to attempt to do that which it is powerless to do. Instead, the commission was asked to require ARAMCO to abide by the New York law against discrimination. Inability of Jewish employees to gain admission to Saudi Arabia would be another matter, which could not be remedied in State proceedings. But the difference is that under the requested procedure, discrimination would be the doing of Saudi Arabia, and not the doing of ARAMCO.

Again, let me express my gratitude for the promptness and responsiveness of your letter. I can assure you that continued efforts by the Department of State to obtain an end to sanctions against Americans by Saudi Arabia will be welcomed generally and will help our country in its leadership of freedom's cause.

With best wishes, I am
Sincerely,

E. L. BARTLETT.

HOME RULE FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

MR. BARTLETT. Mr. President, I am very happy to note that the Senate, earlier this month, approved S. 866, a bill authorizing the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to allow separate departments of the District government to include charts, maps, and graphs in their annual reports.

I mention this legislation because the events of Berlin and Geneva may have caused the issues relating to visual aids in annual reports to be obscured. For the record, Mr. President, I do not know why S. 866 has been so long before the Congress. Approval still is pending in the other body. The struggle for this

legislation to allow the Commissioners to permit visual aids in annual reports of the District departments began in February 1957, when the late Senator Matthew Neely introduced S. 1041—to which S. 866 is identical—in the Senate. S. 1041 passed the Senate in March 1958. No action was taken in the House of Representatives during the 85th Congress, and S. 1041 failed of enactment.

But perhaps, Mr. President, we can imagine the causes of delay. Picture the Congress divided into several ideological camps on the visual aids issue. Some Members favor the use of charts and maps, but not graphs. Others believe that maps and graphs should be included in the annual reports, but not charts. Still others—resisting those ideological extremes—would allow charts and graphs, but not maps.

Mr. President, to make my own position clear before the waiting Nation, let me say that I stand foursquare for the use of charts, maps, and graphs, in departmental reports of the District of Columbia if authorized by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, who, of course, have the responsibility which I would not share. I realize, Mr. President, that my bold stand for charts, maps, and graphs, may cause me to be labeled a spender, but that is one of the risks of statesmanship.

Mr. President, I have indulged in this bit of whimsy to demonstrate the absurdity which must mark efforts by Congress to continue as the city council for the District of Columbia. The proposal to allow the Commissioners to authorize visual aids in departmental reports has been before the Congress for more than 2 years, and is still not law. No business, no community, and no nation can grow and prosper under such cumbersome handicaps. As an Alaskan, I know that even a most sympathetic U.S. Congress cannot be fully responsible to the needs of a non-self-governing area. As in the case of S. 866, many other non-controversial—but necessary—measures are never enacted, or are delayed, by the sheer cumbersomeness of congressional machinery and by the natural preoccupation of Congress with larger matters.

Home rule for the District of Columbia, for which I was privileged to testify before the Judiciary Subcommittee of the District of Columbia Committee, is a necessity. We would have a more sensible, more workable, city government machinery. That machinery would be responsible to the people of the District. Congress would be relieved of a real burden during these years of crisis. Congressional talents would be freed for other duties, and District of Columbia talents would be unleashed and put to work on the rightful responsibilities of the people of the District.

Most of all, Mr. President, by enactment of home rule legislation, Congress will be extending once again the principle of self-government. This time, Mr. President, the extension of self-government will occur in the most dramatic setting of all, the seat of the National Government. Once again, Congress has an opportunity to demonstrate by deed

as well as by word the quality of our democracy.

Mr. President, on another subject—
The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Alaska.

TRANSPORTATION FACILITIES FOR ALASKA

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, transportation is one of our most serious problems in Alaska.

We look to the Alaska International Rail and Highway Commission, which was revived and extended by recent congressional action, to do the groundwork necessary before plans can be laid for new links between Alaska and the other 48 States, through Canada.

The Commission this month is expected to begin a full-scale research study of resources, markets, and existing transportation facilities. On this study, future plans will be built.

Two of my colleagues from the Pacific Northwest, the senior Senator from Washington, chairman of the Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, and a member of the Commission [Mr. MAGNUSON], and the junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER], have been of particular aid, and we from Alaska are grateful.

J. R. Walker, the able and industrious Washington correspondent of the Vancouver, British Columbia Province, outlined the work that lies before the Commission in an article published May 25, 1959.

I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Walker's article be printed in the body of the RECORD, together with my remarks.

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

SEARCH STARTS IN JUNE—NEW ALASKA ROUTE SOUGHT IN BRITISH COLUMBIA

(By J. R. Walker)

WASHINGTON.—The search for new or improved transportation routes from the United States to Alaska through Canada will begin in earnest in June.

It will be next year before the newly reactivated Alaska International Rail and Highway Commission in the United States knows whether a new railway line, a new road, or a paved Alaska Highway is required to mesh the 49th State closer to the Union, and, undoubtedly, it will take longer to discover what can be worked out in cooperation with the Canadian Government.

The Commission, which was established in 1956 and held a few meetings here in 1957 and 1958, and talked with Canadian Federal and Provincial officials, was brought back to life late last week by congressional action to extend the Commission's existence until June 30, 1961. Funds for its work have also been appropriated.

As a result, according to Commission Secretary Carl Junge, a full-scale research study of the resources, markets, and transportation facilities of this northwest sector of North America will be started, probably in June.

This study of the natural resources and necessary transportation, not only in Alaska but in British Columbia, Alberta, and the Yukon Territory, was proposed in November 1957 by the Commission. An agency was chosen in 1958 to do the job, but Congress did not appropriate funds for the study late

last year, and the Commission had to go into hibernation.

Now that Alaska has been admitted to the Union and has two able and industrious Senators in Congress, there has been pressure to get started again. The Commission now hopes that one of the national research agencies can make its extensive study of the area's economic resources, its potential markets, its population and income trends, and the feasibility of new or improved transportation routes and feeder roads during the rest of this year.

Members of the Commission itself hope to reschedule an inspection trip to Alaska, British Columbia, and the Yukon in September.

Sensors WARREN MAGNUSON, of Washington, and E. L. BARTLETT, of Alaska, have been the prime movers behind the recent congressional action and both of them are on record as being anxious to improve connections with Alaska in full cooperation with Canada. They feel, however, that no substantive move can be made here until a thorough study of the region and its requirements has been made.

The same feelings now apparently are motivating the actions of Senator RICHARD NEUBERGER, of Oregon. The cool shoulder which the Diefenbaker government has again given his bill to pave the Alaska Highway—which, contrary to his information, is not even being actively considered by Canada—has caused the Senator to ease up on his favorite project at this time, while awaiting the report of the Commission's study group. That report might well consider paving of the highway an uneconomic or unnecessary effort at the present time.

As far as extension of the Pacific Great Eastern or the Northern Alberta Railways into the Alaska region is concerned, none of those interested in these problems has heard of any projects under consideration. And they don't expect to until the Commission's study program is completed. Then the whole picture of whether new rail or highway or even water or air routes to Alaska are needed may be clarified, and the problems of shipments in bond, maintenance charges, and so on can be looked at more realistically.

In fact the only discussion of railways here is in the Interior Department where the bill to incorporate the Government-owned Alaska Railroad, which operates in the State, has just been put through committee.

NOMINATION OF LEWIS L. STRAUSS TO BE SECRETARY OF COMMERCE

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, I desire to bring to your attention and that of the Senate an instance, during the recent hearings on Admiral Strauss' nomination as Secretary of Commerce, of a minor falsehood with major implications.

On May 5, 1959, a newspaper column by Drew Pearson charged that Mr. Strauss called the Atomic Energy Commission to seek information on a hostile witness. In attempting to discredit this charge, Mr. Strauss said that, although he had made such a call, he had done so only after being provoked by the appearance of the Pearson article. This statement clearly implied that ordinarily he would never do such a thing. To make sure the Admiral meant what he said, I asked him to repeat his statement that his inquiry was made after the column appeared. He did so.

This statement was proved false when a letter from AEC Chairman, Mr. John

McCone, which appears on page 844 of the printed record of the hearings, revealed Strauss had made no inquiries after the column appeared, but made two inquiries before the column appeared.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, may we have order, please, so we can hear the Senator?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senate will be in order.

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, when I pointed out to Mr. Strauss this discrepancy in his testimony, he attempted to ridicule my concern by saying sarcastically, "I realize in your opinion this is a very heinous difference," and added that I would "have to draw whatever inference" I could from what he said.

Mr. President, this was a heinous difference. If he had not himself so carefully stressed that he had made no inquiry until after being provoked, it might have been a little different, but this contradiction of fact demonstrated again that rather than admit a simple, if embarrassing falsehood, Mr. Strauss preferred to employ another falsehood.

This performance compels me to ask again—why did not Mr. Strauss admit the simple facts? Why did he not tell the committee the truth? Was it perhaps because, as a recent Washington Post editorial suggested, Strauss "sensed conspiracy in others because of his own elaborate preoccupation with the indirect and obtuse"?

Mr. President, as I said in my opening remark, this was a minor falsehood. But it was a minor falsehood with major implications. The inference I draw from this falsehood is deepened when I recall the many other falsehoods Mr. Strauss employed before our committee. My inference, indeed my conclusion, is that Lewis Strauss cannot be trusted to tell the truth to Congress as Secretary of Commerce and his nomination should not be confirmed in that office.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the appropriate extracts from the hearings which bear upon my remarks this morning.

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

EXCERPTS OF TESTIMONY FROM HEARINGS HELD BEFORE THE INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE COMMITTEE OF THE SENATE ON THE NOMINATION OF LEWIS L. STRAUSS AS SECRETARY OF COMMERCE MAY 13, 1959 (PP. 1490-91, 1497-1500)

Senator McGEE. No. As a matter of fact, the witness on Friday added a clause or an appended phrase in several places. The burden of the area on which I questioned you was unchanged. And you had had that copy of that since the first day of May.

Mr. STRAUSS. I hope to be able to reply to these charges in as much detail as you will permit, and I will take the time to do it. If I cannot get away, as the chairman had so kindly arranged for me to do, it will just be too bad.

The CHAIRMAN. I am not in control of all the questions and the time of the answers. If I were in full control of it, we would be out of here long before this.

Mr. STRAUSS. With respect to the column which has been the subject of the dis-

cussion today, I may say, Mr. Chairman, that it is quite academic to me as to whether or not the previous witnesses were under oath. I call attention to the fact that in big red letters it was stamped "Confidential," where it could be read, but it was described in the column sent out as marked "Top Secret."

I called the Commission to ask what about—after this had appeared—where was Mr. Inglis' security files, and they said they were in Chicago.

Senator McGEE. Was that after this?

Mr. STRAUSS. After this had appeared. Had they been in Washington? No, not in recent years. I called to ask whether Mr. Inglis was still employed by the Commission, whether he had a "Q" clearance, and what kind of job he did, what his qualifications were. And I was referred to American Men of Science, which is a publication of general circulation. That is all I have to say on that.

With your kind permission, Mr. Chairman, I would like to get into this statement because I am sure that parts of it will be interesting.

Senator McGEE. Mr. Chairman, I object to going further without another question, if I may.

The CHAIRMAN. You can ask a question. Is that all you have to say?

Mr. STRAUSS. That is all that I have to say. Senator McGEE, does that answer your question?

Senator McGEE. Yes. It raises another one now in view of what you testified to here today. If I heard you correctly—you may want to review your testimony—in regard to Mr. Pearson or Mr. Anderson's testimony here, that you had made a call down there and made routine inquiry after the Drew Pearson article appeared on Tuesday, May 5, 1959.

Mr. STRAUSS. No. I said that after this article appeared, I had asked whether anyone had inquired for this top secret file on Mr. Inglis, which all personnel security files are secret or top secret.

Senator McGEE. That is correct.

Mr. STRAUSS. I was told they had not. This was done in order to find out whether, as I suspected, this story was out of the whole cloth. I think it is a lie from start to finish.

Senator McGEE. May we have the clerk read the questioning at that point in Drew Pearson's testimony?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

Senator McGEE. I think there is a statement here from the Admiral that we have to make very clear.

The CHAIRMAN. The clerk will go back.

What portion do you want?

Senator McGEE. The part where there was some comment from the Admiral about when he himself volunteered the information that he had made a phone call down to the AEC after the article appeared.

(The reporter read the testimony.)

Senator McGEE. May I call back to your mind, Mr. Chairman, the dates of the letter and the language of his letter which touches on every one of those points that you have just referred to in the context of your statement to Drew Pearson—to me, as I remember—that this had followed after the Drew Pearson column had appeared. And now this stands in direct contradiction to the evidence in this letter that we have received.

Mr. STRAUSS. Senator McGEE, I realize that in your opinion this is a very heinous difference. The Commission calls me and I call the Commission on matters several times a week. I do not know that this was the subject of the call. But the conversation took place between myself and some officer of the Commission—perhaps even the Chairman, I don't know. But I see absolutely—I see ab-

solutely no significance in whether the date was the 22d of April or May the fifth, or what.

Senator McGEE. Admiral, we are going on your testimony here today. You have belabored Mr. Wenzell, if I recall correctly, because he could not remember some things that happened. And you have suggested that his memory only happened to click when he remembered that you and he had talked about his connections.

But now we find you cannot remember what you said the day that you said it.

Mr. STRAUSS. Senator, let us say that I called him on whatever date you said. The fact of the inquiry, and the reply—

Senator McGEE. That is not what you said, Admiral, and the record shows it.

Mr. STRAUSS. Senator, you have to draw whatever inference you can.

Senator McGEE. I am not drawing inferences. I am quoting your words on the record.

The CHAIRMAN. Let's not have the witness—try to answer the questions here.

Senator McGEE. There is no inference at all. You have made categorical statements and I want them cleared up.

Mr. STRAUSS. I have nothing more to say, Mr. Chairman, on this point.

RESULTS OF SURVEY IN ILLINOIS IN REGARD TO NOMINATION OF LEWIS L. STRAUSS

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, as I mentioned on the floor of the Senate about 2 weeks ago, I sent a letter to the 722 members of the American Physical Society who are listed as living in the State of Illinois. I asked them their confidential opinions as to whether the nomination of Mr. Lewis L. Strauss to be Secretary of Commerce should be confirmed.

As I indicated at that time, the replies were to be anonymous, so that no one would know how the men voted. I am pleased to say in many cases I received signed amplifications of the positions taken.

We have now completed a final tabulation of the poll, and I believe the Senate and the country will be interested in the results.

There were 327 replies to the 722 inquiries. Some of the 722 persons had changed their addresses, and so could not reply. However, the return was 41 percent of the number from whom the ballot was requested. This is a very high percentage for a mail return.

Of the 327 who did express themselves, 30, or 9 percent of the total, were noncommittal; 203, or 62.3 percent of the total, voted "No," against confirmation; 94, or 28.7 percent of the total, voted "Yes."

Of those who did express themselves, excluding the 30 who were noncommittal, 69 percent voted "No" and only 31 percent voted "Yes"; so the vote of these physicists was more than 2 to 1 against the confirmation of the nomination of Mr. Strauss, based on their experience with him as Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission.

Mr. President, I do not think any eulogies on my part with regard to the physicists of Illinois are needed. It was at my own university that the atom bomb was discovered. The physicists in my State are probably as eminent as those

in any other State of the Union, since not only a number of great universities but also the Argonne National Laboratory are located there.

I think this is a fairly good sample of the informed public opinion of the physicists. I offer these figures for what they may be worth—and they may be of some value to the Members of the Senate and the general public.

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR FULBRIGHT

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, in this age of prolonged crisis, there can be no substitute for intelligence and imagination in the job of giving shape to our national response to the Soviet challenge.

With the prospect of an unremitting cold war lying indefinitely before us and with foreign policy now a matter affecting the daily lives of every one of us, we are truly fortunate to have as chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee a man with the stature, wisdom, and experience of the junior Senator from the State of Arkansas. He is preeminently qualified to meet the need.

Mr. President, an article entitled "Egghed From the Ozarks," written by the Washington editor of the Saturday Evening Post, Beverly Smith, Jr., appearing May 2, 1959, rounds out a complete picture of the man, his background, his interests, and his achievements. I ask unanimous consent that excerpts of this article be printed in the RECORD, at this point.

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

EGGHEAD FROM THE OZARKS

(By Beverly Smith, Jr.)

Toward the close of 1920 in Vienna, that favorite center of diplomatic intrigue in Eastern Europe, American correspondents used to foregather at the Cafe Louvre to swap information. An attentive kibitzer admitted to these sessions was young BILL FULBRIGHT. He was a likable companion, athletic and boyish-looking, easygoing in manner, his soft Arkansas drawl intact after 3 years of graduate study at Oxford.

He was not a newspaperman, but, having specialized in history, was fascinated by the seamy nether side of international maneuver in Vienna. Here was stuff not found in the textbooks. His chief preceptor in such matters was M. W. Fodor, experienced correspondent of the old Philadelphia Public Ledger. FULBRIGHT accompanied Fodor as a volunteer helper on many reportorial assignments and on travels ranging from central Europe down through the Balkans. Through Fodor he met many of the top politicians of the area. He also encountered some of the shadier underlings—specialists in propaganda and infiltration—who worked for Stalin, for Mussolini or for a still-obscure demagogue named Hitler.

When he went home to Arkansas in 1929 young BILL FULBRIGHT was certainly no international "expert." But he had sniffed the devil's broth which, 10 years later, was to boil over into World War II. The experience gave him a special interest in foreign affairs which he has followed up through the years, whether he was working as a teacher of law, a farmer, a businessman, a university president or a lawmaker.

In Congress this has manifested itself in legislation—particularly that creating the Fulbright exchange scholarships—which has made his name known throughout the world.

Now this same FULBRIGHT—Senator J. WILLIAM—has taken over as the new chairman of the powerful Senate Committee on Foreign Relations. Thus his long interest in world affairs has been clothed with a responsibility which, in the present deepening crisis, is awesome. He has become a top adviser on life-and-death decisions which may involve us all.

In recent years FULBRIGHT has been one of the sharpest critics of administration foreign policy. He may return to the attack in the future. But when he succeeded to the chairmanship in early February there was a noteworthy new moderation in his attitude. This may have been due in part to the darkening of the international scene, in part to the chill responsibility of his new position. A Senator can sound off freely without shaking the foundations; but when the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee speaks, it may be assumed, especially abroad, that he speaks for the committee and for the majority of the Senate itself. Chairman FULBRIGHT began to ponder his words as though seeking the subtle line between useful suggestion and divisive criticism.

A few weeks after he took his new post, the increasing danger of the Russian threats toward Berlin provoked a flurry of worried speeches in the Senate. FULBRIGHT said he was sure the suggestions were meant to be helpful, that they reflected a concern natural under the circumstances. Then he added:

"No football team can expect to win with every man his own quarterback. * * * To force the President into a negotiating strait-jacket or to overwhelm him—and the world—with uncoordinated and perhaps conflicting advice would cause nothing but trouble. The Foreign Relations Committee is available to advise the President, but his is the primary responsibility. * * *

"The President has stated clearly, forcefully and authoritatively the policy of the United States in Berlin—that is, we will not give 'one single inch,' and if there be any shooting, it will be someone else who started it. This does not, of course, mean that we will not negotiate on any reasonable basis."

Does this mean that the usually outspoken FULBRIGHT has laid aside his right of criticism and given the President's foreign policy blank check support? Evidently not. Soon after the quarterback statement, and following a visit to the White House, FULBRIGHT returned to his earlier urgings that we show more imagination and initiative in our response to the Russians. He repeated his support of our firmness in Berlin, but suggested we counter Russia's demands with demands of our own that she withdraw from her satellite countries.

Later he added further comments. He said we should not be so "sticky" about summit conferences. "It leaves the impression that we are afraid to talk to the Russians or that we haven't anything to say. Actually we have a lot to say." He said he thought Mr. Eisenhower spoke in the sense that we will not give 1 inch * * * unless there are concessions on the other side to justify it.

As one example of possible mutual concessions, he said that if both sides along the East-West German boundary were to move their armed forces back an equal distance—no matter how slight the distance—the possibilities of war, especially accidental war, would be reduced. He suggested that if a clear Western corridor could be established into Berlin, free of any inspection, coupled with some form of international control in Berlin, the possibility should be seriously considered. He also warned that the Russians may go very far in Berlin and that it is premature to assume they will not start a war.

How do these statements square with FULBRIGHT's earlier objection to too many quarterbacks? Probably he decided that he cannot chart for himself any exact course of action in a crisis which changes from one day to the next. As chairman his problem of full support versus loyal opposition is one of extreme delicacy, made the more so by events which followed his assumption of the post.

On November 27 Khrushchev had begun his ominous threats to give control of Berlin's western lifelines to his East German puppet government. He originally set May 27 as a deadline, and the time was ticking away. * * * And America's Secretary of State Dulles, rugged embodiment of our foreign policy since 1953, was ailing, though the seriousness of his illness was not yet known.

As the new chairman, FULBRIGHT's immediate concern was his relationship with Mr. Dulles. He had often been highly critical of the secretary, and now certain ones of his more caustic remarks were being resurrected in the press. Some commentators pictured a bitter feud between the two men which might weaken American policy and unity in the critical period ahead. * * *

The secretary and the chairman realized that the impression of a personal feud between them was harmful; they were already moving to correct it. Fulbright emphasized his admiration for Dulles' "many fine qualities." The secretary, about to leave for Europe, invited Chairman FULBRIGHT to his home for an evening of private conversation. In this friendly exchange, both felt they had reached a more sympathetic understanding.

When the gravity of Mr. Dulles' illness became known, there were suggestions that the time had now come, in justice to himself and the Nation, for his resignation. FULBRIGHT did not join in these. In a Senate speech he said that Mr. Dulles "must play the leading role, both in formulating our foreign policy and articulating it." * * *

Elsewhere in his remarks he said that "the day of all men everywhere * * * may be short," that the time in which we live is "the most dangerous in the 60 centuries of man's recorded history." These are not cheerful comments. They reflect what some critics consider a tendency on FULBRIGHT's part toward a brooding pessimism. He disagrees with this assumption, which in our optimistic land amounts almost to a charge of defeatism. Rather, he feels, the sane and healthy attitude is to look at the dark as well as the bright side of the world situation.

Generally conservative in economics, FULBRIGHT agrees with Eisenhower on the dangers of continued deficit financing and inflation. But he rejects the idea that we cannot "afford" what we need for education, science and defense. He regards these as necessities, which we can afford by forgoing some of our luxuries and raising taxes. In reply to the argument that we "cannot live with higher taxes," he points out that we lived pretty well prior to the Federal tax cut of 1954.

He has in him a certain strain of individualism, of independence, of wry humor, which does not quite harmonize with the clublike camaraderie of the Senate. He is more studious, more reflective, less gregarious than most of his colleagues. He spends much time in reading which others devote to politicking and persuasion among their fellows. He cannot be fitted into any group or category. It has been said that he is a liberal in international affairs, a conservative in domestic matters, but this rule has its exceptions. While he usually votes with the Democratic majority, he is not regarded exactly as a "regular." He has often offended the higher-ups in his party, including President Truman, who in a heated moment

once referred to him privately as "an over-educated Oxford s.o.b."

In early 1954, when the late Senator Joseph McCarthy was riding high, FULBRIGHT was the only Senator who cared, or dared, to vote against further funds for McCarthy's melodramatic investigations. McCarthy called FULBRIGHT Senator Halfbright, but the nickname did not stick. He has also been called the Egghead from the Ozarks. More kindly, when he became Foreign Relations chairman, it was widely commented that he brought to the post the most thorough background of any Senator in recent memory.

FULBRIGHT came to Congress as though by accident. He might never have entered public life if he had not been fired as president of the University of Arkansas. He was fired partly because he refused to play politics with the job. It might thus be said that he got into politics because he didn't want to play politics. Before exploring this paradox, we had better look back to FULBRIGHT's beginnings.

The fourth of six children, he was born on a farm near Sumner, Mo., on April 9, 1905. When he was a year old the family moved to another farm near Fayetteville, in Ozark country of northwest Arkansas.

In college his grades were good, but not tops. Much of his energy went into athletics. He played 3 years of varsity football as a regular halfback. He also captained the tennis team. In his last year he was organizer and first president of the university's system of student self-government.

In BILL's junior year his father died suddenly at 56. He left the university to help his mother with his father's estate and business interests. She soon proved herself such a capable manager that he was able to return to his studies. Despite this time out, he won his bachelor of arts degree in February 1925, when he was not quite twenty. He stayed on during the spring to take additional courses.

When he was about to return to the family business, one of his professors suggested he apply for a Rhodes Scholarship. He journeyed down to Little Rock, appeared before the examiners, and was surprised next day to hear that he was the new Rhodes selection for Arkansas.

His time at Oxford, with vacations passed in Europe, was an eye opener for the young man who hitherto had hardly ventured beyond the Arkansas hills except on football trips to Texas and Oklahoma. He met students from every continent and began to understand something of the world's vast variety of political and religious beliefs. At Oxford's Pembroke College he took what was known as the Final Honour School of Modern History, graduating with the equivalent of B-plus grades.

In 1929, back in Fayetteville, Ark., he settled down to what seemed might be his life-work in the family business. A couple of years later chance intervened. On a trip to Washington he ran into a friend who invited him to dinner. There he met a beautiful young lady from Philadelphia, Miss Elizabeth Williams. This, he quickly decided, was the girl.

Soon afterward he convinced himself that he ought to study law. He enrolled at the George Washington University Law School in Washington. Looking back, Senator FULBRIGHT thinks that maybe his real idea was to get within courting distance of Betty Williams. They were married in 1932. It has been a most happy marriage. They have two daughters, Elizabeth and Roberta.

At George Washington University FULBRIGHT took his law degree in 1934, second in a class of 135. He served as a prosecutor in the Justice Department for a year, then taught law at George Washington University for a year. In 1936 his mother needed help

at home and he returned again to Fayetteville. For the next 3 years he helped in the family business, raised beef cattle on the farm, practiced law and taught law courses at the University of Arkansas. So far his life had been pleasant, but without clear direction. In 1939 chance stepped in again. Dr. John Futrell, president of the university for a quarter century, was killed in an automobile accident. FULBRIGHT, popular among the students and faculty, was chosen by the trustees to succeed him.

Now his career seemed set. Here was work he could take pride in. He did not think of his position as a political one. He concentrated on recruiting the best teaching talent which the university's modest budget could afford.

In 1940 there was a hot gubernatorial fight in Arkansas. The incumbent reform Governor, Carl Bailey, was defeated by Homer Adkins. FULBRIGHT's mother, affectionately known as Miss Roberta, was a strong partisan of Bailey. Among her other energetic activities, she for many years wrote a daily column in the Fayetteville paper. It was called As I See It, and she never hesitated to call it as she saw it. On the election of Adkins, Miss Roberta commented that the voters apparently preferred a hand-shaking, backslapping politician to a statesman.

Adkins, annoyed with the Fulbright family, began quietly putting in his own men as trustees at the university. In the spring of 1941 he wrote to FULBRIGHT, suggesting that the university employ an Adkins protege as public-relations man. FULBRIGHT replied that he needed another good professor more than he did a publicity man. Soon afterward his resignation was requested. He said it would make things clearer all around if he were fired. And so on commencement day, despite roars of protest from students and alumni, FULBRIGHT was duly fired.

Again he returned, less happy now to the family business. The following spring his friend, Clyde Ellis, Congressman from the Fayetteville district, urged FULBRIGHT to run for the House seat he was vacating. FULBRIGHT said no, but when Ellis reminded him of his preachments to students about the duty of public service, he began to waver.

Once he made up his mind to run, he went all out. A novice and a long shot, he plunged into the heat and dust of the fight like an old pro. His wife Betty, friends say, turned out to be an even better campaigner than Bill, and a great hit with the farm wives. Together they reversed the odds; FULBRIGHT won by 4,000 votes.

It is rare for a congressman to get much attention in his first few years. The new Representative from Arkansas won fame in a matter of months with the so-called Fulbright resolution, favoring "the creation of appropriate international machinery, with power adequate to establish and maintain a just and lasting peace . . . and the participation of the United States . . . through its constitutional processes." The entire resolution contained only 55 words. Passed overwhelmingly in 1943 by the House, and later endorsed by the Senate, it became a historic milestone. It marked the end of our long policy of isolation and the first official step toward the United Nations. FULBRIGHT feels the mistake in setting up the U.N. was to permit the veto, thus depriving the organization of the "adequate power" envisioned by his resolution.

In 1944 FULBRIGHT ran for the Senate. His chief opponent was none other than the Homer Adkins whose influence had ended his university presidency 3 years before. He beat Adkins by 32,000 votes. Politics, he found, has its compensations.

In 1946 Senator FULBRIGHT, through the fusion of two simple ideas, produced a beneficial chain reaction which still continues

through the non-Communist world. The first idea, drawn from his own experience, was that study abroad makes for better international understanding. Second was the fact that quantities of surplus American war materials—such as trucks, jeeps, and bulldozers—were rusting away in many foreign lands; these countries wanted to buy the stuff, but lacked dollar exchange. Why not let each country pay in its own currency? The proceeds could then be used for two purposes: (1) scholarships for selected American students who wished to study in that country, and (2) travel expenses for its own students chosen to study in America.

Such was the genesis of the famous Fulbright scholarships. The Senator, with unwonted political energy and savvy, fought his bill through Congress to final passage in the closing hours of the 1946 session. Under the Fulbright Act, supplemented by later legislation, exchange scholarships have been awarded to date to more than 37,000 American and foreign students and teachers. In its contribution to better understanding among peoples, according to a State Department report, the law has been "the most fabulously profitable investment ever authorized by Congress." * * *

Shortly before the 1946 elections FULBRIGHT was pondering aloud to a colleague about the difficulties which would arise if, with a Democrat in the White House, the Republicans should capture both Houses of Congress. In such case, he thought, it might be a patriotic thing for Mr. Truman to appoint a Republican as Secretary of State, and then resign. In the absence of a Vice President and under the law at that time, the Republican—perhaps Vandenberg—would become President. Thus the White House and Congress could work together harmoniously.

The Republicans did win both Houses. A reporter, who had noted down FULBRIGHT's casual remarks, hit the headlines with them the morning after election. Hence the explosion of wrath in which Mr. Truman referred to FULBRIGHT as an overeducated so-and-so.

FULBRIGHT was embarrassed as well as amused by all the rumpus. But he still seriously believes it is a weakness in our governmental system which permits the President to be of one party and the Congress of the other, that it could produce delays and divisions in time of crisis. Seeing such danger he is likely, as chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, to take special care not to aggravate it during these troubled times.

While he worked effectively as chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee, his heart wasn't in it. His strongest interest was in America's foreign relations. Under the Eisenhower administration he became increasingly critical of Secretary Dulles, not so much for his fundamental policy as for his methods of approach. He felt that the Secretary's attitude was too negative, that when Russia makes proposals we should not just say "No," but should counter with proposals which would put Russia on the spot.

He also objected to Mr. Dulles' reports to the Foreign Relations Committee as not being fully frank, as painting too rosy a picture of the world situation, and as adopting a papa-knows-best tone.

He has long been a critic of our policy in the Middle East, which he thinks has played into the hands of the Communists. He has asked for more economic, less military aid to other countries, and has especially opposed lavish shipments of arms to prop up reactionary and tottering regimes. And he has blamed both Republicans and Democrats for continuing the custom of awarding ambassadorial posts to fat-cat political contributors.

FULBRIGHT himself is in difficulty on one hot American issue—that of racial segregation. He has opposed the Supreme Court integration decisions as being too hasty and as trying to oversimplify an immensely complex problem. This has disappointed his liberal admirers and can cause uneasiness among the nonwhite nations of the free world. On the other hand, the fact that his opposition to the court decisions has been temperately expressed has hurt him in his home State of Arkansas, where extremist segregation feelings run high. The power of such sentiments was shown in the defeat of Arkansas' hitherto extremely popular Representative Brooks Hays. He, like FULBRIGHT, had signed the so-called southern manifesto, but counseled moderation at a time when fanaticism was demanded. Unless these passions cool, FULBRIGHT may face dangerous opposition for re-election in 1962. There is talk that Gov. Orval Faubus may challenge him.

But that eventuality is 3 years away, and FULBRIGHT is not likely to let it distract him from his chief ambition, which is to do the finest job he can as chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee. As to what his course there will be, carrying a new responsibility and facing new situations at home and abroad, I think the best clues may be found in his general character, background and ability.

He has been a student of international problems ever since those days at the Café Louvre 30 years ago. He is intelligent, with an original, inquiring mind which has proved itself fertile in constructive ideas. He cannot be ranked among the optimists, but perhaps they are already in surplus supply. His honesty and patriotism are unquestioned—if he makes mistakes, it will not be in pursuit of partisan advantage. He approaches his work as chairman as the climax and supreme test of his entire career. All this gives good reason to hope that Chairman FULBRIGHT will serve his country well among the unprecedented perils ahead.

PUBLIC EDUCATION IN THE UNITED STATES

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, in the Washington Post of today, June 4, there appears an excellent article by the distinguished columnist, Walter Lippmann, on the serious long-range problem we face in financing public education in the United States.

I commend this thoughtful article to my colleagues and to the attention of the American people. The quality and capacity of our educational system are vital factors in our domestic progress and in our scientific competition with the Soviet Union.

In his article, Mr. Lippmann refers favorably to the Rockefeller brothers report on costs of education, "The Pursuit of Excellence." I think this report is must reading for everyone seriously concerned with the problems of rising school enrollments and the costs of school construction and teacher salaries.

I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Lippmann's article from the Washington Post and Times Herald be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

THE PURSUIT OF EXCELLENCE

(By Walter Lippmann)

The report of the President's Science Advisory Committee, of which Dr. Killian was

the chairman, was published about 10 days ago. It has a general blessing from the President who said that he hoped it would be widely read and that it would stimulate a wider understanding of the importance of excellence in our educational system.

Among the crucial ideas that need a wider understanding is the conclusion of the report that doubling our current annual investment in education is probably a minimal rather than an extravagant goal. This does not mean, of course, that if we spent twice as much on our schools, they would automatically become twice as good. The sponsors of the report are among the most distinguished men in American science, and they make it clear that to improve American education very important reforms are needed in the recruiting of teachers and in the curricula which they teach.

What they do say is that these reforms will have to be paid for and they imply that no one is really serious about the improvement of education who does not want to think about raising more money.

The best discussion of the problem of money and education is to be found in the Rockefeller brothers report under the title of "The Pursuit of Excellence." To see the problem clearly, says the report, we must realize that since 1870 we have heaped upon our educators one of the most heroic assignments a society could have invented. The assignment has been to educate the whole mass of the American people. Between 1870 and 1955 our population has been multiplied by four. But the number of students in our public high schools has multiplied approximately 80 times.

In a period of three-quarters of a century "we have taken into the school system a greater proportion of our youngsters and we have kept more of them in the system longer than any other nation." Sheer size and mass are not the only, but surely they are the main reasons, why our educational system is so far short of being excellent.

Education on such a scale, if it is to be good for the great mass and excellent for the very gifted few, is bound to be expensive. As of 1955, the most recent year for which the figures are available, the total spent in this country on education was \$14 billion a year. This breaks down into \$9.4 billion for public elementary and secondary schools, \$1.2 billion for private elementary and secondary schools, \$1.5 billion for public higher education and \$1.9 billion for private higher education.

The President's Science Advisory Committee and the Rockefeller brothers report agree that the total of \$14 billion will have to be doubled if education is to be good enough for the times we live in. As the two groups which concur in this conclusion are composed of eminent, very highly qualified, and widely experienced men, we may assume that they know what they are talking about. Indeed, so far as I know, no one has seriously disputed their conclusion.

The real question is how to raise the money. Here, we may begin by insisting that this country can indubitably afford to raise the money. From 1930 to 1957 the expenditure on education was more or less stationary at about 3.5 percent of the gross national product. It has now risen to about 4 percent. As the gross national product has risen since 1930, the amount spent on education has risen too. But it has not risen fast enough to keep pace with the rise in enrollments. Thus, in fact, less money is available for each pupil. There is more money. But the school population is much bigger. There is, therefore, a growing shortage in our educational facilities, in classrooms and in teachers and the like, to deal with our expanding population.

If we adopt the conclusion of the President's Committee, we should be prepared to spend, by say 1967, something like 30 billions. It is generally estimated that by 1967 the gross national product will be around 600 billions. Thus, the expenditure for education would rise from about 4 percent, as at present, to about 5 percent of the gross national product.

This percentage looks small, but the real figures are big, and the most difficult question arises as to how these extra \$15 billion a year are to be raised. Most of us would prefer to have them raised locally. But we cannot be dogmatic and absolute about this preference.

In the past 25 years there has been a drastic shift in the burden of school support from the local governments to the State governments. Whereas in 1930 the State governments carried only 17 percent of the load, by 1954 they were carrying 37 percent. There is no use expecting or hoping that the whole new burden of cost can be borne by the States. For, as the Rockefeller report says, "State and local tax systems are in some respects archaic," chiefly because of their dependence upon the real property tax.

There is no escape from the conclusion that if the new and necessary costs are to be met, if they are not to be ignored and neglected, we shall have to raise some considerable part of them out of Federal taxes. This is bound to happen, and the sooner we face up to the necessity, the more likely are we to be prepared to act with deliberation and with awareness of the hazards and with wisdom.

FINE ARTS SELECTIONS FOR THE MOSCOW EXHIBIT

Mr. HART. Mr. President, this morning the Washington Post reports some criticism directed at the selection of certain works of art to be exhibited at the American National Exhibit in Moscow this summer, which exhibition, I am delighted to know, will be attended by the Vice President, the distinguished Presiding Officer of the Senate.

The criticism is directed to the fact that certain of the artists whose works have been selected were affiliated with Communist efforts or causes. I had hoped that we had grown beyond the point where a political litmus test would be applied to our judgment of art. All that this hullabaloo would do would be to take the Russians off the hook of world opinion on which they find themselves in connection with the Pasternak case, and put us right on it.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD at this point the release issued by the Office of the American National Exhibition in Moscow. The release lists the names of the selection committee and the names of the owners of the works of art which have been selected. The selection committee and the owners of the art works are distinguished Americans or American institutions. The release also names the artists of the various works of art which have been selected.

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

FINE ARTS SELECTED FOR MOSCOW EXHIBIT

Franklin C. Watkins, chairman of a special four-man art committee, today announced the 49 paintings and 23 works of

sculpture which have been selected for showing at the American National Exhibition in Moscow this summer.

In addition to Mr. Watkins, artist and for many years an instructor of painting at the Pennsylvania Academy of Fine Arts, Philadelphia, members of the selection committee were: Lloyd Goodrich, director of the Whitney Museum of American Art, New York City; Henry Radford Hope, chairman of the Fine Arts Department of Indiana University;

and Theodore Roszak, internationally known sculptor and faculty member of Sarah Lawrence College, Bronxville, N.Y.

Mr. Watkins said the paintings and sculpture were chosen as distinguished examples of the variety and wide range of American art produced during the period from 1918 to the present.

The art collection has been crated and will be shipped on the S.S. *Finn sailor*, sailing from New York tomorrow (Monday, June 1).

The paintings and some of the sculpture will be shown in the main exhibition hall. Other works of sculpture will be exhibited outdoors.

The 6-week American National Exhibition opens in Moscow's Sokolniki Park, July 25. It will contain cultural, scientific, and technological exhibits designed to further Soviet understanding of life in America.

The works of art selected by the committee:

Artist	Painting	Lender	Artist	Painting	Lender
Ivan Le Lorraine Albright	The Hole in the Wall Gang, 1952, oil.	Mr. and Mrs. Lawrence A. Fleischman, Detroit, Mich.	Jacob Lawrence	Fulton & Nostrand, 1958, tempera.	Mr. and Mrs. Alexander Rittmaster, New York, N.Y.
William Bazotes	Moby Dick, 1955, oil.	Mr. and Mrs. William A. M. Burden, New York, N.Y.	Jack Levine	Welcome Home, 1946, oil.	Brooklyn Museum, Brooklyn, N.Y.
Thomas Hart Benton	Boom Town, 1928, oil.	Rochester Memorial Art Gallery, University of Rochester, Rochester, N.Y.	Conrad Marca-Relli	Pamplona, 1958, collage and oil.	Kootz Gallery, New York, N.Y.
Hyman Bloom	Younger Jew With Torah, 1942-44, oil.	Smith College Museum of Art, Northampton, Mass.	John Marin	Movement—Sea and Sky, 1946, oil.	William H. Lane Foundation, Leominster, Mass.
Peter Blume	The Eternal City, 1937, oil.	Museum of Modern Art, New York, N.Y.	Reginald Marsh	Steeplechase Park, 1936, egg tempera.	Joseph H. Hirschhorn, New York, N.Y.
Alexander Brook	My Son Sandy, 1932, oil.	Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York, N.Y.	Robert Motherwell	Wall Painting No. 4, 1953, oil.	Mr. I. Donald Grossman, New York, N.Y.
Charles Burchfield	Promenade, 1928, water color.	Mr. A. Conger Goodyear, New York, N.Y.	Georgia O'Keeffe	Ram's Head, White Hollyhock and Little Hills, 1936, oil.	Milton Lowenthal, New York, N.Y.
John Stuart Curry	Wisconsin Landscape, 1938-39, oil.	Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York, N.Y.	Jackson Pollock	Cathedral, 1947, oil.	Dallas Museum of Fine Arts, Dallas, Tex.
Stuart Davis	Combination Concrete No. 2, 1958, oil.	Mr. and Mrs. Earl Wade Hubbard, Lime Rock, Conn.	Abraham Rattner	Two Figures and Masks, Composition No. 3, 1949, oil.	Mr. and Mrs. Joseph Shapiro, Oak Park, Ill.
William De Kooning	Asheville II, 1949, oil.	Phillips Gallery, Washington, D.C.	Mark Rothko	Old Gold Over White, 1956, oil.	Mr. Roy Neuberger, New York, N.Y.
Charles Demuth	After All . . . , 1953, oil.	Norton Gallery and School of Art, West Palm Beach, Fla.	Ben Shahn	Parable, 1958, tempera.	Munson-Williams-Proctor Institute, Utica, N.Y.
Edwin Dickinson	Ruin at Daphne, 1943-53, oil.	Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York, N.Y.	Charles Sheeler	Upper Deck, 1929, oil.	Fogg Museum, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.
Philip Evergood	Street Corner, 1936, oil.	Mr. Himan Brown, New York, N.Y.	Do	Lunenburg, 1954, oil.	William H. Lane Foundation, Leominster, Mass.
Lyonel Feininger	Manhattan, The Tower, 1944, oil.	Mrs. Drew Chidester, San Francisco, Calif.	John Sloan	Sixth Ave. Elevated at 3d Street, 1928, oil.	Whitney Museum of American Art, New York, N.Y.
William Glackens	Soda Fountain, 1935, oil.	Pennsylvania Academy of Fine Arts, Philadelphia, Pa.	Raphael Soyer	Waiting Room, 1942-43, oil.	Corecoran Gallery of Art, Washington, D.C.
Frits Glarner	Relational Painting, 1949-51, oil.	Whitney Museum of American Art, New York, N.Y.	Eugene Speicher	Red Moore, Blacksmith, 1935, oil.	Mrs. Eugene Speicher, New York, N.Y.
Anshile Gorky	Water of the Flowery Mill, 1944, oil.	Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York, N.Y.	Niles Spencer	In Fairmont, 1951, oil.	Museum of Modern Art, New York, N.Y.
Morris Graves	Flight of the Plover, 1955, oil.	Whitney Museum of American Art, New York, N.Y.	Joseph Stella	American Landscape, 1929, oil.	Walker Art Center, Minneapolis, Minn.
George Grosz	Peace II, 1946, oil.	Mrs. Phyllis B. Lambert, New York, N.Y.	Yves Tanguy	Multiplication of the Arcs, 1954, oil.	Museum of Modern Art, New York, N.Y.
Philip Guston	Passage, 1957, oil.	University of Nebraska Art Collection, Lincoln, Nebr.	Mark Tobey	Delta, 1952, tempera.	Mr. Dan R. Johnson, New York, N.Y.
Marsden Hartley	Mount Katahdin, Autumn, No. 1, 1942, oil.	Mr. Richard D. Tucker, San Francisco, Calif.	Franklin Watkins	Portrait of Thomas Raeburn White, 1940, oil.	Mrs. Thomas R. White, Pennsylvania, Pa.
Edward Hopper	Lighthouse at Two Lights, 1929, oil.	Whitney Museum of American Art, New York, N.Y.	Max Weber	Music, 1940, oil.	Brooklyn Museum, Brooklyn, N.Y.
Karl Knaths	Winter Wharf, 1955, oil.	The Honorable and Mrs. W. Averell Harriman, New York, N.Y.	Grant Wood	Pastor Weems' Fable, 1939, oil.	Mrs. John P. Marquand, Cambridge, Mass.
Walt Kuhn	Seated White Clown, 1929, oil.	Des Moines Art Center Des Moines, Iowa.	Andrew Wyeth	Children's Doctor, 1949, tempera.	Dr. Margaret Handy, Wilmington, Del.
Yasuo Kuniyoshi	The Amazing Juggler, 1952, oil.				

Sculptor	Sculpture	Lender	Sculptor	Sculpture	Lender
Saul Baizerman	Extase, 1950-57.	World House Gallery, New York, N.Y.	Jacques Lipchitz	Mother and Child, 1941-45.	Philadelphia Museum of Art, Philadelphia, Pa.
Alexander Calder	Seven Footed Beastie, 1958.	Mr. Austin Briggs, Redding, Conn.	Seymour Lipton	Sorcerer, 1957.	Whitney Museum of American Art, New York, N.Y.
Do	Black Mobile, 1957.	Peris Gallery, New York, N.Y.	Oronzio Maldarelli	Bianca II, 1950.	Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York, N.Y.
Jo Davidson	Dr. Albert Einstein, 1934.	The artist, New York, N.Y.	Elie Nadelman	Head of a Woman, 1922.	Robert Isaacson Gallery, New York, N.Y.
Jose De Creeft	Youth, 1956.	Grace Borgenicht Gallery, New York, N.Y.	Isamu Noguchi	The Ring, 1957.	Stable Gallery, New York, N.Y.
Jose De Rivera	Copper Construction, 1949.	Do.	Bernard Reder	Adam and Eve, 1957.	World House Art Gallery, New York, N.Y.
Do	Construction No. 47, 1957.	Kootz Gallery, New York, N.Y.	Hugo Robus	Walking Figure, 1957.	The artist, New York, N.Y.
Herbert Ferber	Once Again, 1954-58.	Do.	Theodore Roszak	Hound of Heaven, 1953.	Pierre Matisse Gallery, New York, N.Y.
Ibram Lassaw	Galactic Cluster No. 1, 1958.	Kraushaar Galleries, New York, N.Y.	William Zorach	Victory, 1945.	Downtown Gallery, New York, N.Y.
Robert Laurent	La Toilette, 1944.				

Mr. HART. Mr. President, it would be well to read, also, the article written by Emily Genauer and published in the New York Herald Tribune of May 31, and I therefore ask unanimous consent that that article be included in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

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

UNITED STATES SENDING BEST ART TO EXHIBIT IN MOSCOW
(By Emily Genauer)

The first big and official exhibition of contemporary American art which Russia will

have seen in 40 years was being packed and crated in a West Side warehouse yesterday for shipment overseas tomorrow.

Filling over 30 huge and specially designed wooden cases, the 48 paintings and 23 pieces of sculpture assembled to represent the variety, vitality and quality of modern American art will travel aboard the *Finn sailor* to Helsinki, and be dispatched from there to Moscow for display in the American National Exhibition of our sciences, industry, and culture scheduled to open in that city's Sokolniki Park July 25.

Viewed by this writer yesterday in the Santini Bros. warehouse at 449 West 49th Street, the works indicate clearly that however badly the United States may have

bungled the opportunity, in the highly controversial art show at the Brussels Worlds Fair last year, to tell the rest of the world about our concern for cultural and spiritual values as well as for material things, we will be putting our best foot forward in Moscow this summer.

In view of the importance Russia itself places on the arts as propaganda in the cold war, it is inevitable that the exhibition will stir a lively reaction in that country where the art clock was turned back around 1930, where artists are officially enjoined from working in modern styles, and where the only art ever displayed is done in the super-realistic prettier-than-life styles of posters and heroic monuments.

It ought, however, to provoke no controversy in America at all. The show will include every significant aspect of our art from the realism of Grant Wood, Thomas Benton, and Andrew Wyeth, to abstractions by the best-known exponents of the avant-garde, like Jackson Pollock and William de Kooning.

The jury which assembled the exhibition consisted of two museum officials and educators, Lloyd Goodrich, director of New York's Whitney Museum of American Art, and Henry R. Hope, head of fine arts at Indiana University, and two artists, Franklin C. Watkins, painter and for many years an instructor at the Pennsylvania Academy of Fine Arts, and Theodore Roszak, internationally known sculptor who is also a teacher at Sarah Lawrence College, in Bronxville.

ONE WORK BY EACH

The position the jury took in organizing the show was that our Government and the cause of art freedom would both best be served by an exhibition that did not, as in Brussels last summer, limit itself to the latest efforts of our most experimental young painters and sculptors, but would, instead, indicate the broad development of American art in the past 40 years. Because the freedom allowed our artists to work in any direction they like is the chief story we have to tell, they limited the representation of each painter and sculptor to a single work, rather than show several works by each artist. The only exception made was for the sculptors Calder and De Rivera, where an additional example will be used in the garden of the exhibition building.

It is anticipated that the Russians will be as surprised by some of the subjects of our art as by its occasional lack of subject. Painters Eugene Speicher, Philip Evergood, Reginald Marsh, Jack Levine, George Grosz, Peter Blume, Raphael Soyer, John Sloan, and Charles Burchfield are all seen in realistic pictures treating with workers, their homes, their amusements, the subways they ride, or with the evils of war and dictatorship (Blume's canvas is the Museum of Modern Art's famous "Eternal City," a view of Rome dominated by the head of Mussolini).

In contrast to works of this nature are John Curry's glowing panoramic "Wisconsin Landscape," owned by the Metropolitan Museum of Art, Benton's lively "Boom Town," Hopper's serene "Lighthouse at Two Lights," Franklin Watkins' portrait of a businessman. Indicating that Americans, if they chose, can satirize, even a hero like George Washington, is Grant Wood's painting "Pastor Weems' Fable," loaned to the show by Mrs. John Marquand. And to prove that we can match or outdo in technical facility any realistic working anywhere and still avoid banality, is Andrew Wyeth's study called "Children's Doctor."

VARIETY OF WORKS

Paintings selected by the jury not only for their quality but also because it was felt they would bridge the gap for spectators between realism and abstraction and help a public unfamiliar with the latter to understand how it developed, include canvases by Georgia O'Keeffe, Charles Sheeler, Max Weber, Stuart Davis, Feininger, Marsden Hartley, John Marin, Morris Graves, Abraham Rattner, Ben Shahn. At the other end of the show's span are recent works by the most extreme nonobjective painters, among them Rothko, Gorky, Guston, Marca-Relli, Motherwell, and Tobey.

The range of sculpture to be seen is no less broad, reaching from the portraiture of Jo Davidson, and classical pieces by Mada-relli, Zorach, and Balzerman, to the metal constructions of men like Lassaw, Roszak, and Ferber.

The collection, owned by museums and private collectors all over the country, is estimated as exceeding a half million dollars in

value. It was assembled and is being shipped under the auspices of the U.S. Information Agency. The exhibition will continue through September 4.

Mr. HART. I believe that it is the Soviet Union which has lost face by attempting political censorship of its artists. We do not want to get ourselves into that situation. There are a great many people in the world who think one can judge a civilization and the soul of a people more clearly by looking at its works of art and sculpture than by counting its plumbing and automobiles. The sooner we understand that fact, the better it will be for us, and the more comfortable will be the visit of the Vice President to Moscow.

NOMINATION OF LEWIS L. STRAUSS TO BE SECRETARY OF COMMERCE

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be included in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, an editorial published in this morning's New York Times entitled "The Strauss Appointment."

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

THE STRAUSS APPOINTMENT

President Eisenhower said yesterday that it would be tragic if anti-Semitism became a serious issue in connection with the Senate controversy over the appointment of Lewis L. Strauss to be Secretary of Commerce. Every thinking American will agree, we are sure.

Neither Mr. Strauss nor our country has been served by the suggestion two of his congressional supporters made Tuesday that anti-Semitism has played a role in Senate opposition to his appointment. It is incomprehensible that Senator Scott should have thought it either wise or accurate to try to draw a comparison between Mr. Strauss' present difficulties and those of Alfred Dreyfus in France more than a half century ago. There simply is no comparison.

Whatever one may think of Mr. Strauss' appointment, it is clear that opposition to it can be explained adequately on very different grounds. Mr. Strauss has been a controversial figure many times in his distinguished career as a public servant. He is a vigorous personality; he fights energetically for what he believes right and in doing so he has undoubtedly stepped on many toes and, as recent events have shown, has made some strong enemies. But we believe none of this has anything to do with anti-Semitism and it is a disservice to all concerned to suggest that it has.

On the more fundamental issue of Mr. Strauss' confirmation we have stated our position and do so again. We believe he deserves confirmation on two grounds: First that a President has the right to name the members of his Cabinet and that right should not be denied by the Senate for any but the most serious reasons, reasons of a sort that do not exist here. Second, we believe Mr. Strauss has been a useful and able public servant in the past and gives every sign of continuing that positive record of contribution to the national welfare if he is confirmed as Secretary of Commerce, which we hope he will be soon.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, it seems to me that as we get into the debate on this appointment, it is very important that the issue be clear. The New York

Times, notwithstanding the obfuscations of irrelevant issues, such as the one which was discussed on the floor of the Senate the other day, about Mr. Strauss' religious faith, lays the issue down so clearly that I believe it deserves repetition on the floor of the Senate.

Of course, the New York Times is in favor of the confirmation of Mr. Strauss' nomination. Interestingly enough, it seems to me that the Times is fairly moral conscious, too, and realizes what would be the implications of confirming the nomination of Mr. Strauss, if he morally did not deserve confirmation. That is a subject, of course, which is the basis of the real opposition to the confirmation.

The editorial in the New York Times makes the fundamental point that "the President has the right to name the members of his Cabinet, and that right should not be denied by the Senate for any but the most serious reasons—reasons of a sort that do not exist here."

I believe that the standard which should be applied ought not to be whether or not Senators agree fully with Mr. Strauss' thinking or with the way in which he has performed his work, but, rather, whether he possesses moral force. That, properly, should be a subject of debate, although I do not believe there is enough question in that regard in the case of Mr. Strauss to deserve it. Any other considerations should be ruled out.

Although I expect to leave for Europe tonight, I shall be back in a few days, and I hope to address myself in great detail to the character of Lewis Strauss, whom I have known for many years. I believe that he will welcome a trial of his character on the floor of the Senate, and I believe that when that trial is had in the open light of day on the floor of the Senate he will have the support of a majority of the Senators, assuming that they will judge him on the basis of character. I am convinced from my long association with him that, whatever may be argued against Mr. Strauss in any other field, certainly in terms of high character, his nomination deserves confirmation, if that is going to be the test.

PLIGHT OF EGG PRODUCERS AND GROWERS IN THE STATE OF OREGON

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, many of us in the Senate have watched with apprehension the disaster which has struck egg and poultry producers in our States.

The average farm price of eggs has fallen to the lowest level in 18 years and the farm price of broilers is the lowest on record for this season of the year.

Recently Mr. Cyril Chambers, of Oregon City, Oreg., wrote me describing the plight of my State's egg producers. He pointed out that:

The amount of feed that one dozen eggs would buy in mid-March was the lowest since 1937, and in April and May we are going to find that our feed/egg ratio will be the lowest in recorded history while our cost of living is at an all-time high.

The decline of egg prices in the last 9 months has been rapid and ruinous. In September of 1958 the average farm

price per dozen for all eggs sold in the United States was 41.8 cents. In May of 1959 the figure was 25.1 cents. In only 9 months, the price received by farmers for a dozen eggs dropped by 33 percent.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a chart prepared from statistics supplied me by the U.S. Department of Agriculture and indicating the terrific fall in egg prices to the farmer over the last 9 months be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

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

Average price per dozen for all eggs sold:

	Farm price	AMS retail price
	Cents	Cents
1958—September.....	41.8	64.6
October.....	39.0	60.0
November.....	38.9	58.9
December.....	37.0	56.4
1959—January.....	36.4	56.4
February.....	35.8	54.7
March.....	34.1	53.0
April.....	28.1	146.6
May.....	25.1	-----

¹ Preliminary.

Source: Department of Agriculture.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I think it is significant to point out that the average retail prices for all eggs have not declined as fast as the prices paid the farmer. During the 9-month period considered in this chart, consumer cost of a dozen eggs fell by only 29 percent. Furthermore, I note with some chagrin that our own Senate dining room, as of June 2, was charging 55 cents for two breakfast eggs. This dish was the same price in September when eggs were selling for about 30 percent more.

Many broiler raisers in Oregon are presently in serious financial straits. One grower told me earlier this year:

We as growers have not made a cent of profit on the last two bunches of broilers we marketed and have gone \$1,200 in debt. Other growers are in the same sad circumstances and those who have larger flocks have gone in the red even more so. All of the allied industries—the hatcheries, the feed companies, the processor, and the retailer—have realized a profit while the growers have gone drastically in the red.

Unfortunately, broiler growers in my State anticipate a continued adverse relationship between broiler prices and production costs in the early part of 1959. Oregon State College reported recently:

Broiler growers cannot hope for as favorable prices in early 1959 as they enjoyed from January through June 1958. Broiler prices in the first half of 1958 were buoyed by two factors: Higher than usual prices for red meats and delayed or reduced marketings of broilers, caused by cold weather in the South and by heavy losses from improper feedstuffs. Consequent favorable prices were followed by weekly broiler chick placements as much as 26 percent larger than in the corresponding week the year before.

Under the impact of increased supplies, broiler prices declined during the summer, and have not since made any sustained recovery. Nevertheless, recent placements and egg settings—which will contribute to 1959 production—have been above a year ago and the large number of layers in breeder flocks

suggest potentially large placements for some time to come.

Because of my concern with the economic distress which is currently prevalent among egg and poultry producers in Oregon and in other States where these commodities are produced, I wrote Secretary of Agriculture Ezra Taft Benson last month urging that the Department of Agriculture take steps to assist in alleviating this situation. I ask unanimous consent that the text of my letter to Secretary Benson be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

MAY 26, 1959.

HON. EZRA TAFT BENSON,
Secretary of Agriculture,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: On May 13, 1959, the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives approved a resolution requesting that your Department "review all existing authority and availability of funds with the purpose of immediately and fully implementing, in every practical manner, such programs of purchase, diversion and export of eggs and poultry products as will lead toward improvement in the present critical situation within the domestic poultry industry."

The request of the House Committee is of great import to poultry and egg producers of my State. The production of eggs in Oregon during April was 2 percent above the same month last year, according to the Oregon Crop and Livestock Reporting Service. Prices received by producers are at record lows. Producers in Oregon inform me that the feed-to-egg price ratio is at the lowest point since depression days. Economic disaster faces many producers. In view of these facts, I wish to urge upon you the need to institute emergency measures as suggested by the House committee in order to provide relief to egg and poultry producers. The economic distress currently being experienced in this sector of agriculture has ramifications for the entire economy. Failure to act will mean business failures, the consequences of which will fall not only upon the families directly dependent upon the sale of poultry products for a living, but also upon those enterprises which serve them.

I would appreciate your office informing me as to what steps the Department of Agriculture has taken, in addition to the proposal for an accelerated merchandising program suggested in your press release of May 20, to alleviate this situation, including possibilities for further expansion of poultry product purchases for use in the school lunch program and for distribution to the States under the needy persons and welfare institutions programs for the distribution of surplus foods.

Sincerely,

RICHARD L. NEUBERGER,
U.S. Senator.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I was pleased to observe that the Dairy and Poultry Subcommittee of the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives will hold public hearings on June 17 and 18 to consider plans for reviving the egg and poultry industry. Both egg producers and broiler raisers will have an opportunity to be heard.

The dried and frozen egg purchase programs announced by the Department of Agriculture will undoubtedly be of assistance in lifting the present depressed egg market.

However, serious consideration should be given now to programs which will

deal with egg surpluses in a more comprehensive fashion and which will assist broiler producers. Use of poultry products in the school lunch and welfare programs, buying of shell eggs and marketing agreements should be given detailed study now with the thought of implementing desirable action as soon as possible in order to relieve existing hardship.

At the present time several poultry marketing bills are pending in the House Dairy and Poultry Subcommittee. A number of poultry men in my State have indicated their belief that some type of cooperative marketing agreement among producers will enable the industry to control surpluses and have a better opportunity to receive a fair price for their product.

Within the next few days I plan to write to a number of egg and poultry producers in my State soliciting their views on these matters. Most of the egg producers and poultry raisers in my State cannot afford either the time or the money to make a trip to Washington to present their individual views. Therefore, I plan to submit to the House Dairy and Poultry Subcommittee, a résumé of the responses which I receive in order that subcommittee members will have a chance to study the comments of these men and women who depend on the poultry industry for a living.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD two articles published recently in the New York Times which describe in some detail the problems facing the poultry industry. Although one of the articles is based on the economic difficulties facing New Jersey egg producers, the elements of the situation in which these farmers find themselves are similar in other States.

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

[From the New York Times, June 1, 1959]
EGG OUTPUT RISING WITH NO END NEAR—
RECORD SPRING SLAUGHTER OF POULTRY
ALSO REPORTED—BENSON WARNS OF AID

WASHINGTON, May 31.—The Department of Agriculture noted last week that egg production in the Nation was well above that of 1958 and predicted that the high output might continue the rest of the year.

The Department further reported a record spring slaughter of broilers and turkeys. Hatching of chicks, it added, continued high until April 1, but has since declined.

Faced with these statistics and cognizant of the current drastic decline in poultry and egg prices, Agriculture Secretary Ezra Taft Benson has appeared extremely reluctant to extend more than limited aid to the distressed farmers.

Under pressure from producers in the Middle West, he agreed to step up the Department's promotion activities in the poultry field. At his direction, the Department also has been buying dried eggs at the rate of 500,000 pounds a week since early April.

Last week, after hearing a plea from New Jersey farmers, he agreed to reconsider his stand against further assistance. Meanwhile the House subcommittee on poultry has slated public hearings June 17 and 18 to consider emergency action to alleviate the depression in the industry.

PRICE CONTROLS BACKED

There are also two bills before the House that would permit the industry to establish price controls. In each instance these controls would be enforced by Washington.

In its report, the Agriculture Department noted that the Nation's farmers received an average of 28.1 cents a dozen for their eggs in mid-April, 16.3 cents a pound for their broilers, and 23 cents for their turkeys. These are the lowest quotations for the products since pre-World War II days.

In 1940 the on-the-farm price of broilers stood at 14 to 16 cents a pound, and the average price of eggs ranged from 26 to 30 cents a dozen.

The Department speculated that the recent reduction in hatchings, coupled with a strong demand for broilers in the summer months, might well raise the price of that product substantially by fall. At the same time the report offered little hope for an improvement in turkey prices unless hatchings were sharply reduced without delay.

[From the New York Times, June 1, 1959]

JERSEY'S EGG PRODUCERS SHAKEN BY PRICE SLUMP

(By George Cable Wright)

FREEHOLD, N.J., May 31.—"We're setting on a keg of dynamite, and the fuse is burning low." With these words, a driver for Henfruit Express summed up today the critical depression in the Nation's poultry industry. He was hoisting egg crates onto the tail of his truck.

Charlie Silver, a 70-year-old farmer, emerged from an egg-grading shed to interject: "Two months like this, you wouldn't see one egg farmer."

The scene was the Silver farm on the Freehold-Lakewood road. A tour of modern rural highways and deep-rutted, tree-lined dirt roads from Mullica Hill to English Creek; from Lakewood to New Egypt, and north to Flemington and Somerville dramatically emphasized the plight of egg and poultry producers.

FARMS BEING SOLD

Scores of farms displayed "for sale" signs; others were boarded up and abandoned. Producers still tending their flocks complained of devastating financial losses.

Some, unable to weather the economic storm, had become sharecroppers on acreage they only recently proudly possessed. The industry calls this "vertical integration." It is not a racial term but a form of contract farming.

The depression began to engulf the egg and meat poultry business in early March. Since then it has reduced producers of these products to as low an economic status as they have experienced in more than 40 years. Egg prices have descended to the lows of the 1930's; broiler prices to 1940 quotations.

Farmers who were interviewed estimated their cost of production at 35 to 39 cents for a dozen of eggs. This week they received 30 cents a dozen wholesale; a week ago 26 cents; and 2 weeks ago, 25 cents.

Retail prices in New York City last week were listed by the department of markets as 49 cents a dozen for the best white eggs and 41 cents for mediums. A year ago the prices were 59 cents and 53.

New Jersey, eighth among the States in the output of eggs, has suffered most. Here most poultry farmers have long put all their eggs in one basket, their only contact with the meat business has been the sale of older laying hens to soup canners.

The comparatively few who breed broilers, rather than layers, do not market eggs.

New Jersey farmers' hen houses, hatcheries, ranges, and homes occupy some of the most valuable farmland in the Nation. These producers pay a higher price for feed than their counterparts in the Midwest and

South, and unlike the latter, they grow no feed of their own.

Their labor costs are among the highest in the industry. In the eyes of the Iowa, Minnesota, Georgia, and Arkansas farmer, Jersey taxes are tremendous.

"Some of us are farming on land as valuable as New York's Central Park," an East Brunswick farmer asserted.

Egg production in New Jersey represents in dollars one-third of the State's agricultural output.

WEEKLY LOSSES SUSTAINED

Charlie Silver, like a large percentage of the more than 6,000 other farmers here, has been producing eggs at a profit for many years. Since April 1, he said, fingering his feed bills and egg receipts, "I have lost from \$200 to \$400 a week; my feed bill last week was \$1,100, but my eggs brought only \$700."

Farm foreclosures in the State are at a record level. The farm bankruptcy rate in the last 3 months—17.5 percent—is the highest in the Nation.

Samuel Dubrovsky and Max Kravet also owned profitable egg farms in Howell Township for 17 and 10 years, respectively. Late last year they were forced to abandon their holdings—each valued at \$30,000.

"Our flocks were not too big. We lost every penny. It's been bad since the Korean war," Mr. Dubrovsky said.

In the little general store they have since purchased together with borrowed funds, Mr. Kravet quietly mixed a bucket of potato salad. "Maybe we're lucky," he muttered.

Individual appraisals by farmers of the present situation vary widely. At one extreme is George Parker of Plainsboro.

"I DON'T EXPECT SYMPATHY"

"Since I was stupid enough to get into this business, I don't expect sympathy," he said. "I'll just try and stick it out. Controls and supports are a thing of the past. They're not for me."

At the other extreme is Jerome Taub of Bound Brook.

"We are entitled to a reasonable profit," he asserted. "Price supports and controls are the answer. There are no more inefficient farmers. They've already been forced out."

The majority of farmers interviewed in the last week agreed that to attribute the present situation solely to overproduction and reduced consumption was gross oversimplification.

Until a year ago New Jersey producers were surpassed only by those of Iowa and Minnesota in volume of eggs supplied to the New York market.

In the last 12 months a major portion of this market has been seized by farmers of the South. Hundreds of broiler raisers in that area, hit by falling prices, have switched to egg production.

SOUTHERN COMPETITION HURTS

These eggs from the South, Martin Schubkegel noted as he gathered eggs just laid by his flock of 19,000 birds, are being candled, crated, and shipped to the metropolitan area at prices comparable to the farm production cost here. Mr. Schubkegel has farmed 27 years on the Lake-New Egypt Road.

"Twenty years ago," he continued, "I paid \$1 for a bag of feed. Now I pay \$4. In 1932 I could hire a man for \$40 a month and his board; now I must pay him \$200. In the same period my taxes have climbed from \$400 to \$3,000."

Similar reports were voiced by all farmers approached. Samuel Jarmus of Englishtown, Irving Berger of Lakewood, Irwin Bernstein of Howell, who is now seeking to dispose of his 120-acre egg farm, blame the South's overnight change from an egg-deficit to an egg-surplus area for much of their troubles.

Yet most farmers here agree that expansion of production in the Midwest, improved

methods of breeding, the widespread use of miracle drugs to control flock diseases, improper farm financing, soaring feed costs and farm mechanization are important factors in the egg and poultry price decline.

"Even sharp reductions in the office and factory coffee break, as well as publicity concerning the effects of cholesterol in the diet cannot be overlooked," Mr. Schubkegel remarked.

MOST WANT U.S. AID

Most farmers want some form of temporary relief from Washington. But they appear confused and divided as to the best method for curing the ills of their industry. George Parker, Martin Schubkegel and others look for the survival of the fittest.

The bulk of the State's producers favor production controls set by the farmers but administered by Washington. Few want direct subsidies, except as a measure of temporary relief.

Integration—in the industrial sense—is generally frowned upon in New Jersey. As practiced here, feed distributors buy and stock a farm. A farmer then contracts to manage the operation and is pledged a specific price for each dozen eggs he produces. The feed concern markets the product. In some instances an incentive bonus is included in each contract.

"Many of such tenant farmers in New Jersey are producers who became so indebted to their benefactor that such integration was their only way out," an official of the State department of agriculture noted.

Down at the K & R Hatchery a few miles southwest of here workmen were busy yesterday dismantling huge incubators for shipment to a Mississippi integrator. The plant last year produced 4 million baby chicks. Now it has been sold for warehouse purposes.

"With chicks selling for 4 cents each," explained a farmer woefully surveying the operation, "you lose money on every egg you hatch."

SOUTH AND MIDWEST HANG ON

A spot check of the egg situation in the South and Middle West by correspondents of the New York Times showed production costs in those areas to be considerably lower than in New Jersey.

The view of industry experts in the South is that the efficient, large poultry producer will survive the present depressed market for broilers and eggs.

But many of the marginal and inefficient operators may become business casualties. Northern producers, even the efficient ones, are expected to be squeezed tighter and tighter because of the competitive advantage that the South has from lower labor and flock housing costs.

The simple fact is that production has caught up with consumption. Some steps have been taken to reduce the size of flocks to stem the glut. A slight improvement in the egg market in the last week appears to have lowered the number of eggs used for setting and to have diverted them to market.

THREE KEY REASONS NOTED

A shift to production on a contract basis, overexpansion by the entrance of amateurs into the industry as a side line and the operations of small producers who do not know that they are selling eggs at a loss are among the reasons cited for market conditions.

Charles D. Hawks of North Little Rock, Ark., general manager of the Arkansas Poultry Federation and head of the Arkansas Egg Council, thinks the egg glut on the New York market can be traced to a sweeping transition to assemblyline production.

Contract production of eggs is becoming increasingly the rule. Under this system, the entrepreneur—usually a feed dealer—obtains feed, the big item in egg and poultry production, from a manufacturer on credit. He

then buys pullets and places them with a farmer grower.

The grower operates the egg factory under contract and is guaranteed a fixed price for eggs. As an incentive, the grower gets a bonus to turn out larger, cleaner eggs on less feed. The entrepreneur markets the eggs.

The big egg factories in the South can turn out eggs for 27 cents a dozen, including production costs, interest, and depreciation on equipment. They are not making money now but are holding their own.

Mr. Hawks contends that while the broiler industry has cut costs to a minimum, there is still room to shave costs in the egg field.

Gordon Sawyer of Gainesville, Ga., southeast manager of the National Broiler Council, summed up the present broiler market in two words: "We're hurting."

It costs a large operator 16.3 cents a pound to raise a broiler. The wholesale market is running 14 to 15 cents.

The pricing practices of chainstores are cited as one factor depressing the poultry market. Broilers were moving slowly at 49 cents a pound, so every 2 weeks or so stores featured them at 29. There was no bottom to the market at this price. But neither was there a profit. And it spoiled the market for 49-cent broilers.

FEDERAL CONTROL A FACTOR

Another problem grew out of the placing of processing plants under Federal regulations January 1. Changes needed to conform to standards increased costs. Since plant changes were needed many processors decided to increase capacity at the same time. This added to the oversupply.

Carl Tower, marketing specialist in the North Carolina Agriculture Department, reported that some improvement in egg prices recently had caused many poultry raisers to switch their laying eggs to the egg market.

The State jumped from fourth to second in poultry production last year. Georgia ranks first.

The chief complaint among Tarheel producers is that the Federal Government has failed to clear away surpluses. Some smaller producers, especially newcomers, complain that they were oversold on the business.

North Carolina farmers were getting 31 cents a dozen for large eggs last week. A year ago the price was 38.5 cents. The retail price was 39 cents compared with 49 cents a year ago.

At Richmond, Va., R. Frank Frazier, executive vice president of the National Broiler Council, and other industry observers detected some hopeful signs. Among them were a fast production adjustment to reduce the hatching of baby chicks; warm weather, which increases consumer demand for broilers; heavier culling of old hens to keep the number of laying hens within bounds, and an upturn of 3 to 4 cents in the market price of eggs last week.

IOWA FARMERS REPORT PROFIT

In Iowa, the special producer of chickens and eggs has been able to cut his cost and is making from 3 to 6 cents a dozen on quality eggs.

The average cost of producing a dozen eggs on the farm is between 20 and 21 cents. The farmer uses his cheap corn and even cheaper oats mixed with a food concentrate to make mash for the laying hens in an effort to keep costs down.

Leading grocery markets are selling eggs to the consumer at prices of two dozen for 75 cents for grade A; two dozen for 79 cents for grade A all whites, and two dozen for 69 cents for grade B. A year ago the grade A prices ranged from 59 to 61 cents a dozen.

In Minnesota, falling prices have put the egg and poultry business in "the most disastrous condition in two decades," according

to Byron G. Allen, Minnesota Commissioner of Agriculture.

Minnesota farmers are receiving an average of 18 cents a dozen for grade A eggs, compared with 29 cents in May of 1958.

The commissioner said the cost of producing a dozen eggs on the farm—the cost of feed alone, with no return for labor, poultry housing or death losses—was 18 cents a dozen.

Today's retail price is about three dozen for \$1, he said.

Production of chickens for the table is just as dismal as egg production, Mr. Allen said. He noted that meat hens were being sold to producers of soups and packaged dinners for as low as 6 to 8 cents a pound.

As a result, he said, farmers are moving out of both businesses in large numbers.

"CAN MONEY LICK CANCER?" — NEWSWEEK MAGAZINE ANALYSIS

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, the June 8, 1959, issue of Newsweek magazine has presented a most thorough analysis of the need for further funds for cancer research, a topic which achieved dramatic emphasis by the recent tragic death of John Foster Dulles.

The article makes evident that additional money for cancer research can have a profound impact on the ultimate conquest of cancer. It quotes a top researcher as follows:

As to whether more money can be usefully spent, the answer is definitely "yes." What we can do immediately (in research) is limited by the availability of people qualified in this field. But we could use much more for training these people, more equipment, better facilities.

Mr. President, the President's budget requested \$75,218,000 for the National Cancer Institute. The House of Representatives has raised this to \$83,308,000. But such eminent men as Dr. Sidney Farber, the leading exponent of cancer chemotherapy, and Dr. I. S. Ravdin, noted cancer surgeon, have pointed out that \$109 million is needed just to fulfill commitments and programs of the National Cancer Institute.

I had the privilege of testifying, as leadoff witness, before the Subcommittee on Health, Education, and Welfare, headed by the able senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], on May 27 in the company of Drs. Farber and Ravdin. I support their requests completely.

I believe that the Newsweek article of June 8 makes emphatic the urgent justification for the Senate voting the complete \$109 million required in this vital cause.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the 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:

(From Newsweek, June 8, 1959)

CAN MONEY LICK CANCER?

More money almost surely will hasten the day when researchers discover a cure for cancer, the medical experts were agreed last week.

A top specialist in the field, expressing the consensus said:

"As to whether more money can be usefully spent, the answer is definitely 'yes.' What we can do immediately (in research) is limited by the availability of people qualified in this field. But we could use much

more for training these people * * * more equipment * * * better facilities."

TARGET: A CURE

The body of John Foster Dulles, dead of cancer, still lay in the vaulted nave of Washington National Cathedral when the Senators convened solemnly in a walnut-paneled room of the New Senate Office Building last week.

"We dedicate these hearings this morning to both the memory of John Foster Dulles and to the hope that our deliberations here may serve to bring closer the day when medical research will wipe this infamous disease from the face of the earth," said Senator LISTER HILL, of Alabama, chairman of the Health Appropriations Subcommittee.

Seldom had a Senate committee met in such a moment of urgency and determination. All over Washington and all across the United States the death of the 53d Secretary of State seemed to forge a new and iron dedication in the assault on the Nation's No. 2 killer.

Cancer had taken many distinguished men—five Senators, including Robert A. Taft, in recent years—and it claims the lives of 250,000 Americans a year, next only to heart disease, which kills 900,000 annually. But somehow Dulles' extraordinary fortitude through months of cruel suffering, and his loss when his services were most needed, made his name a battle cry.

In the hearing room, where the Hill subcommittee was considering an increase in appropriations for the National Cancer Institute from the \$75,218,000 proposed by the administration to \$110,203,000, John Foster Dulles was in every mind. And support for the increase was unanimous.

A VAST PROGRAM

The first witness, Democratic Senator RICHARD L. NEUBERGER of Oregon, who recently underwent surgery and radiation treatment for cancer himself, went farther and urged consideration of his previously proposed \$500 million-a-year crash program to combat the cruel killer of so many humans.

"* * * What greater way could there be to honor Mr. Dulles' memory," he asked, "than to launch a vast program * * * aimed at vanquishing the disease which took his life?"

At the end of Senator NEUBERGER's testimony, Chairman HILL read into the RECORD a letter from TV star Arthur Godfrey, another recent cancer sufferer, pressing for "greatly increased appropriations * * * for the fight against cancer. The lives of too many irreplaceable people have been cut short by this horrible disease," Godfrey wrote.

THE EXPERTS SPEAK

The other witnesses were Dr. Isador S. Ravdin, president of the American Surgical Society and a consultant to both President Eisenhower (when he was stricken by ileitis) and Dulles, and Dr. Sidney Farber, chairman of the Cancer Chemotherapy Committee and professor of pathology at Harvard.

Explaining the need for more money, Dr. Ravdin said optimistically.

"Great breakthroughs in medical knowledge are usually the result of research by many workers, each of whom adds to the sum total."

Dr. Farber detailed three great areas of promise for exploitation:

Chemotherapy (use of chemicals for the arrest of the disease).

The search for cancer diagnostic tests that can be carried out rapidly, inexpensively, and with complete accuracy for the entire population.

Studies of cause, leading to the prevention of cancer.

When the hearing ended, shortly before the Dulles funeral service began, substantially increased funds for cancer research were clearly in prospect.

Already the House had increased the President's request to \$83,308,000, and after Dulles' death, it might go higher. Mr. Eisenhower would find it difficult to veto appropriations inspired by his friend's death.

If money could beat cancer, Congress would provide the money—and it would do so in the name of John Foster Dulles.

NEED FOR ARCTIC RESEARCH

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, our foreign policy and our appropriations seem to be largely geared to opposition to the totalitarian regime which rules in Moscow. More than half the proposed budget—in excess of \$40 billion—is to be expended on national defense and mutual security. Yet in another field, in which the Russians have long been eminent, and where comparatively negligible sums would go a little way if not to enable us to catch up in the field of Arctic research, at least not to drop further behind, we are tragically neglecting our opportunities.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks an editorial entitled "United States Neglects Need For Arctic Research," published in the Anchorage (Alaska) Daily Times, which deals cogently with this subject. The editorial points out that appropriations which are needed to carry on the work which we have been doing effectively in Alaska have been so curtailed in amount that there is great danger that much of this very vital activity will be suspended. These are relatively minor sums. It seems to me that we are being pennywise and dollar foolish when we are spending billions in other ways to meet the Russian threat, and neglect this very important field of Arctic research, which is bound to play a very important part in the future in our struggle against the totalitarian regime across the Bering Strait.

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

[From the Anchorage (Alaska) Times, June 2, 1959]

UNITED STATES NEGLECTS NEED FOR ARCTIC RESEARCH

Arctic research in the field of health is languishing for lack of interest on the part of the U.S. Government.

Programs of the Arctic Health Research Center in Anchorage are dying on the vine. Federal appropriations now pending in Congress are inadequate to maintain present work schedules.

Alaska's two Senators recently made a plea for greater allocations. They asked that funds also be made available for planning an adequate headquarters building.

Senator BARTLETT told a committee that two entire sections of the research center's operations may have to be discontinued because the appropriations are insufficient to support them.

This is an alarming situation. The need for research in the field of health is greater today than it was in 1948 when the program was established.

The research center is the only American organization devoting its entire efforts to biological and physical sciences concerned with health in Arctic areas.

When it was established the purpose was twofold. First, it was to catch up on Federal delinquency in the Arctic health investi-

gations which resulted from long neglect. Second, it was to safeguard the health of the growing population resulting from the influx of people—military, veterans, defense construction workers, and others.

Substantial progress has been made in the 11 years of study. But the need for continuation of the program is urgent today. Alaska has become a State. Modern technology has placed her at the heart of a small world. Continued increase in population is inevitable.

Time and restless men will not wait for answers to low-temperature living. As communities grow and new settlements spring up in the wilderness, better answers are needed for permafrost engineering, food production and processing, endemic diseases and factors affecting their control.

The Alaska research program was a courageous and sound measure to alter the traditional course of civilization. Until then public health activities had developed in the wake of civilization. The new effort was to make these activities a leader instead of a follower. Public health was to pioneer new fields and become a creative force in opening new frontiers.

Accomplishments under the program have been noteworthy. Included among them are a water distribution system that will work in permafrost, identification of parasites affecting animals and man in the Arctic, discovery of effective controls over biting insects, development of home treatment program for tuberculosis, learning about anemia among Eskimos.

Federal neglect of the Arctic health research program is deplorable in the light of its great accomplishments and the great need.

But the neglect becomes alarming when compared to the activities of Soviet Russia in the same and other scientific fields.

While the United States has only one establishment carrying forward its health studies in the Arctic, the Soviets have 31 institutions engaged in medical sciences in the Arctic.

The Soviet's concern with Arctic health is only a small part of a larger program in which it has 374 institutions participating. Those institutions operated 107 polar stations during 1956 and the trend is for more of them, not less.

These scientific programs play an important role in Russia's great success in carrying civilization into the far reaches of the Arctic, the area of the world that is destined to be one of the most important in coming generations.

It is ridiculous that the leaders of the United States should lack the vision to see the need for expansion rather than contraction of scientific studies in Arctic areas.

The Arctic Health Research Center should be given adequate funds for a widening of its investigations. It should also be provided with adequate buildings in which to conduct its scientific studies.

The request for Federal funds to do this is not a boondoggling proposition, nor a pork barrel operation for the edification of the Senators elected here. It is a sound warning that this Nation must keep pace with the northward migration of civilization.

The Arctic is no longer a vacuum beyond the periphery of human interest. It is one of the most strategic areas of the globe and the destiny of the American way of life might well be decided there.

THE FRIENDLY RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES AND FRANCE

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, on Monday last it was my privilege to pay a tribute to France and to express the

satisfaction which I personally felt, and which I was sure a great number of Americans likewise felt in the recovery of France. It is one of the brightest spots in a troubled world. It is a recovery which spells increasing peace and stability, and should rejoice Americans, who ought never to forget our great debt to France, which began with the invaluable assistance which the French people gave us in the Revolution which gave birth to our Republic.

The friendship between our two peoples, the American people and the French people, has been—despite a brief lapse in the 1790's—for nearly a century and three-quarters, one of the most gratifying and inspiring examples of the relationship of two peoples, both cherishing the ideals of liberty, equality, and brotherhood, and of the dignity of man.

I shall ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, at the conclusion of my remarks, the second and third articles of that series, as well as an article contained in a special dispatch of the New York Times of this morning headed "De Gaulle Sets Stage for Algeria Debate," and, finally, an article written by the well-known columnist Constantine Brown which was published in last night's Washington Evening Star entitled "France Revitalized in One Year," with the subheading "Nation a Sample of What Can Be Done When It Rallies to Patriotic Leadership." All these articles are extremely well worth reading, and I commend them to the attention of my colleagues.

I call particular attention to the enlightened way in which President De Gaulle is approaching the Algerian problem. As we know, the world has moved rapidly away from the idea and practice of colonialism. By and large, the Western Powers have made, or are in the process of making, an end to their colonial policies. The Russians are now practicing it, and in particularly brutal fashion, with a ruthlessness which makes other colonial regimes of the past seem benign by comparison. With complete hypocrisy, while fastening the shackles of colonial servitude on their helpless satellites and reaching out for more such victims, they are denouncing the vanishing colonialism of the Western Powers with the hope of posing as liberators and then infiltrating the newly liberated nations to try to convert them to communism and to bring them into the Soviet orbit.

The Chinese Reds have likewise followed suit in this policy, as their recent conquest of Tibet demonstrates. That is all the more reason why the Western World may point with pride to its present trend and performance to liquidate the colonialism of the past.

Our own Nation has set a conspicuous and shining example within the year by granting our two incorporated Territories, Alaska and Hawaii, statehood. I have no hesitation in saying that Uncle Sam would have been guilty of colonialism had we not taken this step, and I know that we are prepared to move as rapidly as possible in providing the maximum of self-government, in accordance with the wishes of the people, to our remaining possessions. We liberated the Philippines 13 years ago, and we have given Puerto Rico the political status which its people approved less than a decade ago. The British Empire, meanwhile, is pursuing an extremely enlightened policy of combining the liberation of its former colonies with the utmost in the way of adequate preparation for their new role of self-government.

The Algerian question is far more complicated than perhaps any of the other problems which come under the heading of colonialism. It is more complicated for a number of reasons, which, incidentally, are set forth in the articles which will follow, but principally because the French have been in Algiers for well over a century. Some five successive generations of Algerian-born Frenchmen have been born there. With the assistance of successive French governments, and through their own energies, they have established a growing and successful economy and have introduced French culture and civilization there. At the same time, perhaps 8 or 9 times the number of Algerian Moslems have felt in the past that their wishes and their aspirations have not prevailed and that they should not be ruled by a minority. Involved in this, of course, are ethnic and religious differences, as well as differences of economic status which enormously complicate the problem. There is the further difficulty arising from the efforts of nearby dictators to stimulate and assist rebellion.

There are the constant intrigues of the Kremlin's emissaries. There are the errors committed by past French governments. There are the rancors aroused by past acts of violence of both sides.

President De Gaulle's policy is the height of enlightenment and courage. He proposes a thoroughly democratic solution by giving full equality in the suffrage to all the people of Algiers. There will be no loading of the vote in favor of Algerians of French origin. Majorities will, according to democratic practice, determine the future status of Algeria. Needless to say, De Gaulle will have much opposition, some in France, some in Algiers. But if he succeeds, the benefits, not merely for France and Algiers, but for the whole world, will be incalculable.

As Robert C. Doty puts it:

If the inevitable political evolution of Africa takes place within the sphere of democracy, the huge continent could become an economic, political and military bastion of that world. If, on the other hand, the young African nationalists should turn toward Moscow and Peking for inspiration, guidance and material help, the loss would be a staggering blow to the West.

President De Gaulle's is a direct attack on colonialism. It is the effort to liquidate colonialism by eliminating its essential character. It is a radical solution because it goes to the root of the trouble. Let us hope for its success.

It is interesting to recall one of the basic tenets of President De Gaulle's philosophy, contained in the opening words of his war memoirs, namely that "France cannot be France without grandeur." President De Gaulle's policies are bringing to France that grandeur which he feels is indispensable. It is grandeur reached for through the enlightened application of democratic principles.

Let no one be under any illusion concerning the great difficulties which lie ahead for France in this inspiring program of its far-visioned and courageous leader. It calls for the sympathy and moral support not only of the United States, but of the people of the entire free world.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the articles to which I have referred, published in the New York Times and the Washington Evening Star be printed at this point in my remarks.

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

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

A YEAR OF DE GAULLE—II

(By Robert C. Doty)

PLACE IN HISTORY MAY HINGE ON ABILITY TO STABILIZE FRENCH-AFRICAN RELATIONS

PARIS, June 2.—Gen. Charles de Gaulle's final place in history may well depend on his success or failure in putting France's relations with Africa on a healthy, durable basis.

The stakes, not for France alone, but for the West as a whole and for Africa as well, are immense.

If the inevitable political evolution of Africa takes place within the sphere of democracy, the huge continent could become an economic, political and military bastion of that world.

If, on the other hand, the young African nationalists should turn toward Moscow and Peking for inspiration, guidance and material help, the loss would be a staggering blow to the West.

As long ago as his Brazzaville declaration during World War II, General de Gaulle demonstrated a penetrating awareness of the vital importance of Africa to France, Europe and the West.

As a result, in the 12 months since his return to power a year ago yesterday, the General has devoted more of his time and energy to reflection, discussion and action on African problems than all his other preoccupations combined.

PROBLEM IN TWO PARTS

The problem presents itself in two inter-related parts: on the one hand, Algeria and the rest of Moslem North Africa, on the other, the French African territories south of the Sahara and the island of Madagascar—altogether a solid third of the total area of Africa.

In his final news conference before his retirement from active politics in June, 1955, General de Gaulle set the pattern for the action he has taken since his return to power.

"There are two facts about which no one can do anything," he said at that time.

"The first is the nationalist passion that the general shakeup of the world has caused to flame up almost everywhere and that makes itself felt also in French North Africa."

And, further on: "But I say that no other policy than that which has as its aim the substitution of association for domination in French North Africa . . . can be either valid or worthy of France."

In North Africa, the die was already cast in tragic fashion when General de Gaulle assumed power again. In Tunisia and Morocco, former French protectorates, fairly satisfactory forms of association had already been worked out to replace domination, consistent with the Gaullist formula.

But the cancer of the unresolved Moslem rebellion in Algeria, engaging increasingly the Moslem solidarity of the two neighboring states, threatened and still threatens to frustrate hopes for mutually profitable collaboration between France and the rest of North Africa.

General de Gaulle's action in Algeria has been inhibited by two factors.

First, the presence of an important European minority, rooted there for more than a century, makes of Algeria an almost unique colonial problem, demanding a solution that will safeguard European rights while satisfying Moslem nationalist aspirations.

Second, 4½ years of warfare, marked by brutality on both sides, having so inflamed passions, so hardened the extreme positions that no reasonable compromise seems to have any chance of acceptance—assuming a reasonable compromise can be found.

VOTING EQUALITY GRANTED

Although no details of a solution in Algeria can now be discerned, President de Gaulle, by one act and one declaration, has set the country irrevocably on the road to self-determination, or the right to choose its own future. The act was the granting of voting equality to the Moslems, outnumbering the Europeans by a margin of about 9 to 1. The declaration, oft-repeated, was that the political status of Algeria would ultimately be determined by free election.

This clearly means that, soon or late, the Moslem majority can achieve any sort of a solution it wants, up to and including independence.

General de Gaulle's gamble, in Algeria as elsewhere in Africa, is that through patient efforts to restore peace without yielding to rebel demands for a grant of independence, coupled with earnest efforts to improve the economic and social conditions of the Moslems, the Algerians will be led ultimately to choose continuing association with France in some mutually acceptable form.

In Algeria, the President has been forced to fight an improvised rear-guard action in a situation already badly deteriorated. In the rest of French North Africa, he has been able to take the lead, to set on foot action to anticipate and forestall the critical, violent stage of nationalism.

His method was to offer the 14 French African territories the choice of full independence or participation in a new French community in which they would exercise local autonomy, leaving foreign affairs, defense and community financial policy to France.

Only one, Guinea, took the first option. In all the others, General de Gaulle's name and record of enlightened views on colonial matters won big majorities for association in a referendum last September.

But by the terms of the community constitution, member states retain the permanent right of secession and access to full independence. This means that the community will remain cohesive for just as long as France can counterbalance the siren song of pan-Africanism rising from independent Guinea and Ghana, and from even farther afield, with solid advantages for those African territories that remain with France.

Thus, at best, the French community could become a permanent grouping of states taking cultural and economic leads from

Paris, much as the Commonwealth states do from London.

At least, even if it should prove to be impermanent, the community can serve as a framework for mutual aid and peaceful evolution toward whatever final political status is chosen by the African States.

President de Gaulle is enough of a realist to foresee both possibilities. He understands that France's essential interest in Africa is not in the French flag's waving over large territories but rather in French humanist ideas expressed in French by millions of Africans, by choice rather than constraint, in the profitable exchange of French and African products on both continents, and in the assurance that, in a showdown, those same Africans would find it to their own interest to stand up and be counted for the free world.

[From the New York Times, June 4, 1959]

A YEAR OF DE GAULLE—III

(By Robert C. Doty)

HE STRUGGLES TO ASSURE FOR FRANCE A ROLE CONSISTENT WITH HER GREATNESS

PARIS, June 3.—The foundation of Gen. Charles de Gaulle's view of world affairs in his refusal to accept the idea that national influence should be proportionate to national material power.

Implicit in all of his declarations and initiatives in foreign affairs is the idea that the old French humanist tradition is at least as powerful as the atom bomb. He intends, however, to have the bomb, too, by allied aid if possible, by independent development if necessary.

A second and corollary tenet, expressed in almost the opening words of his war memoirs, is:

"In brief, to my mind, France cannot be France without grandeur."

It is in this that the De Gaulle of the wartime Free French movement, struggling without legal status, without funds, without an army, with only an idea and the force of character, for recognition of France as a full partner most resembles the President de Gaulle of 1959, 1 year after his return to power last June 1.

Today he is again struggling to assure for France a role consistent with his concept of her greatness in the resolution of what he conceives to be the real issues of our times.

Quarrels held transitory

In General de Gaulle's scheme of things, established with the long view of the historian, the issues that excite and divide the European-Atlantic world today—rival ideologies, Berlin, Germany, and the arms race—are mere transitory petty quarrels—annoying, even dangerous—but basically irrelevant to the real issue of man's fate.

"In our time, the only worthwhile cause is that of man," he said, defining his foreign policy views at his March 25 news conference. "It is man that must be saved, made to live and develop."

The important stake for him does not lie in the quarrels between the Communist and democratic worlds, which he sees as essentially members of a common European family of nations, but in the portents for the future in the two-thirds of mankind who live in misery outside the European tradition.

It is the task, he says, of the entire European-Atlantic world, from the Urals to San Francisco, to bring material and moral aid to less-favored peoples.

He sees France, once her own house has been set in order by settlement of the Algerian problem, as qualified to take a leading role in that approach to the "third world" of Asia and Africa without arousing the fears of domination that the Soviet Union or the United States by their rivalry and power would arouse.

These views, regarded as utopian and unrealistic by some of France's allies, are nonetheless important, for they motivate the general's policy in each of the major domains of foreign affairs.

Thus, he does not regard the East-West rivalry as a new struggle between Rome and Carthage from which one must emerge victorious, the other defeated. But he is no neutralist. In current Western councils, France has been most insistent on the maintenance of the Western positions in Berlin and Germany.

Again, General de Gaulle does not permit the disparity between France's tough line and her military means for backing it up to dissuade him from proclaiming what he believes to be the wise policy.

Firmness, General de Gaulle holds, offers the best hope of bringing the Russians to reason so that, at a summit conference, he could raise for discussion by the big powers the real issue of cooperation in worldwide development.

Here, again, the fact that France could contribute less, materially, to such a program than could her major allies is regarded by General de Gaulle as an irrelevancy. So is the suggestion, advanced by cynics, that France would need such a program to enable her to carry out promises of vast development projects in Algeria and the French community in Africa.

In his attitudes toward the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and the European unification movement General de Gaulle is opposed to those aspects of both movements that tend to blur the lines of national identity and responsibility.

Despite his vision of the worldwide obligations of the European-Atlantic world as a whole, General de Gaulle believes that for Frenchmen, at least, the essential fact is the fact of nationhood.

Accordingly, in NATO he disputes and resists the tendency toward the integration of national forces in international commands.

Stand on fleet explained

Explaining his decision to keep France's Mediterranean fleet under national command in time of war, he said:

"I think, in fact, that [the alliance] will be so much the more living and stronger if the great states will unite in a form of co-operation where each bears his own responsibility rather than in that of an integration where peoples and governments would find themselves more or less stripped of their role and responsibility in the domain of their own defense."

The fleet move was designed also to point up General de Gaulle's demands on Britain and the United States for French participation with them in the constitution of a global political and military strategy board. The move served also to underline General de Gaulle's desire for revision of the NATO command structure to give France a larger role, particularly by the extension of the alliance's strategic planning to Africa.

His attitude toward European unification projects is consistent with his nationalist principles.

Those who established the first three supranational European Economic Communities—the Coal-Steel, Atomic Energy, and Common Market Communities—saw them as preliminaries to a real federal political union of France, West Germany, Italy, Belgium, the Netherlands and Luxembourg and any other European states willing to merge their sovereignties with those of the founding six.

General de Gaulle does not share this view. His ideal of European unification is that of increasingly close consultation and collaboration among national governments, with no nonsense about a merging of sovereignties.

He has honored France's signature on the existing six-nation treaties but is unlikely to

take France into any more supranational organizations authorized to exercise jurisdictions independently of national governments.

Instead, General de Gaulle can be expected to continue to seek to formalize contacts between heads of government, like those he has established with Dr. Konrad Adenauer, the West German Chancellor.

FRANCE REVITALIZED IN 1 YEAR—NATION A SAMPLE OF WHAT CAN BE DONE WHEN IT RALLIES TO PATRIOTIC LEADERSHIP

(By Constantine Brown)

This column has reported frequently the emergence of France as a new and revitalized force among the nearly demoralized free nations of the world. That country with a small population compared to the 208 million in the Soviet Union and 170 million in the United States has set an example of what a nation can do when it rallies around genuine patriotic leadership.

When Gen. Charles de Gaulle took over the reins of France a year ago, he had on his hands a state close to total moral, financial and political bankruptcy. There were as many political parties as there were ambitious politicians. These parties and politicians, while jockeying for power, combined their efforts to overthrow any administration which gave a vague impression of strength by remaining in office for more than a few months. The interests of the country had become an expression used only for the purpose of replacing a set of politicians by another office-hungry crowd.

The French people themselves had lost not only faith in their leaders but had become so frustrated that the voices they expressed at the polls had become meaningless. "Je m'enfoutisme" (I don't care a damn) had become the political slogan. And cheap, selfish politicians were thriving on it. Everyone for himself was the watchword. Translated into practical consequences, it meant a lessening of concentrated economic efforts for the good of all, and particularly a flight from the franc.

The big industrialists and financiers transferred large sums to banks in Switzerland and the United States. Little people bought gold coins or ingots. This was done especially by the still-prospering farmers.

France was going to her destruction fast. This, at least, was the consensus, not only of the casual foreign observer but also that of many French people themselves. It was heard all over that only a man on a white horse could save the situation.

The man appeared, not on a white horse but in a black limousine. He was General de Gaulle, whom every political observer in France abroad regarded as having been thrown on the political junk heap after the errors and incompetence he had shown as head of the Government after the liberation.

We construe the expression "man on a white horse" to mean a military dictatorship with all its implications of harshness and curtailment of civil rights and human freedoms. This is apparently an obsolete conception, at least insofar as France is concerned. For while there were serious misgivings about the De Gaulle dictatorship not only among the French politicians who saw the end of an era but also among the British and American people to whom interference of the army in political strife is repugnant, the results of the De Gaulle administration in 1 year are close to miraculous.

There was an almost instantaneous return of confidence among the French masses, with a decisive decline in Communist infiltrations. After acceptance by plebiscite of the new constitution and the election of a new Parliament this return of confidence became more accentuated. The flight from the franc not only ceased, but those who placed their

funds in the safety of American banks began to withdraw them. Between January 1 and April 30 of this year, not less than \$971 million returned to France from the United States alone. The French currency is now hardening fast.

There are, of course, still many hurdles in the way of France's economic recovery. A moribund economy cannot be revived in only a few months. But what is far more important is the fact that the French people feel that they have regained much of their lost dignity and prestige. There is an almost unprecedented moral revival which even the casual traveler can sense after a few days in what was described a year ago as a dying democracy.

France's moral revival is being strongly felt on the international scene. At all the past conferences the French were merely there. At the present foreign ministers powwow in Geneva, France is playing as much of a role as the United States or Britain. It is true that the Muscovites are trying to shove De Gaulle's foreign minister aside as they did at the past gatherings. But the effect of De Gaulle's stand had already been felt when he disposed in a few words of Premier Khrushchev's manipulations to hold a summit conference somewhere in the United States.

Similarly, if the strenuous efforts of the advocates of a meeting of the heads of state fail it will be because De Gaulle refuses to attend. He has made his decision known to President Eisenhower and Secretary of State Herter that unless tangible results come from the Geneva meeting, there is no reason for him to go to the summit.

The renaissance of France has had an impact on the rest of the Western European countries which have found Paris to be a new rallying point which could in a pinch replace London or Washington.

[From the New York Times, June 4, 1959]

DE GAULLE SETS STAGE FOR ALGERIA DEBATE

PARIS, June 3.—President Charles de Gaulle set the stage today for the first French parliamentary debate on Algeria in more than a year.

"Like it or not," he said democracy is now the rule in the rebellion-racked north Africa territory.

Since the uprising by the army and the European settlers in Algeria in May 1958, General de Gaulle, as Premier and then President with full powers, has traced a course in Algeria without reference to the legislators.

Tomorrow, in the National Assembly, those who feel that his policy has been too liberal, those who think it has not been liberal enough and those—probably a majority—who think it has been just right will confront each other for the first time.

The immediate issues will be two bills proposed by Premier Michel Debré to merge the French and Algerian currency ultimately and to give the National Assembly the right to vote on the Algerian budget.

In a general way these measures tend to give satisfaction to those who demand the full integration of Algeria with France. But Government proposals for delays in their application would retain freedom of action for President de Gaulle and the Government to avoid an irrevocable commitment to the integrationist cause.

General de Gaulle's statement to the Council of Ministers today had a direct bearing on the issue of integration.

In view of the activist leaders of the European colony of Algeria integration means the complete absorption of the 9 million Moslems there into the French state of 43 million Europeans. This would give a result quite different from that which would result from the "integration" of the 1,200,000 Europeans of Algeria with the 9 million Moslems there.

REVOLUTIONARY STEP TAKEN

By decreeing, in the early days of June last year, that Moslems and Europeans should vote in a single college on the basis of man-for-man equality, General de Gaulle took the revolutionary step of putting the future of Algeria ultimately into the hands of the Moslem majority. The European extremists have grumbled since then that they would not bow to the law of mere numbers.

It was in this context that President de Gaulle, according to Minister of Information Roger Frey, told the Cabinet today:

"From now on the door is open to the equality of rights and democracy. Whether one likes it or not, democracy exists in Algeria. Nothing can prevent the holding of elections—legislative, senatorial, or municipal—and that is the essential thing."

Alluding to the guerrilla warfare going on in Algeria, the President said that "the difficulties inherent in the situation" there "have not been of a nature to impede the carrying out of free consultations."

"These have thus brought proof of the Moslem accession to political equality, to equality of rights and, definitely, the establishment of democracy in Algeria," he added.

Until 1958, Moslems and Europeans voted in separate colleges, each community electing the same number of representatives at all levels of government. This made one European vote worth nine Moslem votes and, in effect, gave the Europeans permanent dominance.

Since there could be no question of Moslems' opposing the change of the system that brings their numerical superiority to bear, General de Gaulle's like it or not appeared to be directed at the European grumblers as well as at the rebels, who have sought unsuccessfully to enforce a boycott of elections.

Meanwhile the integrationists were mobilizing to try to force the Government to move more swiftly toward their desired goal of the complete merging of Algeria in the French Republic.

An Algerian Deputy, Marc Lauriol, announced that he would move to strike out of the Government's project to merge the French and Algerian currencies a provision delaying action until expiration of the Algerian Special Powers Act—in effect, until the end of the rebellion. It was anticipated that Premier Debré would oppose the Lauriol amendment.

ACCELERATION OF REFORESTATION PROGRAMS

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, the Hungry Horse News in its May 8 issue has a series of five excellent pictures describing the reforestation of Teakettle Mountain on the northwest edge of the Flathead Valley by the U.S. Forest Service. It is unfortunate that this was entirely a pictorial story from the standpoint of printing it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, but I consider the story of such signal interest that I want to call the matter to the attention of the Senate.

This area was burned over in 1929 and the people of this Nation have had to wait 30 years for reforestation efforts to get under way. One excellent picture by Mel Ruder, the editor of the Hungry Horse News, shows the slopes of Teakettle Mountain with its rocky outcrops and the remains of dead trees still standing. A crew of six men is in the foreground of this steep slope, working their way up through the brush with their tree-planting mattocks and their bags of Douglas-fir seedlings. This reforestation

project involved only 13,000 trees being planted 7½ feet apart, or enough trees to reforest only about 15 acres.

There are far too many areas in our national forests which were burned over 10, 20, and even, as this area, 30 years ago, which are in need of reforestation. The 4.4 million acres of national forests that need to be planted to trees can be adequately and promptly planted if the administration will endorse the purposes of Senate Joint Resolution 95, introduced by my colleague, the junior Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], and a bipartisan group representing all sections of our Nation.

I want particularly to mention the forest crew who did this planting job—Jerry Rose, Dwight Dauber, George Gilbert, Ed Blankenship, Joe Misiewicz, Don Carroll, Art Findlay, Don Bunker, Francis Anywaush, Curtis Chagun, Bruce Pyles, Henry Schlueter, Dick Hellstrom, T. W. Paulin, Jim Hutchens, and Del Hutton. These men who are doing this work on the ground are the ones who can do the job. All it takes is for this administration to decide that the future of America requires a balanced resource budget—a budget that is balanced in terms of the needs of a growing nation rather than the ledger sheets of a budgeteer.

Mr. President, let me tell the Senate how grassroots Montana leaders see the need for resource development. Here is what Mel Ruder, president of the Columbia Falls Chamber of Commerce as well as editor and publisher of the Hungry Horse News, writes:

The United States is doing practically nothing out here in the mountain West when it comes to reforestation, thinning, pruning and the like.

This is a matter of consequence. Our county—none of it is desert—is the size of the State of Connecticut, and is 84 percent publicly owned. Of course part of it is Glacier National Park, but then more than 2 million acres is Flathead National Forest.

We had a better than usual planting year this spring with 106,000 small trees put out. I expect that's about 1 percent of the need. Heard a figure that at the rate we were going it would take 400 years to cover what we should be doing now.

Yes, Teakettle was burned over in 1929, and a small portion of the wasted slope was planted to trees in 1959. None last year, etc.

Of much more consequence to us is the situation where trees on flats have come back like hair on a dog's back. There are tens of thousands of acres of Flathead Government-owned land where natural forestation has taken place, but the trees grow too close together, and won't develop into a resource of value. We need a thinning-pruning program. We need roads to get to these areas so that the resource can be managed.

You folks have access to foresters, who can tell this story better than I.

He speaks on the one hand of the failure to plant burned over areas and, on the other hand, the failure to thin and prune other areas, and the need for roads to manage this Federal property. He thus presents a compelling argument not only for Senate Joint Resolution 95 but also for S. 812, which would authorize establishment of a Youth Conservation Corps and put young men to work

managing and conserving our great timber, soil, water, range and recreational resources.

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

AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS TO THE NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be laid before the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 7007) to authorize appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for salaries and expenses, research and development, construction and equipment, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Shall the bill pass?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I should like to have the yeas and nays ordered on this question; and then I shall yield the floor.

I ask unanimous consent that on the question of the passage of the bill, the yeas and nays be ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, exploration and development in the field of space and aeronautical sciences are bound to cost our taxpayers billions—not millions, but billions—of dollars in the years to come.

Somewhere along the line, we must cut expenditures to meet the new demands of this age of challenge. Difficult though it may be, we must discard some of our concepts of defense, in the light of the new era which we are now entering.

As a member of the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences, I have, to this good hour, voted full financial support for America's exploration of outer space.

Here is an area in which we are starting afresh. Here is an area in which we can, by careful scrutiny and management, avoid the tragic waste of many other Government programs, both foreign and domestic.

But equally important with the task of financing this exciting adventure into space is the task of developing positive national policy on the control and use of outer space by the peoples of the world.

Lt. Gen. Bernard Schriever testified, when he appeared before the Senate Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences, that if the Soviet Union controlled outer space, it would have the power to destroy the United States.

We, in this Nation, in adopting a positive national policy, must convince na-

tions of the world that we are willing to negotiate on space agreements, on orbiting objects, giving notice of launchings, providing identification of space vehicles, and keeping free from interference communications frequencies involving manned space craft.

The benefits to science from space exploration are less obvious than the practical benefits, but are of supreme importance to mankind. As the introduction to outer space, prepared by the President's Science Advisory Committee, pointed out last year, man has "A compelling urge * * * to explore and to discover." All the great scientific discoveries, on which our civilization has been founded, arose from this basic wish to learn more about the universe in which we live.

In the human search for knowledge, no distinction can be made between "space science" and any other kind of science. Everything that we learn about the cosmos—about the stars which are the source of energy, the planet on which we make our home and find our material resources, about the forces that govern our activities, about the origins of life itself—all these bits of information which we hope to find in space add to the whole fabric of our knowledge.

The earth is an extremely imperfect platform from which to carry on astronomical observations. Its atmosphere is a hazy medium that causes deviations in the light passing through it, and often obscures objects in the sky. By placing instruments in satellites circling outside the atmosphere, we can secure a clear view of Mars, of the moon, of a host of distant stars which are now hidden from our sight. Just recently, a photograph taken from a rocket above the atmosphere gave us for the first time a detailed picture of the surface of the sun. Similar photographs of the entire visible universe can be made from a satellite observatory.

Many experiments need to be made on the behavior of materials and chemicals—including elemental specimens of life—in a vacuum. The most complete vacuum we can create on earth is far less nearly perfect than the vacuum in space. So we have a use for scientific laboratories permanently orbiting in space satellites.

We have much to learn about the dimensions and composition of our own earth—about its magnetic fields, its electrical forces, and its gravitational attraction. These studies can be made best from satellites and other vehicles in space. They should add greatly to our understanding of geology, navigation, meteorology, and a dozen related studies which are included in the earth sciences.

One of the questions we want to answer is how matter has been created in the first place. We can see how the basic element, hydrogen, is being converted into helium and other elements all the time, in the interior of stars like the sun. Yet there seems to be no decrease in the supply of hydrogen. We should like to know whether new hydrogen is constantly coming into existence, somewhere in space; or whether,

as many scientists think, the amount is limited, and will some day come to an end as the universe ages.

There are many facts we wish to discover—about the behavior of light and of objects traveling at the enormous speed of light, about cosmic radiation and the many different particles and pulsations that continually bombard the earth from space, about the atmosphere and mineral formations, if any, on other planets, and so on, beyond any knowledge that we can conceive of, until men have traveled in space and seen what new problems and unsuspected natural forces are there.

There is only one satisfying way by which we can learn about the universe: namely, by having those who travel in it take note of what they find.

I shall continue study and work on these continuing problems, and shall help, to the extent of my energy and whatever ability the Almighty has given me, to the end that we adopt a forward looking national policy for the control and use of outer space for the welfare of this Nation and the other nations of the world.

I respectfully urge Members of the Senate to give their support to this bill, so we may rapidly establish the leadership of our Nation in this new age of challenge.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, the committee report which accompanies the bill is certainly worthy of examination by every Member of the Senate, if for no other reason than the cost of the future implications of this program. I shall summarize it very briefly, and shall point out that it involves \$485 million, and that approximately 10,000 persons—all of them technical experts, I presume—now are employed in the Space Agency. Of the salaries and expense account, 75 percent is allocated to salaries.

Dr. Glennan, who appeared before the committee, gave some rather exciting and dramatic testimony when he said this authorization is nothing more than a downpayment on this program.

Of course, Mr. President, everyone knows that when one is purchasing an article of commerce—whether a refrigerator, an automobile, a washing machine, an electric toaster, or any other item—the downpayment is only a fractional part of the entire cost.

So it is rather impressive when Dr. Glennan says this is only a downpayment on the future cost of the program.

Dr. Glennan said:

Today, we are making the downpayments on programs that, inevitably, will cost very much more in the years ahead.

So that is the first item which has impressed itself upon us, namely, that this is only a downpayment, and that every implication is that the amounts involved in the authorizations in the future will increase. In fact, Dr. Glennan indicates that the cost will rise year after year.

But there is a highly exciting statement in the report; and again it is from the testimony of Dr. Glennan, as follows:

The 1960 cost of Project Mercury is \$70 million, and before we have completed this

first U.S. effort to put man into space, the bill will have exceeded \$200 million.

A few days ago it was my good fortune to have a brief visit with the young men who have been selected, for their mental, physical, and all other attributes and virtues, to be the experimental astronauts. I visited with and shook hands with every one of them; and I sized them up as, in a way, typical Americans. One of them will be the first to go up into space, I suppose. At the hearings, Dr. Glennan said it will cost us \$200 million to put a man into space.

So the conquest of space is going to be at once exciting and costly; and I think we should interpret it in terms that our people can readily understand.

Finally, there was the following statement in the testimony of Dr. Glennan:

The cost of the national booster program, to provide the building block units of basic rocket motors needed for our space programs, will exceed \$2 billion, in my opinion.

Two billion dollars for rocket boosters and basic rocket motors.

I am quite sure our people have as yet no good concept of how costly it is going to be to send a man swirling into orbit and finally do all the things contemplated by the program; but it is an astronomical dimension in which we operate. I am hopeful, of course, that there will come back, in the form of data, solutions, and answers to speculations and queries which are not solved and answered, fruitful information which will enrich and expand the enjoyment of living by the billions of people who have inherited and who live upon the earth.

Those things I wanted to emphasize, Mr. President, because we are going to hear more about this subject. Since those matters are prospective rather than retrospective, they are going to find their way into the annual budget, and I suppose the budget will be going up year by year.

That fact gives point to what a great Senator once said to me, and he was a great Senator. The Honorable Reed Smoot, of Utah, said to me once, "Young man, when you get on a high budget plateau, you never recede to a lower plateau, except temporarily. It will always be upward and forward."

I have lived with and been a part of this legislative process for a quarter of a century and have seen how the budget goes up. In 1933, when I first came to Congress as a freshman Member of the House of Representatives, as I recall, the whole cost of Government was in the neighborhood of \$3 billion. That sum was for the Army, Navy, Air Corps, all the regulatory agencies, all the regular departments, for every function and purpose and activity of Government. So in 25 years, the budget has risen from \$3 billion to \$77 billion. That is a terrific increase. If it accelerates in an equal proportion in the years that lie ahead, of course, it is going to challenge our people and, among other things, there will be times when they will have a right to be filled with wrath. In those times every high quality of statesmanship will have to be summoned in

order to meet the challenge and the issue.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I am sure the Senator remembers that the first year when the appropriations reached \$1 billion was 1911. Then, from time to time, until the year he mentioned, possibly, they rose until they became \$3 billion, the budget having increased 300 percent in that period.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I believe the time to which my distinguished friend from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON] alludes was the time when Thomas B. Reed was the Speaker of the House of Representatives. When a Member of the House observed that we had finally got to a billion-dollar budget, his answer was, "This is a billion-dollar country."

It could have been said that this country was a \$7 billion country, or that it is now a \$77 billion country. I presume in due course it may be said that it is a \$100 billion country, and even more.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, with reference to House bill 7007, the NASA authorization bill, in my opinion, it has been fully presented to the Senate, so far as the factual information in the report and in the bill is concerned. I have nothing further to say, if the Senate is ready to vote on the bill.

I should like, however, to call attention to a matter which I mentioned yesterday. I refer to part I of the hearings on the bill which contain a great deal of data, pictures, illustrations, graphs, as well as scientific testimony on the amazing projects which are under way and are planned, as reflected in the provisions of the bill. That part of the hearings is now available. There has not been time to distribute it on the Senate floor, but it is available to any Senator who may wish to have one. I think the document is of unusual interest, not only to Senators, but to their staffs who work on these matters. It will be a matter of great interest throughout the Nation, especially in scientific and educational circles.

Mr. President, I have no more comments. I was glad to hear the comments of the Senator from Illinois with respect to the contemplated programs. It shows his familiarity with the subject. So far as that is concerned, he is familiar with everything which comes up on the floor. Furthermore, I think he is certainly pointing in the right direction when he calls to the attention of the country the importance of these programs and states that one of them, which is merely for the purpose of carrying a man to the moon, certainly does not tell the full story, although it is a part of the story. I appreciate the remarks of the Senator from Illinois very much.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, I mentioned at the outset I thought the committee report was good reading for the American people. There are too many persons who still think in rather academic terms about the subject. It is a reality. We are in the space age, and we are going

forward. I have no doubt of it. I think the majority leader merits a compliment on that score for the diligence and devotion he has applied to the whole program and the leadership he has manifested in regard to it. But the space age is here, and we are going to deal with it. We should familiarize ourselves with the facts involved.

Mr. STENNIS. The majority leader certainly does deserve to be commended, as time will prove still further year by year.

The attention of the minority leader was diverted a moment ago when I referred to the hearings which are available, particularly the scientific part, with illustrations, pictures, graphs, and documents, which will have a nationwide, and perhaps a worldwide interest.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I appreciate the generous statement of my friend the minority leader, although I realize how unworthy I am of the commendation.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass? On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I announce that the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNING], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], and the Senator from Utah [Mr. MOSS] are absent on official business.

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] is absent because of death in the family.

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

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

I further announce that if present and voting, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNING], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], and the Senator from Utah [Mr. MOSS] would each vote "yea."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON], and the Senator from

Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] are absent on official business, and, if present and voting, they would each vote "yea."

The Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER] is necessarily absent, and, if present and voting, would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 81, nays 1, as follows:

YEAS—81

Alken	Frear	Morse
Allott	Gore	Mundt
Anderson	Gruening	Murray
Bartlett	Hart	Muskie
Beall	Hickenlooper	Neuberger
Bennett	Hill	O'Mahoney
Bible	Holland	Pastore
Bridges	Hruska	Prouty
Butler	Humphrey	Proxmire
Byrd, Va.	Jackson	Randolph
Byrd, W. Va.	Javits	Robertson
Cannon	Johnson, Tex.	Russell
Carlson	Johnston, S.C.	Schoeppel
Carroll	Keating	Scott
Case, N.J.	Kennedy	Smathers
Church	Kerr	Smith
Clark	Kuchel	Sparkman
Cooper	Langer	Stennis
Cotton	Lausche	Symington
Curtis	Magnuson	Talmadge
Dirksen	Mansfield	Thurmond
Dodd	Martin	Wiley
Douglas	McCarthy	Williams, N.J.
Dworschak	McGee	Williams, Del.
Eastland	McNamara	Yarborough
Engle	Monroney	Young, N. Dak.
Ervin		Young, Ohio

NAYS—1

Ellender

NOT VOTING—16

Bush	Green	McClellan
Capehart	Hartke	Morton
Case, S. Dak.	Hayden	Moss
Chavez	Hennings	Saltonstall
Fulbright	Kefauver	
Gulwater	Long	

So the bill (H.R. 7007) was passed.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist on its amendments, request a conference with the House of Representatives thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer (Mr. HART in the chair) appointed Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. STENNIS, Mr. YOUNG of Ohio, Mr. DODD, Mr. CANNON, Mr. BRIDGES, Mrs. SMITH, and Mr. MARTIN.

NOMINATION OF MR. LEWIS L. STRAUSS TO BE SECRETARY OF COMMERCE

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, in the light of the fact that we shall soon be called upon to vote on the nomination of Mr. Lewis L. Strauss to be Secretary of Commerce, I thought it might be interesting for Senators to know that, at least in a couple of instances in my State, there has been the use of people's names without their authorization.

I hold in my hand a telegram from Palm Beach, Fla., which reads as follows:

PALM BEACH, FLA., May 18, 1959.

Senator GEORGE SMATHERS,
U.S. Senate:

Your vote is important to confirm the nomination of Lewis Strauss. Please cast it in his favor.

Mr. and Mrs. MORTIMER PHILLIPS.

I responded to that telegram by telling that I did not intend to vote for Mr.

Strauss, and stating the reasons why. In reply I received the following letter:

PALM BEACH, FLA., May 30, 1959.

Senator GEORGE SMATHERS,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SMATHERS: Thank you for your letter concerning approval or disapproval of Mr. Strauss for Secretary of Commerce. This letter brings out the fact that neither my husband nor I ever sent you a letter urging you to vote for approval of Mr. Strauss. As a matter of fact we do not want you to vote for him, and are pleased that you agree.

Is there any way of ascertaining who sent you the letter in our name? My husband is quite incensed and would like to see it run down.

Truly yours,

ANNE D. PHILLIPS
Mrs. M. B. Phillips.

I received another telegram, reading as follows:

PALM BEACH, FLA., May 18, 1959.

Senator GEORGE SMATHERS,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.:

We need more public servants with the ability of Lewis L. Strauss. Do cast your vote for him.

Mr. and Mrs. BARNEY BLICHER.

I wrote them the same kind of letter, stating that I did not intend to vote for confirmation of the nomination, and the reasons why.

I received the following letter in reply:

WEST PALM BEACH, FLA., May 30, 1959.

Hon. GEORGE SMATHERS,
Senator, U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR SMATHERS: I am in receipt of a letter from you dated May 26, which is in reply to an alleged communication from me. I am quite disturbed by this letter of yours because of the fact that I had never written you one in the first place. Someone must have used my name without my permission, and I am particularly upset by the fact that it was used to further the cause of Admiral Strauss.

Apparently there must be a pressure group which is resorting to all sorts of tactics, including unwarranted endorsements. I am happy that you, as my representative in the Senate, feel as I do regarding the confirmation of Admiral Strauss to the position of Secretary of Commerce, and I hope you continue your opposition to this man.

It may not be possible, but I would like to know the source of this letter which you received. Something should be done to prevent recurrences of this nature.

Sincerely yours,

BARNEY BLICHER, D.D.S.

I do not know how many of such messages I have received, but one afternoon, from 3 until about 5 o'clock, I was in receipt of nearly 300 telegrams.

I had begun to think that the people whose names were on the communications actually did not know that their names were being used.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HART in the chair). Under the order entered yesterday, the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] is entitled to the floor for 30 minutes.

U.S. DEFENSE AND DISARMAMENT POLICIES

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, as the three nuclear powers—the United

States, and Soviet Union, and the United Kingdom—move closer to an agreement to stop nuclear weapons tests under an effective and workable control system, those who question the wisdom of such an agreement continue to voice their doubts.

In a free society each citizen has the right to give his opinions and to present his arguments. An informed citizen on a particular question not only has the right to present his case; he has an obligation to share his knowledge and views with others. When many of our fellow citizens, including some of my good friends, champion the cause of continued nuclear testing they are performing a service by stimulating debate and discussion on a subject of vital concern to all Americans. I feel sure that these friends will welcome the fact that I, too, wish to join with them in debate, and to offer some comments and arguments of my own.

Those who oppose an international agreement on the cessation of nuclear weapons tests have two main arguments. One argument is that the control and inspection system would not be good enough to detect secret tests in violation of any test ban treaty that might be agreed to. I have discussed aspects of a control system on three separate occasions on the Senate floor since the beginning of this Congress. I do not at this time intend to dwell at length on the nature of the control system now being negotiated except to reiterate my own position. My position, in short, is that, while no system can be perfect, it is possible to install an effective and workable control system to monitor an agreement to suspend all nuclear weapons tests. Such a control system must have as its main elements five basic features:

First. The establishment of appropriately instrumented control posts at specified intervals throughout the territories of the nuclear powers, and including provision for the improvement of the system.

Second. The staffing of the control posts and all other personnel connected with the control system to be international in character so that objectivity and impartiality in the operation of the system will be guaranteed.

Third. The right of the control commission to conduct an unimpeded on-site inspection of any event which the control system cannot identify as being natural in origin.

Fourth. A time schedule whereby the agreement and the control system shall extend to other nations and areas in addition to the territory and test areas of the three nuclear powers.

Fifth. A control organization which can conduct its business without being thwarted by the use of a veto on key decisions.

So far as I am aware, the United States and the United Kingdom in their negotiations with the Soviet Union for a test ban treaty have not sacrificed any of these five fundamental features of a control system. I do not agree with those who say that the control system cannot be made to work. Furthermore, I do not agree with those who say that the United

States has already accepted aspects of a control system which are not sufficient to deter a violator or to catch him if he tries to sneak a few tests undetected.

ATOMIC TESTS AND LIMITED NUCLEAR WAR

The second argument that is given in opposition to a test ban treaty concerns a thesis of military strategy. The advocates of this thesis would have us reject a test ban agreement regardless of the type of control and inspection system that the nuclear powers might agree to.

What is this thesis and why do these people feel so strongly about the need to continue nuclear weapons tests?

First, they believe that war with the Soviet Union and perhaps Communist China is probable and, therefore, we must do everything in our power to prepare for such a war.

Second, since a war is likely, they believe it is vital that we try to prevent it from spreading to envelop the whole world in a nuclear holocaust with the consequent possible result of the end of civilization as we know it. In order to prevent the spread of such a war, it is necessary to limit the weapons used and also, insofar as possible, to restrict the geographical area of combat.

Third, if we are to limit the weapons and restrict the area of combat, they believe it is imperative that we have a large family of tactical nuclear weapons at our disposal. These weapons cannot be the large megaton hydrogen bombs which are not really weapons of war so much as they are weapons of mass destruction of innocent peoples. Furthermore, it is argued, we cannot use non-nuclear weapons because these weapons are not powerful enough to fight a limited war. What power they have is further handicapped by their heavy weight. In other words, conventional armaments are considered no longer adequate for the United States because in helping to defend the entire free world we must be able to move large numbers of weapons quickly and with great mobility to the scene of crisis or actual combat. The use of our Armed Forces in limited wars without the resort to nuclear weapons is likewise considered inadequate because the Soviet Union and Communist China, having a combined population vastly greater than ours, and having less appreciation than we of the worth of human lives and the dignity of individual human beings, would have an insurmountable advantage. Thus goes the argument of those who oppose any prohibition of the testing of nuclear weapons under an international agreement.

The advocates of a program of continuous atomic weapons tests say that when big hydrogen bombs are eliminated as too powerful and when conventional armaments are eliminated as not powerful enough, the only thing left is the category of small atomic weapons. These weapons, say these advocates of continued testing, have the advantage of being light in weight, and therefore highly mobile, and of being sufficiently powerful to destroy an opponent's armed forces, but not so powerful as to be weapons of mass destruction. Only in this way, they say, can limited wars be

fought and won without great destruction to human life around the globe.

The proponents of continued testing claim that the United States does not now have a sufficient number and variety of small atomic weapons for the purpose of defense in limited wars. Furthermore, the opponents of a nuclear test ban also contend we have not reached the necessary stage of development of these weapons. They conclude that under no circumstances should the United States enter into an agreement to discontinue tests of atomic weapons at this time.

The advocates of continued atomic testing for the purpose of assuring an arsenal for defense in limited nuclear war ignore, in my view, many of the realities of present day international political life. Their thinking, I submit, is based on a faulty concept of the nature of the crises facing us. They have constructed hypothetical situations about fighting wars which do not correspond to the actual situation in which we are apt to find ourselves.

What are the weaknesses in the arguments which I have presented on the part of those who favor continuing nuclear tests and who believe that we must have an ever-expanding arsenal of small tactical atomic weapons?

WEAKNESSES OF LIMITED ATOMIC WAR THESIS

Let us take a look at the weaknesses of the limited atomic war thesis. Weakness No. 1: The assumption that small nuclear weapons must be used as a defense against the large armies of the Soviet Union and Communist China fails to recognize that the Soviet Union also has a large supply of nuclear weapons and that if we use such weapons there is nothing to prevent her from using them, or making them available for use against us. If small atomic tactical weapons are effective against the large armies of the Communist bloc, they are no less effective against smaller armies of the Western bloc. The idea that small nuclear weapons will give us a decisive military advantage in a war in which both sides use nuclear weapons is fallacious. This is not to deny that the small weapons may be militarily useful in a nuclear war. But there is no evidence that they will be substantially more useful to us than to the other side. And to assume that the Communists will not recognize their utility and be prepared to exploit it would be to repeat an old error. We have no monopoly on these weapons, large or small.

Indeed, we must accept the fact that if we use these weapons there is no assurance that an enemy would not reciprocate in kind. To some extent, this concept about having nuclear weapons to use against large armies of a potential enemy is a hangover from the days back in the midforties when the United States had a monopoly on the atomic bomb and when the U.S. Armed Forces were cut back way below those of the Soviet Union. Then we could say that our nuclear weapons stockpile was an active deterrent to aggression by the swollen Soviet armies, but this comforting idea has become increasingly outdated during recent years as the Soviets have developed

a stockpile of nuclear weapons comparable to our own. The deterrent may still exist, but it is a deterrent that now applies to both sides.

Weakness No. 2: If the United States ever became involved in using nuclear weapons against the land armies of the Chinese Communists and the Soviet Union this would probably not remain a limited war. It would become a major conflict. What is there to make anyone believe there can be limited war with the Soviet Union and Communist China simply on the basis of the size of weapons? It is extremely difficult to envisage a situation whereby the United States, the Soviet Union, and Communist China would be engulfed in a nuclear war without large strategic weapons being used. It seems almost impossible to contemplate a nuclear war in which tactical weapons of small size are used against the large Communist armies but in which the war is politely limited to these weapons. It is unlikely that the belligerents in such a major war would limit the size and nature of the weapons through fear of retaliation in kind. And even if the big bombs were not used, the Soviets would have the small weapons just as we.

The conclusion seems unavoidable that when the advocates of limited atomic war capabilities speak of a limited atomic war, they are thinking primarily in terms of conflict on territory controlled neither by the United States nor the Soviet Union. As I shall suggest in a moment, it is not at all clear that third parties welcome the idea of being used as a nuclear battlefield.

Weakness No. 3: If the United States is the first to use nuclear weapons, be they tactical or strategic, this country will be stigmatized throughout many parts of the world. We would deliver to the Communists a political victory of such proportions that any military victory, if one were achieved, might not offset the political defeat. At least, I say this must be taken into consideration. I have tried to test my viewpoint in this matter by addressing to the Department of State and the Department of Defense questions related to the attitudes of other nations on the use of nuclear weapons. I asked, for example, whether the difference in kind between the conventional weapons—even the largest, and nuclear weapons, even the smallest—is not such that it is inevitable that a distinction be present in the minds of people. The Department of State did not deny that such a distinction exists. It merely held that the development of tactical nuclear weapons "would help—I emphasize the word 'help'—to correct the distinction now made between nuclear and non-nuclear weapons and obtain recognition that there is a continuous spectrum of yields." The Department of Defense answered my question by saying that it was not "attempting to propagandize the fact that nuclear weapons are no different than conventional weapons. The nuclear weapon is different and this fact stands up by its own recognition." What this means to me is that nuclear weapons are regarded by many, if not by most people in the

world, as a class of weapons quite different from so-called conventional weapons.

Of course, the nation that commits the act of aggression should and would be stigmatized and condemned by all peace-loving nations. But since many people do place nuclear weapons in a special category, and since it is doubtful that we could succeed in changing their attitudes, then we must live with the reality that such attitudes exist.

My concern on this score is echoed in a letter recently received by the Committee on Foreign Relations from a distinguished career diplomat now retired. He was asked by the Committee on Foreign Relations to comment on certain aspects of American foreign and defense policy. He pungently states the case in the following comment:

It is said that we need not worry over this eventuality because we will more than counter a conventional aggression with the use of our nuclear weapons. This does not reassure me because I, for one, am anything but convinced that in a showdown we will dare to loose a nuclear war if the other side does not. The responsibility is too great, the moral abloquy too heavy, the danger to our own existence too overwhelming. If my suspicion is correct, where would this leave us?

In other words, this eminent witness points out that in any kind of so-called limited war the use of nuclear weapons would leave the United States with a tremendous moral responsibility, one which could not be ignored.

Weakness No. 4: We cannot assume that all countries would risk the total devastation that would probably result from the use of nuclear weapons as the price of defense against Communist imperialism. No country wishes to be the victim of Communist aggression, and each would want to have help defending its people against Soviet and Chinese tyranny. In fact, a number of countries have accepted our aid in building their defenses and in preventing Communist aggression from being successful. But the defense that we employ must be commensurate with the threat.

There is a tendency to talk about small tactical nuclear weapons as though they were similar to the weapons of World War II, but these weapons are not similar. Our small tactical nuclear weapons contain enormous destructive power. They are small in size only, not in destructive capability. This destructive power is not only inherent in the weapon itself, but it also comes from local radioactive fallout. This local fallout can affect the water supply, the soil, foodstuffs, and all the various kinds of materials on which a population must feed itself.

I call the attention of Senators to a very important military operation which I think substantiates my argument. Four years ago, the U.S. Army and Air Force held some joint maneuvers in Louisiana called Operation Sage Brush. This was one of the first attempts to use tactical nuclear weapons in a simulated way in local warfare. The exercise showed, as a result of an analysis made by the military chiefs following the exercise, not only that the enemy was de-

feated, but that our own troops also suffered severely from the local radioactivity. Mr. Hanson Baldwin, the eminent military specialist of the New York Times, who witnessed these maneuvers at the time, termed them a "frightening experience." It was found that during these maneuvers not only the State of Louisiana, but also an area the size of 12 States would have been devastated, the cities partially destroyed, and the surviving inhabitants completely affected by radioactivity. The size of weapons used in this maneuver were the so-called small, tactical, nuclear weapons, ranging from 2 kilotons to more than 40 kilotons. The military terms such weapons small tactical weapons. I admonish Senators to remember that when they hear the terminology "small tactical weapons," they are hearing about weapons of from 2 to 40 kilotons, or even larger.

Operation Sage Brush took place 4 years ago. It is possible that the Armed Forces have learned how to use tactical nuclear weapons to better advantage since that time, so that the residual radioactivity will not be so damaging to civilian populations. I tried to learn something about this problem when the members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff testified earlier this year before the Disarmament Subcommittee. Unfortunately, they would not be communicative even in executive session. Their lack of candor makes me suspect that our ability to reduce local fallout in a limited atomic war has not increased in 4 years. I urge Representative HOLIFIELD, chairman of the Special Subcommittee on Radiation of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, who is about to hold hearings on the results of a thermonuclear war, to hold hearings and inquire into the results of a limited atomic war as well. This study is urgently needed in light of recent efforts to underscore the importance of continued atomic weapons testing for the purpose of developing so-called smaller tactical atomic weapons.

My point in bringing up the results of Operation Sage Brush is that I question whether any nation wants to be the battlefield for a limited atomic war, to defeat an enemy only to turn around and find even its agricultural produce has been well fertilized with radioactive dust. I am aware there are those who claim this problem can be solved by developing so-called clean bombs. The Atomic Energy Commission has produced large yield weapons with reduced fallout. Although the development of small weapons with reduced fallout has not yet been achieved, some of our scientists think this, too, can be realized. But even if the fallout hazard can be reduced, it is doubtful that it can be completely eliminated. Moreover, it does not help our safety and those of people everywhere if our weapons are 60 to 90 percent clean and those of an opponent are not.

I repeat that if our weapons are from 60 to 90 percent clean, but if those of the opponents are not clean, but, instead, are dirty, the fallout from the opponents' weapons could be just as deadly

as an extremely dirty fallout from our own. So clean weapons on our side, but dirty weapons on the part of the opposition, would not make for clean fallout.

Weakness No. 5: Our defense officials have persuaded us that the free world with its armed forces, conventional armaments, and industrial power cannot without nuclear weapons withstand the armies and armaments of the Soviet bloc. Again, we are presented with reasoning that is inconsistent. If the full land armies of the Soviet Union and Communist China were even thrown into battle, the war would no longer be limited. Both sides—starting, perhaps, with the side that seemed to be losing—would use nuclear weapons.

Another of our high officials in the Foreign Service stated recently to the Committee on Foreign Relations, with respect to our NATO strategy:

A military policy that reaches for nuclear weapons as its main ingredient, is a self-defeating policy, in that it guarantees a dead Europe. Moreover, a military policy tailored to the concept of "limited nuclear war" is also a policy which is likely to lose us our European allies. For what this notion comes down to, is a confession that America and Russia realize that the nuclear weapons are too dangerous to use against each other. Hence they will be used against Europe or on European terrain alone.

What we need is a military policy leading to military forces in being that will not be more terrifying than the fear of hostile threats.

A number of experts in military strategy contend that conventional armed strength can be made to offset that of the Soviet bloc, without the use of nuclear weapons, at least if the conflict is not all-out war. In other words, if the full force of Soviet and Chinese Communist armed forces were not used in a conflict, the conflict would already be significantly limited. In such a case, the use of nuclear weapons by us might well not be appropriate; indeed, their employment by the defense might serve only to breach the limits and bring on total war.

It is in the area of conventional armaments and Armed Forces that the United States and the free world should build up their defenses. Unfortunately, the administration and some of the advocates of continued nuclear testing at all costs have persuaded the American people that a defense consisting of nuclear weapons is about all that we need to have. They have tried to lull us into the concept that we can be strong and deter aggression without sacrifices in men and money. This is a new type of defense panacea—a kind of automation. These same people argue that wars can be prevented, or, if they break out, can be won, with only limited participation of our manpower, and without the cost of paying for an adequate Defense Establishment based on the principle of balanced forces and balanced weapons. We have been so brainwashed about this automation of our defenses that today, when a Member of Congress rises to point out the tragic lack of balance in our defenses, people are likely to accuse him of undermining the deterrent effect of our nuclear arms.

NEW CONCEPT NEEDED OF DEFENSE AND
DISARMAMENT

I have attempted to cite the weaknesses in the arguments of those who advocate continued atomic tests at all costs, because I am convinced that the faulty and misguided strategies on which this concept is based must be revealed and brought forth for debate.

I wish to make it quite clear that I am not arguing that we should unilaterally forego the use of atomic weapons, their testing, development and production, and the determination to employ them if the world situation became so intolerable that our very existence and survival were at stake. Furthermore, compared to the military strategists who would place most of our reliance for defense on the very large, multimegaton hydrogen bombs and on long-range missiles, I think the advocates of a diversified atomic stockpile have the stronger case. And so long as the nuclear powers fail to reach an agreement based on effective and workable controls, I support them in their efforts to expand and diversify our nuclear weapons stockpile.

Where I part company with many of my friends in the atomic weapons field is in their notion that continued atomic weapons development is more important than anything else we can do, that it is more important than trying to have an effective test ban agreement based on effective controls, more important than trying to slow down the arms race, more important than trying to prevent the spread of nuclear weapons production throughout many countries, and more important than getting the Soviet Union to accept and implement the principle that control and inspection must be parts of the reduction of armaments. It is here that balance is lost and judgment becomes blurred. It is on this point that certain military factors are overlooked and political and psychological factors are almost completely ignored. And it is here that the fatalism about the inevitability of another war and the skepticism and cynicism about the prospects for progress on disarmament produce a distorted concept of what the goals of our defense and foreign policy should be.

Mr. President, I shudder to think of the military situation that would confront this Nation and, indeed, the world if several other nations achieved a nuclear weapons and missile delivery capability of our own. To prevent such a situation is one of the main reasons why a total ban on nuclear weapons tests is more desirable and more urgent than a ban only on tests in the atmosphere and underwater. It is to our own national interest, and indeed to the interest and well-being of humanity to try to limit the membership of the nuclear power club.

Mr. President, do not misunderstand me. I have said before, and I repeat, that a ban on atmospheric tests is desirable. But I am speaking now of what I consider to be most desirable, namely, a total ban.

For too long now the words "defense" and "disarmament" have been treated in our thinking as though they represented the opposite points on a compass or the

extremes in the thermometer. Writers on defense and military strategy compose long and scholarly dissertations without once mentioning the subject of armaments control; or occasionally they may throw in a sentence or two, almost as a sop. At the other extreme, there are writers and organizations who prepare equally long and learned theses on the subject of disarmament, without mentioning weaknesses in our Defense Establishment.

I do not see why disarmament and defense cannot be made the inseparable twins of national security policy. I should like to illustrate this concept by referring to the present missile gap.

Ample evidence has been presented that the United States has allowed the Soviet Union to move dangerously ahead in the development and production of long-range ballistic missiles. We now know that unless we put forth great effort, within the next 2 years especially, this gap will so widen that the Soviets may feel able to attempt a major surprise strike. The Soviet Union may be tempted to strike, because the Kremlin will know that we do not have enough long-range missiles, well enough protected and dispersed, to strike back after an initial attack, and that our strategic bomber command would not have sufficient time to get off to deliver a major blow against the Soviet Union, in retaliation. A military balance of terror is not very comforting; in fact, it is a horrible thing. But this horror is exceeded by the prospect of an imbalance of terror, an imbalance favoring the Soviets.

I am not a defense expert, nor do I claim to be, but insofar as I am aware no one in the administration and no one in the military departments of our Government has argued that these are not facts. As a consequence, the United States is inviting disaster through a failure to take the necessary steps to close the missile gap and to take the necessary steps to harden our strategic airbases.

At the same time, the United States has not persisted in the development of plans whereby the threat of an attack by long-range missiles might be removed and the missiles eliminated or their production and testing curtailed. The Surprise Attack Conference was a start, but at that Conference the United States terms of reference were limited to inspection only. Measures of control and reduction of missiles, for example, were not included. We were not prepared for that Conference, and neither were the Soviets. But that Conference is over now and we should not be standing idle. We must start to talk and to prepare for the next one. We ought to have a plan and a policy which is pursued vigorously for the control or the eventual elimination of these missiles. Soon the missiles will be installed in their launching platforms and readied for instant firing. A mistake, a miscalculation, or madness on the part of one or a few people could send these gigantic birds of destruction on their way to foreign territory. Yet, months and years go by, and little serious effort is made toward their control.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President—

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

Mr. HUMPHREY. Let me complete my statement. I am under a time limitation. I have another page.

The noted scientist, Dr. Harrison Brown, has stated the problem very well. He has said:

We are faced during the course of the next 25 years with the prospect of seeing one nation after another achieve the means of manufacturing nuclear explosives and of delivering them with planes, missiles, and submarines. With the addition of each new nation to the list, the problem of achieving control of any sort will increase enormously. As missiles become more dependable agents for delivery, increased emphasis will be placed upon the use of nuclear explosives for defensive purposes. Eventually most nations will be heavily armed with these weapons. Stockpiles for offensive purposes will be numbered in the hundreds of thousands and those for defensive purposes will be numbered in the millions.

We must simultaneously increase our efforts and our expenditures, if necessary, to close the missile gap, on the one hand, and to devise plans for missile control, on the other. Such an effort should be pursued all down the line in areas of defense and disarmament. Alongside such a program of action, our negotiators, our information service, and our diplomats should be waging a campaign to bring pressure on the Soviet Union and other nations to enter into serious negotiations. This campaign should be waged at every level—at the United Nations, at summit conferences, at foreign ministers meetings, and at any other forum where representatives of the major powers meet.

Mr. President, I know the time granted to me has expired. I need about 3 more minutes to complete my prepared statement. I ask unanimous consent that I may complete my statement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time allowed to the Senator under the limitation has expired, but there is no restriction on debate, if the Senator desires to continue.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I ask for time to continue my statement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senator from Minnesota is recognized.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Chair.

Mr. President, the American people are not unwilling to make sacrifices for adequate security and defense. They will make the sacrifices, provided two conditions are met. First, they must be told the truth—the hard facts about the world situation—facts that are military, political, social, and economic. And secondly, they must be shown that these sacrifices may one day contribute to the emergence of a better world—a world in which competing systems, be they religious, economic, social, or political, can compete without the fear that the competition must lead to all-out war.

The international crises demand that we adopt such a program for our national security and for the security of the rest of the world. Military preparedness alone cannot give us the security we want. A policy of defense only is inadequate and promotes attitudes of

hopelessness on the part of our people. And we can use beautiful words about disarmament and peace, but these will be futile also unless we apply ourselves and make the necessary efforts both to control and reduce the weapons of war and to build a Defense Establishment that is balanced and meets the Nation's defense requirements.

If we do these things, then our sights can be lifted beyond the terrible thought that a nuclear war, large or small, is probable. So long as the United States views the world crisis primarily in military terms, and exclusively as a crisis against communism, its moral stature and its leadership qualities will be seriously questioned, and may be irrevocably undermined in nations and among peoples throughout the world who have not a prayer of a chance to defend themselves against aggression by a major power. It is one thing to build varied and strong defenses, but quite another to say this defense is all we have. If the democracies of the world are to survive, they must place more emphasis and put more effort into works of peace at the same time that their defense efforts act to deter war from breaking out. Defense is a shield designed to give protection and buy time while we pursue with courage, imagination, and purpose the war against man's ancient and relentless enemies—poverty, hunger, disease, illiteracy, injustice, and economic stagnation.

Now I yield to the distinguished Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. ANDERSON. The Senator from Minnesota is under no time limitation. The Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] represented this country at the disarmament meeting. Why does not the Senator yield to him now, and he can yield to me later.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The distinguished Senator from New Mexico had asked me to yield first. I was going to yield to him. I am delighted to yield to my good friend from Tennessee.

Mr. GORE. I appreciate the courtesy of the senior Senator from Minnesota and the junior Senator from New Mexico, the able chairman of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

The senior Senator from Minnesota has performed a service by opening for debate an extremely important subject. I shall not undertake today, under the situation prevailing on the floor, to discuss this matter in detail; but I shall, at the very first available opportunity, discuss it in some detail.

In the first sentence of the prepared statement of the Senator from Minnesota, he stated:

As the three nuclear powers . . . move closer to an agreement to stop nuclear weapons tests under an effective and workable control system—

That is the first clause in the sentence. Now I come to the first one of the five main elements or basic features which the Senator says must be incorporated in an agreement:

(1) The establishment of appropriately instrumented control posts at specified intervals throughout the territories of the nuclear

clear powers, and including provision for the improvement of the system.

I should like to point out to the able Senator that that first basic feature is not in complete accord with the first sentence in his speech from which I quoted, nor does it appear to meet fully the criteria set forth in the agreement of the experts reached in Geneva in July of last year. It is not in accord with the Senator's own resolution, approved by the Senate recently, which called for a worldwide system of control and inspection. The experts in Geneva agreed upon a worldwide system, not a system confined to the territories of the three nuclear powers.

I wanted to invite the attention of the able Senator from Minnesota to that fact, because the concept of worldwide control is implicit in an effective and workable control system.

I believe the experts said it would be necessary to have approximately the same number of control posts for the land mass of Red China as they recommended for Red Russia; I do not recall the exact number. If the entire land mass of Red China is eliminated, and control posts apply only to the territories of the existing nuclear powers, I doubt if the condition which the Senator describes in his first sentence could possibly be met.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I submit, most respectfully, that the nuclear powers cannot negotiate what they will do in the lands of other nations. Those powers can only negotiate with respect to the areas over which they have sovereignty.

It is perfectly true that there are control posts, of a type, in other lands under certain lease rights. The nuclear powers are attempting to negotiate an agreement among themselves covering the territories of the three nuclear powers. Once on-site inspection in the areas of the nuclear powers themselves is brought about, then the expansion of a control system on a worldwide basis can and must be accomplished.

I point out to the Senator that that is point No. 4, which reads:

A time schedule whereby the agreement and the control system shall extend to other nations and areas in addition to the territory and test areas of the three nuclear powers.

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

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. GORE. I had intended to interrogate briefly the able Senator about the fourth point. His statement brings up the question of when and how the proposed agreement shall go into effect. Shall the agreement go into effect before an effective and adequate control system is established, or shall the effective date of the agreement await the establishment of an effective control system? If the able Senator will answer that question, then it can be determined how his suggested basic features of a control system apply to the first sentence of his speech.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator has an answer.

Mr. GORE. I should be happy to hear it.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator's answer is this: If it is possible to get an agreement to suspend nuclear weapons tests; to get an agreement which does not provide for a veto of on-site inspections on the part of any one of the members; if there can be an agreement which will permit mobility and movement within the nuclear areas themselves for the purposes of inspecting alleged violations of a nuclear test ban; if there can be an international control organization; if, within the mechanism for policing the agreement, there can be means and methods for the improvement of the system as new technology develops; then we can accept the agreement and proceed from that point to the broadening of the area of the agreement, because the nuclear powers cannot negotiate as three separate sovereign powers what the other nations of the world will do. It is necessary to negotiate from that point with the other nations for further extension of control posts and for their inclusion within a nuclear test ban agreement.

So far as I know, to date no other nation is a nuclear power. France may become one shortly. There is reason to believe that perhaps Communist China will become one.

As the Senator knows, in case the nuclear test ban agreement arrived at does not include any other power which is a nuclear power, then the agreement is off. In other words, there is an agreement among only those powers which are nuclear powers, and if any nuclear power comes into the "club," so to speak, and does not join up with the terms of the agreement, then all controls are off and the entire agreement is off.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I assuredly do.

Mr. GORE. Do I correctly understand that the able Senator would not have us enter into an agreement effective within the United States and effective within the territory of the Soviet Union, but not effective within the territory of Red China?

I take it that the able Senator wants, as he has said, an effective and workable control system.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct.

Mr. GORE. The Senator knows that none of the 3 negotiating powers at Geneva has so far made mention of Red China in the on-the-record negotiations.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I believe that it is a correct statement. I can tell the Senator why. It is because this Government says Red China does not exist, insofar as official recognition is concerned.

I happen to believe that Red China ought to be covered. I think it is very important that Red China is covered. I say, most respectfully, I think it is equally important or more important that nuclear technology be curbed. The truth is that there is some information of late to the effect that Red China may well be at the point of perfecting an atomic device. When that day arrives, I will say to the Senator from Tennessee, with all respect, when the day comes when Red China has been able to test atomic weapons and perfect atomic weapons,

considering the kind of irresponsible leadership which is characteristic of that country today, there will not be a person or nation in the world who will be safe. It seems to me there is almost a God-given mandate that we attempt to stop the spread of this technology before it gets to that point.

Mr. GORE. I seems to me the Senator has indulged in the presumption that an agreement among the United States, Great Britain, and the Soviet Union would somehow prevent other nations from becoming nuclear powers.

Mr. HUMPHREY. No.

Mr. GORE. I know of no such provision under negotiation. I know of no provision or proposal made by any country which could bring about such a result.

I agree with the Senator as to the seriousness of the possibility that possession of this horrible weapon of destruction may spread to other nations, but I do not know upon what basis the Senator presumes that an agreement among the existing nuclear powers will suddenly bring an end to that possibility.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I will say, most respectfully, to my colleague, who knows this subject better than I, that the policy of the United States, rightly or wrongly, is one of no recognition of Red China. It is a policy of its nonacceptance in the United Nations, into the international community. We are therefore dealing with the powers which we recognize and with the knowledge which we have at hand. We know that there are three nuclear powers today; that there are three nations capable of nuclear destruction and capable of nuclear testing. Therefore, we are attempting to limit at this stage—I repeat, at this stage—further nuclear weapons development by these three nuclear powers.

Mr. President, the position of our country, of course, is one of nonrecognition of Red China.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. GORE. That is undoubtedly a fact; and the Senator cited that fact a moment ago as one of the reasons why the U.S. Government has made no mention at Geneva of the country of Red China. That reason, however, does not obtain with respect to Great Britain, which has accorded recognition to Red China; and it surely does not apply to the Soviet Union, which accords more than recognition.

Mr. HUMPHREY. But the Soviet Union has asked for world-wide control at Geneva. We are the ones who have stated that while we want it as an objective, we have not yet raised this question in the negotiations.

What we are prepared to negotiate is what I laid down as the fourth principle, namely, a time schedule which will become a part of the agreement, "whereby the agreement and the control system shall extend to other nations and areas in addition to the territory and the test areas of the three nuclear powers."

We have attempted to say on the one hand, "We are not willing to negotiate about Red China now, but perhaps some day we shall have to." So we include in

the agreement a time schedule; and that part of the agreement, if signed and agreed to, would be as controlling as any other part. If the time schedule is not fulfilled, if the test areas are not expanded under the terms of that schedule, the agreement is off.

The Senator and I have discussed this subject at length on previous occasions, both publicly and privately. It is much more desirable to include Red China, but we cannot include her at this stage if she is an untouchable from the diplomatic point of view.

There are three nuclear powers, and the three nuclear powers have the prime responsibility at this stage to slow down the nuclear weapons race.

Third, an agreement should include a provision which would provide for the extension of coverage of both the member nations and the areas to be considered.

I have laid down five fundamental principles which are generally agreed upon, perhaps not as to details, but as to principles, by the participating nations.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. GORE. The facts which the Senator has just stated, subject to one modification, are facts which I cited last fall as one reason why an effective and workable inspection and control system applying to underground tests was not achievable at that time. The Senator said a moment ago that the Russians have advocated a worldwide control system.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct.

Mr. GORE. I think it might be more accurate to say that the Russians have proposed that all tests be stopped. In fact, the very first day we met in Geneva, they said, "We have an agreement now to stop all tests. Let us sign on the dotted line, and we will talk about controls later."

Mr. HUMPHREY. Of course, we know that we would not accept such a foolish document.

Mr. GORE. That is correct.

So far as I know, the Russians have never advocated or agreed to accept a workable and effective control system, even within their own country, let alone on a worldwide basis. The fact that Red China has not been mentioned by either of the negotiating powers is one reason why we must proceed with the greatest of caution in entering into an agreement to stop all types of nuclear tests, precluding further development of tactical nuclear weapons, and thereby, by omitting the great land mass of the Himalayas, leaving Red China, in co-operation with Red Russia, free to make such development.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator from Minnesota is prepared to negotiate control over atomic weapons testing on a worldwide basis, and I believe our Government should be willing. There is no doubt about that.

But the point that needs to be raised is not whether the Soviets have agreed to a workable control system, because they have not, but that they have been

yielding a little each time. We have not given up any basic principle, despite some comments to the contrary.

We have refused to accept the principle of the veto. We have refused to be denied the right of on-site inspections. We have refused to accept the proposal of the Soviets that they inspect on their grounds, and we inspect on ours. We have demanded international inspection.

I believe that, so far as negotiations have proceeded thus far, we have edged closer to workable, effective proposals, to a greater degree than the Soviets have been able to block us in such proposals.

The argument has suddenly been raised that one of the reasons why we need more nuclear weapons is because of the need for tactical weapons. Why do we need tactical weapons? Because they are smaller weapons, and because, with smaller weapons, we could fight a limited nuclear war.

With whom are we to fight a limited nuclear war? With Egypt? With Norway? With Afghanistan? Of course not. The only place we would need nuclear weapons, if we were to fight a war, would be against Communist China or against the Soviet Union.

I ask my colleagues, what makes anyone think that if we should get into a war with China or the Soviet Union, it would be a limited war? What makes anyone think that the Soviet Union would want to limit the war to a war with small nuclear weapons, on a limited scale? The concept of a small nuclear weapon, to be utilized in limited atomic warfare, is a contradiction in terms. There is no such thing as a small, limited nuclear war with a major power.

Finally, it is presumptuous on our part to believe that we would be the only ones with small weapons.

Mr. ANDERSON rose.

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

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield first to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I was keenly interested in the Senator's statement, and in the colloquy he had with the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE].

I turn to page 6 of the Senator's prepared statement. Later I shall return to the first page of his statement. On page 6 there is a paragraph reading in part:

I shudder to think of the military situation that would confront this Nation and, indeed, the world if several other nations achieved a nuclear weapons and missile delivery capability of their own.

I am sure the Senator would not mind my placing in the RECORD at this point a memorandum concerning the proposed agreement between the United States and France and a proposed amendment to an existing agreement between the United States and Great Britain, for co-operation in the uses of atomic energy for mutual defense purposes; also a memorandum concerning proposed agreements between the United States and, first, Canada; second, the Netherlands; third, Germany; and fourth, Turkey for cooperation in the uses of atomic energy for mutual defense purposes.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I shall be very glad to have that material in the RECORD.

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

JOINT COMMITTEE ON
ATOMIC ENERGY,
CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
May 25, 1959.

To: All committee members.

From: James T. Ramey, executive director.

Subject: Proposed agreements between the United States and France and the United States and Great Britain for cooperation on the uses of atomic energy for mutual defense purposes.

Under date of May 19, 1959, the President of the United States submitted to each House of the Congress an agreement between the United States and the Government of France for cooperation on the uses of atomic energy for mutual defense purposes. On the same day the President also submitted to Congress an amendment to the agreement between the United States and the United Kingdom for cooperation on the uses of atomic energy for mutual defense purposes, originally signed July 3, 1958.

In accordance with section 123d of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, both have been referred to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy for the required 60 days, which assuming no adjournment of either House of more than 3 days, will expire at 12 o'clock midnight July 18, 1959.

The proposed agreement with France provides for the United States to transfer by sale agreed amounts of U²³⁵ for use in the development and operation of a land-based prototype submarine nuclear propulsion plant during a period of 10 years. It does not involve the exchange or communication of any restricted data.

The amendment to the United Kingdom agreement provides for the transfer from the United States to the United Kingdom of (a) nonnuclear parts of atomic weapons and other nonnuclear parts of atomic weapons systems involving restricted data for the purpose of improving the United Kingdom's state of training and operational readiness; (b) special nuclear materials for research on, development of, production of, or use in utilization facilities for military applications; and (c) certain source, by-product, and special nuclear materials, and other materials for research on, development of, or use in atomic weapons necessary to improve the United Kingdom's atomic weapon design, development, or fabrication capabilities.

The amendment also provides for the transfer of similar materials and equipment from the United Kingdom to the United States.

Specific details of the materials and quantities involved are contained in classified documents on file at the Joint Committee.

The above is being furnished for your information. Members will be notified as to when hearings will be held by the Subcommittee on Agreements for Cooperation.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON
ATOMIC ENERGY,
CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
June 1, 1959.

To: All committee members.

From: James T. Ramey, executive director.

Subject: Proposed agreements between the United States and (1) Canada, (2) the Netherlands, (3) Germany, and (4) Turkey for cooperation on the uses of atomic energy for mutual defense purposes.

Under date of May 26, 1959, the President of the United States submitted to Congress four proposed agreements for cooperation for mutual defense purposes. They are sep-

arate agreements between the United States and each of the following individual nations: Government of Canada, Federal Republic of Germany, Kingdom of the Netherlands, and Government of Turkey.

The individual proposed agreements provide that the United States will transfer nonnuclear parts of atomic weapons systems to the individual nations for the purpose of improving the state of training and operational readiness of that nation's armed forces. In addition each agreement will permit the United States to transfer classified information necessary for the development of defense plans; the training of personnel in the employment of and the defense against atomic weapons and other military applications of atomic energy; the evaluation of the capability of potential enemies in the employment of atomic weapons and other military applications of atomic energy; and the development of delivery systems capable of carrying atomic weapons.

It should be noted that these agreements only provide for transfer of nonnuclear parts of atomic weapons systems and not nonnuclear parts of atomic weapons. Nonnuclear parts of weapons can only be transferred to a country that has made substantial progress in the development of atomic weapons, i.e., only the United Kingdom at the present time. The distinction between the two is explained in the statement of the managers on the part of the House in the conference report, dated June 27, 1958:

"The conference agreement, therefore, makes provision for the transfer of two distinctly different types of nonnuclear parts. One type, the nonnuclear parts of atomic weapons, relates to the integral components of the weapon itself which could only be transferred to those nations that have made substantial progress in the development of atomic weapons. The other type relates to nonnuclear parts of atomic weapons systems which are not integral to the weapon itself but pertain to various kinds of equipment involving restricted data to make possible the operational use and maintenance of the weapon, such as adaption kits. This latter category of nonnuclear parts relating to the atomic weapons systems is not as sensitive as the first category of nonnuclear parts and would not disclose internal design information of the weapon. This type, under the new language, may be transferred to a nation provided that the transfer will not contribute significantly to that nation's atomic weapon design, development, or fabrication capability."

In addition to transfer of nonnuclear parts of atomic weapons systems, which is contained in each, the proposed agreement with Canada would also provide for the United States to transfer classified information pertaining to research, development, and design of military reactors with an express intent to agree at some future time by an amendment to the agreement for the transfer of military reactors and special nuclear material for research on, development of, production of, and use in military reactors. This latter provision would be similar to what was entered into with the United Kingdom last year by which the United Kingdom is purchasing an American built nuclear submarine reactor.

In accordance with section 123d of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, each of these agreements must lie before the Joint Committee for 60 days, during which time they may be subject to congressional resolution of disapproval. Assuming no adjournment of either House of more than 3 days, the 60-day period will expire at 12 o'clock midnight July 25, 1959.

Members will be notified as to when hearings will be held by the Subcommittee on Agreements for Cooperation on these agreements as well as on the proposed agreements between the United States and France, and

the United States, and Great Britain, which were the subject of my memorandum of May 25, 1959.

Mr. ANDERSON. These memoranda are indicative of the fact that pretty soon other nations will join the nuclear power club. The Senator from Minnesota has said that it would be desirable to try to limit the membership of the nuclear power club. Here they come. We all know that Canada could very quickly test nuclear weapons if she wished to do so.

Australia may be about to test some sort of weapon which might be regarded as a nuclear weapon. A similar situation exists with respect to the Federal Republic of Germany, the Kingdom of the Netherlands, and the Government of Turkey, which will get nuclear parts of atomic weapons systems. These are not nuclear parts of atomic weapons. There is a nice line being drawn between adaptation kits which can be placed in an airplane, and other devices. There is also the question of what to do with them after we let them get hold of them.

In the case of France, I expect that shortly we shall be confronted with the request that France be supplied with some materials and plans. There is even discussion to the effect that France may wish to be supplied with a nuclear propulsion system for a nuclear submarine.

I suggest to the able Senator from Minnesota that if we give France a nuclear submarine with a reactor built in the United States, it will not take the French very long to understand how it works, and they may also build for themselves some other nuclear weapons. Does not the able Senator believe that all this leads to the inevitable conclusion that if we do not do something very shortly, there will be no way to limit membership in the nuclear power club?

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is my view. The Senator from New Mexico is right. I have heard some persons speak about nuclear weapons being made available for sovereign possession by other nations. There is a difference between weapons being in our possession in Europe, and under our control, on our military bases in a foreign country, and those weapons being in the possession of the sovereign power and host country. I believe there is a considerable difference between the two situations. For example, let us say that we have weapons in the possession of the United States in Germany for mutual defense purposes, under U.S. control. Let us compare that situation with nuclear weapons in the possession of the German Government within the German armed forces, outside our own control. There is a difference. I wish to add that these people have responded by saying, "If that happens, the Soviets will put some atomic weapons inside Poland."

I doubt that the Soviets will put such weapons under Polish control. What that will lead to is the stationing of more and more Soviet troops in the satellite countries, and more and more nuclear weapons in those particular countries for Soviet use and under Soviet use and under Soviet control.

Therefore we would spread the possibility of the dispersal of Soviet weapons over a much greater terrain. Indeed, if we were to give, for example, our major allies complete and unlimited control over such weapons, with no restraint upon them at all, the Soviet Union would do the same.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I do not desire to take too much of the Senator's time. I only wish to say to him that I have examined some installations of nuclear weapons in countries other than the United States. Without trying to say where those locations may be, I have seen many of the installations, and I do not believe that those installations are manned with a sufficient staff. So, if a situation should arise under which the host country wanted to take the installations over, it could now do so with a small group of men.

We are unable to maintain a large number of individuals at those installations. They are men there for the purpose of servicing the weapons. They are men who may be regarded as protectors of those weapons. However, a small group in the foreign country could very quickly take control of those weapons.

My question is what would happen if they got control? Obviously it would be a group of irresponsible people who would take over the weapons.

I merely wish to say to the Senator that some of us do not have much confidence in the fact that a representative of the United States or of the United Nations or NATO would be on hand to say effectively, "We have control and sovereignty over these weapons." In case of an emergency and in the case of bombs dropping on that country, I am sure the people there would say, "We will take these weapons and fight back with them."

It would be a perfectly understandable result for people to try to protect their country. I do not believe that they would worry too much about sovereignty.

I should like to turn now to the top of page 4 of the Senator's prepared address, where the able Senator from Minnesota said:

The nuclear weapon is different, and this fact stands up by its own recognition.

He was quoting the Department of Defense. The Senator went on to say:

What this mean to me is that nuclear weapons are regarded by many, if not by most people in the world, as a class of weapons quite different from so-called conventional weapons.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I surely do regard them as such.

Mr. ANDERSON. I, too, regard them as such. We do have to take unusual steps when it comes to weapons which are different from conventional weapons. When I was Secretary of Agriculture, I found that our country had established in the St. Lawrence River area a very unusual installation. The Department of Agriculture had there a payroll which was fantastic. The people there were not engaged in the cultivation of crops. They were developing poison gas and disease germs which could attack not only human lives, but all kinds of live-

stock as well. The development of the poison gases was so awful that we did not use them.

When our armies marched into Germany, they found that the Germans had the same types of poison gases and the same type of disease germs. These things were so frightful that no nation used them. These were unconventional weapons which could have been used; a government, in desperation, could have seized upon them and used them.

Could we not say that there is something comparable or similar, at least—similar, if not comparable—in the use of very large and very unusual types of nuclear weapons? Could we not say that it gives some support to what the Senator was saying?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I believe so. I could imagine that the large megaton weapons on which we supposedly rely for our great defense, might be weapons with such horrible consequences, that, with both sides knowing it, we could get into the situation to which the Senator refers, on the basis of bacteriological warfare and poison gas warfare.

Mr. ANDERSON. I believe so. I believe that we might develop some multi-megaton weapons with greater firepower than any target would justify. That situation may very well develop. On the other hand, it may not develop, and we may find that we should have some of these weapons. However, I think we have greater firepower than any target would justify.

I should like to refer now to page 3 of the Senator's prepared text. I refer particularly to the second paragraph. The Senator refers to the Soviets having developed a stockpile of nuclear weapons comparable to our own. In order that there may be no misunderstanding of what the Senator says, I am sure he is not suggesting that the Soviets may have more than we have. He is not speaking of the number of weapons, is he?

Mr. HUMPHREY. No.

Mr. ANDERSON. Many of us doubt that the Soviets have the same number that we have in certain styles, or in all styles. I wonder whether it is the Senator's opinion, as it is my opinion, that it is not necessary to have as many as we have to cause a great deal of damage.

Mr. HUMPHREY. First of all, I should like to say that I do not believe any of us are sure of how many weapons the Soviets have. We have to accept what is told us on the basis of intelligence reports. I know that the distinguished Senator from New Mexico and the Senator from Tennessee, who are members of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, have a much better idea than the Senator from Minnesota on that point.

However, let us not underestimate the Soviets. We were not so sure about the sputniks and about a great many other things. The Soviets constantly come up with surprises. However, the important thing is what the Senator from New Mexico is saying. If it takes only 1,000 bombs to destroy the United States—

Mr. ANDERSON. Ten bombs. I suggest that the Senator need not go above 10 bombs. Ten bombs of the size we

have now, if properly dropped on populous areas of the United States, would do such damage that the Senator and I would not be much interested in what could happen to the country afterward.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Let us say that 10 such bombs could do catastrophic damage to the United States. If we have 200 of those bombs, and if the Soviet Union has 100, the difference in ratio really is not so controlling as it would appear to be, because it would be presumed that a sizable portion of those bombs could be delivered. That is something that can almost be guaranteed. There is no military authority today who will say that we have perfected a defense system which can prevent the delivery of a major portion of the weapons which the enemy wishes to send against us or that we, in turn, can deliver against the Soviets. What we are talking about, in other words, is the continuation of a situation which we call one of massive deterrence, and because of which it is hoped no one will use those weapons.

Then someone comes along and says, "That is true. Therefore, we must perfect smaller nuclear weapons which we can use if we need to use them."

That presumes, of course, that the Soviets are going to play dead, so to speak, and not develop any small nuclear weapons. We have no guarantee that they will be so accommodating to our national purposes. There is no evidence of which I know—perhaps the Senator from New Mexico has some—to the effect that smaller weapons are any less lethal if they hit the target than a big nuclear bomb. If we drop enough small bombs, the effect becomes that of dropping a big one.

Mr. ANDERSON. I only wish to say to the Senator from Minnesota that, without getting into classified information, the present designs of the small nuclear weapons are more deadly per pound or ton of bang than the large weapons, because they are fission weapons. That is well established and well known.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I should like to add at this point, so there will be no misunderstanding, that the Senator from Minnesota is not advocating any unilateral action.

Mr. ANDERSON. The Senator has made that abundantly clear to me, and I hope to everyone else.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am not advocating that we cease our testing or cease our production or cease our development, or cease the expansion of our stockpile, unless and until we can be reasonably sure of an effective agreement, which is policed and inspected, so that the Soviet Union and the other nuclear powers, are doing the same thing. Such an agreement must be one which is satisfactory to us. Those who are opposed to that proposition and those who believe in continued testing say we cannot arrive at any agreement. If that is the case, what we are saying is that we are determined to build for ourselves a Frankenstein monster which will tear the world to bits.

The more we promote the expansion of nuclear technology along with guided

missiles, the more we shall have to rely upon the individual officer at a control post always being mentally stable, emotionally stable, having a sound mind and a sound body, one who will never do anything which will in any way jeopardize the peace of the world.

I am of the opinion that we may arrive at the day when we shall be uncertain from whence these weapons come. If the day ever comes when weapons can be launched from countries other than the major powers, how will we know at what country to strike back? How will we know upon whom to unleash our tremendous retaliatory power? What if we should make a mistake and unleash our retaliatory power on the wrong nation? That is surely a way, it seems to me, to provide for the end of civilization—at least, as we have known it.

I do not wish to be an alarmist, but it seems to me that greater effort must be made to attempt to determine how to control this situation, rather than, as I believe has been happening in the last month, namely, a concerted effort somewhere in Washington—I imagine in the Defense Establishment itself—to get the American people to believe that it is not possible to reach an agreement to control these weapons; that it is not possible to control these weapons. I must say if that is the case, then we are at a sad impasse in the history of the world.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield, so that I may ask a question of the Senator from New Mexico?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. CARROLL. This is the first time I have ever heard, and I am not sure that the information has been widely publicized, that the small nuclear weapon is dirtier from the standpoint of fallout than a large bomb. I have no special or classified information on this subject. Only recently I read on the front page of a Washington newspaper a description of a small nuclear weapon similar to the bazooka which we used in World War II. A bazooka, now, can launch a small nuclear weapon. I assume, the story being on the front page of the newspaper, the information is no longer classified. The size of the weapon was not mentioned, but we are talking about small nuclear weapons. However, if these small weapons are dirtier and the fallout dangers are greater than from a big bomb, and if we are to be confronted with more and more changes to this type of weaponry—that is the small nuclear weapons, then I think this is a very important point that should be discussed, because certainly, as the distinguished Senator from Minnesota has said, if these small nuclear weapons are dispersed throughout the nations of the world that is a serious matter. I wonder if the Senator from New Mexico will comment?

Mr. ANDERSON. I will try to be very careful, because I do not want to get into the field of classification. I did not say the small weapon would cause more fallout than a large one. I said that per ton or pound of bang, it was dirtier.

If a small weapon, having a bang of 10,000 tons, is discharged, as against a large weapon having a bang running to millions of tons, the amount of plutonium or some similar substance, which is required, which makes it a different style weapon, causes it to be a dirtier weapon, because there is fission instead of fusion. In a large hydrogen bomb, the fusion process does not cause strontium 90 fallout as does the smaller fission bombs. This has been brought out in our recent fallout hearings before the Special Subcommittee on Radiation.

The larger weapons may be built with a more efficient process; but in the small bomb there is a completely different situation, and it is, relatively, a dirtier bomb as far as strontium 90 is concerned.

I dislike getting into a discussion of this subject, because we had a long argument at one time about clean and dirty bombs. I think the matter was finally resolved by a release from the Department of Defense, which set the question at rest for a while. But there is no question, relatively speaking, that per ton of bang there are more fission products from a small atomic bomb than from a large hydrogen one.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Before we get away from the relevancy of the argument, the witnesses from the Department of Defense who appear before the appropriate committees of Congress tell the American people and tell Congress, first, that we are ahead of the Soviet Union in thermonuclear and nuclear weapons, both as to size, quantity, and variety. In other words, we have been told repeatedly, both in public session and in executive session, that the United States has a more diversified arsenal, and more sophisticated weapons, better in quality and greater in quantity. The records of the appropriate committee of Congress, reveal that the most eminent witnesses of the Government say that the United States has more small tactical weapons than does the Soviet Union. In this case, then, why should we want to stop testing? We are ahead.

But I have heard from the evaluation experts of the Atomic Energy Commission that we were much farther ahead 3 years ago than we are now. I have heard that if testing continues, the gap will be narrowed so that our lead can be diminished. I do not say overcome; I qualify my statement by saying that our lead can be diminished, limited, or restricted.

So it seems to me that if we can find a system whereby we can have some reliance as to the effectiveness of inspection and control, it is to our national advantage, and surely to the advantage of the world, for us to try to perfect such a system and reach an agreement upon it.

I realize also that there is no absolute guarantee of any perfect control system. There is no absolute guarantee that a pilot who is flying a plane with a bomb load will not go berserk and drop his bombs. Mental illness and emotional instability are characteristic of our times. Men who are in the very sensitive, highly important service of the defense of our country are under terrific strain. It is entirely probable—at least, it is a remote

possibility—that someone might go off the beam, and there could be a first class war by sheer accident. There are such possibilities.

When I hear people say that we must be absolutely and positively certain that a control system is foolproof, then I ask them, What is foolproof about the continuation of the nuclear race? What proof is there that we will not lose it? At present we seem to have proof that we are ahead. There is an old adage, both in politics and poker: "When you are ahead, it is time to quit." That saying may even apply to war; it may apply to defense.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield, so that I may finish my colloquy with the Senator from New Mexico?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. CARROLL. The junior Senator of Colorado did not misunderstand. He knew we were having small weapons. But I wanted to reemphasize the importance of change in military weaponry, and the fact that, so far as the question of fission is concerned, there is greater danger from fallout and radiation, from small nuclear weapons, and I think this is reflected by records everywhere; but this Nation and other nations will continue to move ahead in this field.

Now may I ask the distinguished Senator from New Mexico, based upon his experience on the Joint Committee—and this is a question I have asked of numerous officials high in Government—is there the slightest doubt in the mind of any leader the Senator from New Mexico has heard express himself that if we become involved in world war III, we will not use small nuclear weapons?

Mr. ANDERSON. I do not have any doubt that they will be used. When I use the word "dirtier," I am talking about local areas, because the other time when we got into a discussion about dirty bombs, it was said it was the world fallout which mattered most, and that is probably correct.

What we must worry about with respect to small weapons is strontium 90, and possibly, in the large weapon, carbon 19, which is relatively greater in a large fission weapon than in a small fission one. But I am not quite so much worried about that. We get into a large range of possibilities. So far as I am concerned, I simply would not care to have even a small nuclear weapon in my backyard.

Mr. CARROLL. In all countries which have become familiar with this discovery, there is a change in military weaponry. This is evidenced by the Navy cutting down and other groups cutting down the large, traditional, conventional type weapons, and placing greater emphasis on small nuclear weapons.

I think the distinguished Senator from Minnesota has made a valuable contribution here today by calling attention to these dangers and insisting upon working out, if possible, some sort of control, at least, to bring some semblance of common sense into this very dangerous field.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. ANDERSON. Some time I hope the Senator from Minnesota will comment further on the possibilities of agreement. In the beginning of our negotiations at Geneva there seemed to be a possibility of agreement. There were announcements of agreement on this section, on that section, or on another section. But, all of sudden, there came from the representatives of this country an announcement that some of the figures our representatives had used could not be trusted, and that announcement blew up the entire conference.

There was general satisfaction with the figures our representatives had in regard to the 180 monitoring stations; but suddenly there was a drive to bring in a new set of figures, figures which upset the proceedings.

So I hope the Senator from Minnesota will carefully watch, to make sure that no new set of figures is brought in now, as our representatives strive so hard to reach at least a partial agreement.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I wish to thank the Senator from New Mexico for his very helpful comments and observations.

First of all, we recognize that there is constant need for improvement of the inspection and control machinery. That is one of the points which was under consideration at the time when the conference at Geneva took a recess until June 8.

As the Senator from New Mexico has pointed out, the conference at Geneva started out fairly well, when dealing with the broader problems which were easier of solution. But when the question of detection systems and on-site inspection systems arose, the Soviets said, "No."

In regard to the question of who would have authority in those fields, the Soviets demanded the right of veto, just as the Soviets have demanded in connection with the United Nations proceedings. At that time the representatives of our Nation said that our Nation would not agree to such a veto, but that our Nation insisted on inspection on the site and on the internationalization of the control posts and, recently, that consideration be given to improvements in the detection of underground tests.

I wish to make it clear that there are serious problems in regard to detection and inspection of underground tests; there is no doubt at all of that. That is one reason why some of our colleagues have advocated the cessation of atmospheric tests. From a human point of view, the cessation of atmospheric tests will be very good. From a technical point of view, much testing for nuclear weapons development can be done underground. Therefore, the Secretary of State and the President have encouraged our representatives to negotiate with the Soviet Union—on the basis of new information we have received from the Hardtack series of tests and the Argus series of tests—for improvement of the system.

In fact, my proposal was that there be allowed a year's time in which to attempt in unison to improve the system;

in other words, that there be an experimental period before the agreement in fact would really go into complete effect. In short, I proposed that there be a period for inspection itself, in order to test the mechanism of inspection. I am advocating, first, that we keep in proper focus the dangers involved in doing nothing; that we keep in proper focus some of the arguments being used against a successful agreement at Geneva—one of those arguments being that we need to have more testing in regard to tactical nuclear weapons, inasmuch as it is argued that, by means of tactical nuclear weapons, perhaps there could be a limited tactical war.

In answer to that argument, I ask with whom we would have a small atomic war. Apparently there are only two major powers with whom our country might engage in such a limited war in which tactical nuclear weapons would be used. One of them is Communist China; the other is the Soviet Union. I want our defense experts who argue the necessity for additional testing of tactical nuclear weapons to demonstrate that in a war with the Soviet Union, the Soviets would accommodate us by keeping that war limited. I should like to have those experts prove that the Chinese Reds would also be willing to accommodate us—on the basis of the recommendations of our Bureau of the Budget or on some other basis—to keep such a war limited in that way.

I wonder what basis anyone has for believing that if we have tactical weapons of a smaller size, the Soviet Union will not have them, also. To the contrary, I think there is no proof that in that event the Soviets would be without them. I do not think it could be demonstrated that they would then be without them.

Finally, if we are now ahead—and expert witnesses have so testified—and if we are superior in the field of tactical nuclear weapons, both in terms of quantity and in terms of quality, and if we have a larger stockpile of them, and if our technology is more advanced, is this not the time for us to obtain an agreement to slow down those developments throughout the rest of the world?

Is this not the time to make a greater effort to obtain some kind of workable, enforceable inspection system which will protect our national interests?

In that connection, let me state that all of us recognize that such a system should be worldwide. One hundred and eighty stations were recommended. The number of those stations is not the only thing which is important; of importance also is the instrumentation at the stations, in other words, the type of instruments at the stations. Particularly is that important in terms of the underground tests.

I have advanced five principles. The first is for the establishment of appropriately instrumented control posts—and the word "appropriately" means adequate to the needs—at specified intervals throughout the territories of the nuclear powers, and to have those territories include the test areas of the nuclear powers, and to include provi-

sion for improvement of the system. That is my first principle. It is very, very important, and it includes provision for improvement of the system.

Another of the provisions which must be included in such an agreement is one for a time schedule in regard to having the agreement and the control system extend to other nations and areas, in addition to the territories and the test areas of the three nuclear powers. In other words, Mr. President, we know that 180 control posts could not be established in 1 year or in 6 months. We also know that the existing inspection system which we have is fairly good; in fact, it has been testified that it is very good. And we know that that inspection system is in operation.

But we also should include in the agreement a provision that if, within, let us say, 2 years or 3 years, the 180 stations are not spread throughout the world, as was indicated at the experts conference in Geneva a year ago this summer, then the agreement will be off. In other words, the provisions relating to the extension of the system and the inclusion of more nations must be fundamental parts of the agreement. I happen to believe that the system needs to be worldwide, but I also believe that the only nations which can negotiate nuclear test suspensions are the nations which are the nuclear powers; and today those nations are the United States, Great Britain, and the Soviet Union. It is imperative that those three nations first agree in regard to the system which will be used. It is imperative that those three nations agree to improve the control system. It is imperative that those three nations agree to extend the control system; and if the extension is not accomplished within the date established by the agreement, or unless there is mutual agreement to extend the date for the expansion and extension of the control system, then the agreement will be off—exactly as the agreement would be off if any nation violated it.

The only provision of that sort already included in the proposed agreement is one to the effect that if a nation violates it, the agreement will be off.

I really believe that this point is worth pursuing. I have been of the opinion—and I must say this, although I do so with great reluctance—that somewhere, somehow, in the Capital of our great Nation, from some source or sources, there is a flow of material and information—which I believe to be misinformation—in an attempt to indicate to the American people that such an agreement to prohibit further nuclear weapons testing cannot be consummated; and that even if such an agreement were consummated, it would jeopardize our security.

Mr. President, I submit that, to date, there is no evidence to indicate that such an agreement would not be in our national interest. On the other hand, there is a preponderance of evidence which indicates that an agreement to suspend nuclear testing would be in our national interest and would be a mighty blow for peace and a beginning of a solution of the problem of nuclear arms

control. The world longs for it. There is as yet no one who can prove that in an uncontrolled arms race humanity would have any assurance of peace and tranquillity.

Mr. CHURCH, Mr. GORE, Mr. CARROLL, and other Senators addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CANNON in the chair). Does the Senator from Minnesota yield; and, if so, to whom?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I yield first to the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH]—who, by the way, has made a most important contribution in this field. I am sure that he and the Senator from Tennessee and other Senators know that what we are doing today is done in an effort to stimulate thoughtful consideration of one of the most serious and thought-provoking problems of our time.

Mr. CHURCH. I thank the Senator, and I appreciate the opportunity to participate in this colloquy.

I concur with the statement made earlier in the afternoon by the distinguished Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] that the Senator from Minnesota has rendered a most important service to the country in opening up for debate the subject that he has examined this afternoon. As the Senator from Minnesota knows, I have a great interest in this field, and I find myself somewhat drawn between the position he has taken and that espoused by the Senator from Tennessee.

I wonder if he would indulge me if I were to ask him one or two questions. I concur wholeheartedly that an agreement with the Soviet Union and with the United Kingdom suspending further nuclear weapons tests, backed up by an effective and enforceable detection system, is not only sorely needed by these three countries, but is needed by all humanity.

I am very much encouraged that from the time the President made his proposal in April, that we first seek a ban on atmospheric testing, that such significant concessions have been made by the Soviet Union, bringing us closer together than we have yet been since the conference began. Thus the hopes for an agreement are rising.

As the Senator has pointed out, an effective inspection system needs ultimately to embrace the entire world. I think there can be no debate on this point. It is also true that, so long as the United States, the United Kingdom, and the Soviet Union remained the only three countries having access to nuclear weapons then an inspection system limited to these three countries might suffice.

Now, I take it that it is a part of the argument of the distinguished Senator from Minnesota that if these three countries come to an agreement and establish a system to enforce such an agreement, there thus will be created a harness in being.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct.

Mr. CHURCH. And thus, if France develops an atomic capacity, or if Red China develops an atomic capacity, then the inducements will be very powerful

indeed to bring these countries within that existing harness, and thus subject them to the suspension agreement and to the inspection system.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Otherwise, I may say, the agreement would have to be off. That would have to be a part of the agreement.

Mr. CHURCH. It would be a part of the agreement that unless these countries were brought into that harness, then the United States would no longer be committed to the agreement or subject to it.

That being so, there still remains a very serious point raised earlier by the distinguished Senator from Tennessee. Let us assume that the United States, the Soviet Union, and the United Kingdom entered into an agreement to establish such a system. If that system were not worldwide in such a way as to give us surveillance as to what was going on inside Red China, is there not a possibility that the Soviet Union, in close alliance with Red China, could undertake a series of subterranean tests, in the remoteness of the Himalayas, from which the Soviet Union could covertly profit, and which would never come to the attention of the United States or the United Kingdom because of the insufficiency of the inspection system?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes. I wish to say to the Senator that some 3 years ago, the then junior Senator from Minnesota raised, in Room F-39, right here in the Senate Wing of the Capitol, with the late Secretary of State, Mr. Dulles, the very serious matter of even negotiating a disarmament agreement without the inclusion of Red China. The response at that time was vague and general. He said it was better not to discuss the matter.

Let me add that the proposal of 180 test stations, which is actually the figure which was agreed upon by the scientists, is the number of test stations which would be included in a final agreement.

The first point of the 5 basic features of a control system was that there must be an agreement among the 3 major powers—I like the term the Senator from Idaho used when he said that the 3 powers would be harnessed in the agreement—and that there would be a climate of worldwide political pressure or orientation for expansion of the agreement.

Then my point No. 4 of the 5 basic features—which are not only mine, but which had been talked about at Geneva—was that a time schedule must be included in the agreement whereby the agreement and the control system shall extend to other nations and areas in addition to the territories and the test areas of the 3 nuclear powers, and that the agreement must include the provision for 180 control posts. I think the Senator from Tennessee agreed that a rather substantial number of those stations would be in China. I think 30 or 40 of them would be in the Asian area.

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

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. GORE. As I recall, the number proposed was 37 on the continent of

Asia, with approximately the same number contemplated for China as for Russia.

Mr. HUMPHREY. That is correct.

My point is, that in the negotiations at Geneva between the three negotiating powers, there cannot be negotiations as to what Red China and other nations are going to do because the three nations have no sovereign power over those countries. But we can include in the agreement between ourselves that 1½ years from now, or 2 years, or 3 years, other nations, as provided in the text of the conclusions reached in the conference in August 1958, shall be included, and it shall be the duty of the Administrator and the Control Commission, which will be an international instrumentality agreed to by the three major powers, to bring the other nations in. Or, if not, that the agreement is off. Or that it is subject, as has been indicated by the discussions so far, to a revision of time as to when they can be brought in.

Mr. CHURCH. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator one further question. What would be his view with respect to the possibility of conditioning the agreement that puts an end to all kinds of further nuclear tests—in space, in the atmosphere, and underground—upon the successful negotiation by the International Commission of the agreements necessary to put into effect the 180 stations that the experts have said are essential to a system of effective control?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I think this goes without argument. I understand the Senator's position.

What I say is that we should not start out by saying there will be no agreement among the 3 major powers until all the 180 stations are in. A time limit has to be set because the 180 stations cannot possibly be installed at once. A period of time has to be set for the establishment of the worldwide network, a subject which has been discussed by the experts themselves.

We cannot expect that to be done by the United States and the Soviet Union. It has to be done by an international instrumentality which will take upon itself the responsibility for inclusion therein of the control system. If such a control system is not extended, in terms of coverage or numbers, one of two things will happen.

Either the 3 major powers who are the original parties of the International Control Commission will extend the time for bringing in other nations, or the agreement will lose its meaning.

Mr. CHURCH. When I asked the Senator whether the agreement would be conditioned upon the establishment of the entire worldwide system within a given period, what I meant to say, and what I should like now to say more precisely, was: Could the effectiveness of the agreement as to the termination of all kinds of tests be conditioned upon the successful negotiation by the International Commission of agreements which would establish the necessary sites for the worldwide system?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I understand the Senator's point, which is well taken.

The point is that if we do not have a worldwide system we can never be sure with regard to underground testing in particular. Without a worldwide system we could be fairly sure with regard to atmospheric tests. Therefore, in order to make sure of a comprehensive and complete banning of all tests—underwater, high altitude, underground, and atmospheric—we must have the 180 control posts with modern instrumentation and with provision for improvement in technology.

I agree. I think the Senator is correct. I did not feel there was any basic disagreement between the Senator from Tennessee and me on this point before. What I said in that additional point was that the agreement must include within it not merely provision for the extension of the worldwide system but also a time and a date certain when that system shall be in effect and shall be operative.

Mr. CHURCH. I appreciate these remarks by the distinguished Senator from Minnesota, because it seems to me there is no necessary irreconcilable conflict of viewpoint between the Senator from Minnesota and the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. HUMPHREY. There surely has not been.

Mr. CHURCH. And it would be possible, giving full credence to the danger the Senator from Tennessee points out, for us to proceed at Geneva to negotiate an agreement which would obviate that danger. That agreement might take the form of an immediate ban on atmospheric tests, backed up with an inspection and control system, together with on-site inspections within the countries negotiating the agreement—namely, the United States, the United Kingdom, and the Soviet Union—to take effect immediately, plus a provision which would condition the effectiveness of a suspension of underground tests upon the establishment of a worldwide system within a designated period of time.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator makes a very valuable contribution.

I will add that in my letter to the Secretary of State, Mr. Herter, approximately 2½ weeks ago, I suggested that there be a period of time in order more carefully to ascertain the effectiveness of the inspection and control system, and that we have a test period for improving it and testing it. I really believe this is another variation.

My point, basically, is not to argue that this must be done my way on such-and-such a day. My point is that we must keep these negotiations alive. We must look to the day of developing an inspection and control system for comprehensive coverage. In the meantime, we must improve the mechanism we have, scientifically as well as politically. We can start, as both the Senator from Tennessee and the Senator from Idaho have recommended, with some variation, with an effort on our part—though I would prefer it to be multilateral and to be an effort by all parties—with regard to atmospheric tests. We should not give up the opportunity to stop the race above ground, underground, under

water, in the atmosphere, at high altitudes, and every place else.

My point, made to the distinguished Senator from Tennessee earlier, is that, under the present diplomatic situation, we cannot negotiate for a treaty with Red China as a sovereign nation; but we can have an international instrumentality—such as the Control Commission, which is to be agreed upon among the three sovereign powers of the United States of America, the U.S.S.R., and the United Kingdom—negotiate on its own for the expansion of the control system. We ought to set a certain date for that to be done in the agreement to be signed by the three nuclear powers, whenever that is possible.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I am happy to yield.

Mr. GORE. In regard to that point I should like to read a statement of the late Secretary of State, the Honorable John Foster Dulles, as reported on June 10, 1958.

I think that, as far as I can see from the initial reports to me of our experts, that an adequate system to supervise a suspension of testing agreement would have to cover the possibility of testing being conducted by the Soviet Union within Communist China.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Surely.

Mr. GORE. So we find that the late Secretary of State was also keenly aware of the possibility of tests being covertly conducted, as the junior Senator from Idaho has described, within Red China.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I will add at this point, I am sure the Soviet Union is also suspicious that we will be covertly conducting tests somewhere in the Sahara or some other place. Therefore, it is all the more important that we have a worldwide detection system.

Mr. GORE. I must express disagreement with that statement. I doubt if even the leaders of the Soviet Union believe a democracy has the facility, even if it has the desire, to operate covertly, equal to that available to the totalitarian state, with its secrecy, its Iron Curtain, and its regimentation, such as are inherent in the Soviet system.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I agree with the first part of the Senator's statement, but the qualification the Senator attached with regard to "equal" with the totalitarian state is another thing.

If the Senator presumes to state the Soviets think we are paragons of virtue, I am sure he does not mean to so state. They distrust us. They dislike us. They try to confound us in every way.

What I say is that the Senator makes a point with reference to Red China which has been made, and with which I agree.

I raised this point with the Government at the time it was a delicate subject. Any Member of the Senate who even asked a question about Red China got about three hues of pink on him before he could look around.

We have to face up to the fact that this is the situation, and the question must be dealt with. Some 3 years ago the response of the Government witness

was, "Let us not talk about this now. Let us hope, somehow or other, that we do not have to."

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes.

Mr. GORE. With further reference to the degree of confidence or distrust Red Russia may entertain with respect to the United States, I should like to point out that the United States has a record of treaty observation which the Russians have not emulated and which the Russians cannot cite as typical of their own record.

If the United States enters into an agreement and a solemn treaty, I am sure the United States will keep it.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Of course, the United States would keep it. But the Soviets do not necessarily believe this.

Mr. GORE. I am not sure I would agree with that. I think all nations believe that the United States would keep a treaty.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Senator and I both know that the United States of America has kept its treaty commitments, but I do not happen to believe that the liars in the Kremlin and those who have been able to distort every rule of evidence and every bit of truth the world has ever known are going to believe that we are nice people, even though we are. In international politics it is not always truth that prevails. That is particularly so in the case of the Soviet Union.

We have every right to be suspicious of the covert activities of the Soviets in Red China. If we Americans do not understand that the Soviets are suspicious of us, there is something wrong. I think we should act like grownup men and face up to the fact that they do not trust us. I hope we do not trust them; and because we do not trust them, we want a system of inspection.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. GORE. I should like to ask one further question, and then I shall desist.

In connection with the Senator's third point, the third basic feature of any agreement, he states:

The right of the Control Commission to conduct an unimpeded on-site inspection of any event which the control system cannot identify as being natural in origin.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes.

Mr. GORE. With that I agree. I only wish to point out that the so-called Macmillan plan does not meet the test of the third point the able Senator has set forth.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The Macmillan plan meets the test up to a certain number of on-site inspections, but a ceiling would be placed on the number of on-site inspections. We do not know how high the ceiling would be. It would certainly need to be related to the scientific capabilities of the detection system.

We would be a great deal better off if the executive branch of the Government would occasionally confide in us and in the American people. There is a report known as the Berkner report, which is the result of a scientific study which

was made, relating to improvements in the seismic aspects of the inspection and detection system, following the Hard-tack series of tests.

That report has been classified. It has been made available to a few of us. We must keep it under lock and key, in the vault. We are not supposed to talk about it in the Senate, among our colleagues. Yet that report is required reading if we are intelligently to discuss the possibilities of an adequate inspection and detection systems. It is a disservice to the negotiations, on the one hand, to permit certain individuals to frighten the American people into believing that their security is jeopardized because someone is talking about an agreement to suspend nuclear tests, by saying that we cannot really test to see whether or not the Soviets are cheating on the tests, when there is available a report prepared by highly qualified scientists and technicians, appointed by the President or by the President's agent, Dr. Killian, which will give us accurate and new information relating to detection and inspection.

I hope the executive branch of the Government has representatives in these environs. If so, I hope they will respond to the request to make the Berkner report public. It is time this kind of information was made available to those who convey news to the American people—to our press reporters, our columnists, Members of Congress, and others who convey information to the American public at large.

The terms of the report have not been made available to Members of the Senate or the House of Representatives, or to the American people. I appeal to the President to make available as quickly as possible the report to which I have referred, because it will give us additional information, which is required for intelligent discussion of this highly important issue.

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

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. CARROLL. I have a very important question to put to the Senator, in view of his mentioning the Berkner report.

I commend the distinguished Senator for talking about a workable control system. Many questions have been raised in the minds of some of us about the validity and efficiency of such a system. We must take a look at the alternative. What if we continue to do nothing? Other nations are building these devices, and they will continue to build them. That is why I wish to go on record today before the distinguished Senator leaves the floor. In the years to come—in the next 1, 2, 3, 4, or 5 years—we shall see the construction of these weapons spreading all over the world—if not big bombs, small nuclear weapons. The question is, "What do we propose to do about it?" If we do nothing about it, as surely as I stand on this floor—and I have been in two wars, and have seen the development of new firepower—no nation in the world will reject the development of new firepower in world war III. It will start with a small bomb, a small nuclear weapon, and

will grow step by step, until we are thrown into a terrible world war III, a nuclear war. All the military authorities of this Nation know this. The Soviets know it, too.

I desire to propound a question relating to the Berkner report. When we talk about control, do we mean only control of big bombs? Do we have an inspection system with respect to the control of small bombs? Why is it that the Berkner report can be given to the delegates of other countries, but not to the members of the Congress of the United States, who are representatives of the people? How are the people to obtain this information?

Does the Senator have information to the effect that the Berkner report might be helpful in ascertaining whether there should be a comprehensive, efficient control system giving us information with respect to small underground explosions as well as large explosions?

Mr. HUMPHREY. When the Berkner report is released—and I hope it will be; that is what the appeal is here today—it will be seen that it contains information which is both refreshing, on the one hand, and disturbing on the other. One of the purposes of this discussion is to get these issues out into the open. If an agreement is ever signed at Geneva, it must come back to the Senate. The questions which the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] asks, and the observations he makes, are pertinent, relevant, and important. We should discuss them now, ahead of time, so that our negotiators will know what is in the minds of Members of the Senate.

I am not at liberty at this stage to discuss the Berkner report. As chairman of the subcommittee, I have had an opportunity to examine it.

Mr. CARROLL. Is it a report by scientists?

Mr. HUMPHREY. It certainly is.

Mr. CARROLL. Does it have to do with the possibility of an inspection system?

Mr. HUMPHREY. Indeed it does.

It contains many proposals and suggestions relating to improvement of inspection systems. It also contains other proposals. It contains materials which are rather disturbing, in terms of some of the problems we shall encounter in connection with an inspection system.

Mr. CARROLL. I commend the distinguished Senator from Minnesota, the distinguished Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], and the distinguished Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH], who have participated in this discussion. This is what we need more of in this country, instead of drifting aimlessly. We must let the people know the real dangers of atomic warfare. They are not small. They are great.

The crisis confronting us in West Berlin today is not a small crisis. If we intend to give up, to appease, and to back off, our stand must be made known, and our people must know what we propose to do. That is why I congratulate the Senator from Minnesota for stimulating thinking along these lines.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I think it is unlikely that the subject matter of nuclear

testing will be settled at Geneva. It will be brought into the so-called summit conference. That is what I believe the Soviets prefer to do. I am pleased that our Government has taken the view that all the technical aspects, all of what we might call the work-table aspects, the detailed aspects, must be hammered out among the negotiators at Geneva.

I am convinced that the Soviets want to take the whole subject of nuclear test prohibition to the summit conference. That is one thing they want to do. Therefore it is imperative, before it gets into the hands of the heads of state at a summit conference, where the observations of Members of Congress, may I point out, are surely limited at best, that we discuss it here. There is no Member of the Senate who knows the atomic energy field better than the two Senators who were discussing it today, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE]. There is no Member of Congress who has made a finer contribution to an intelligent discussion of the problems at Geneva than the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH]. It is my privilege to be the chairman of the Subcommittee on Disarmament. I am not an expert. However, I believe that we ought to get these matters into the open, and I believe we should discuss them. I would rather argue in public these great national policies, and make my share of mistakes in the arguments, than to see them negotiated in secret, without the information being made available to Members of Congress, on the basis of reports such as the Berkner report, and subsequently find out that the negotiators had agreed to something which, later on, the Senate either accepted on the basis of blind acceptance, or rejected because of fear or misunderstanding. We are going to have understanding on this issue. This debate is all to the good.

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

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield the floor. The Senator may conclude the debate, if he wishes.

Mr. CARROLL. I should like to make one short observation, Mr. President. I should like again to commend the distinguished Senator from Minnesota and all his colleagues who are experts in this field. The questions involved are tremendously important to the American people. I say to the Senator from Minnesota that, so far as the future is concerned, he need have no qualms about having overreached himself. This is a matter for discussion and debate. I frankly have many qualms as to whether we can have an efficient control system. I do not know how we are going to control smaller weapons.

Science may solve it for us. A year and a half ago, when I discussed the subject with the Senator from Minnesota, we were talking about reconnaissance satellites. The time seemed far away when we could ever have in orbit a satellite, containing cameras taking photographs of countries. At that time we did not know how reentry could be made.

Only 2 or 3 days ago Able and Baker reentered in a cone. And a few days ago I read of further progress with a camera-satellite.

Science will make great advances in this field. The Berkner report shows the scientific advance which has been made in seismological instruments, as I believe they are called. The importance of a debate such as this is that we discuss the subject, and become aware of it, and do not agree with any attitude or mentality or military jingoism, which holds that the only way out is war. As surely as I am standing in the Senate today, if we ever get to the point of dropping small nuclear weapons, the big ones will follow. That is the whole history of military warfare whenever a new system of firepower has been developed. This is the way we have developed in the field of atomic energy and nuclear warfare.

That is why I again commend the Senator from Minnesota and his colleagues who have made this contribution.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President—The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wisconsin.

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

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield to the Senator from Georgia.

AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, my attention has just been called to some remarks which were made yesterday by the senior Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] after I had left the floor and after the passage of the agricultural appropriation bill for fiscal year 1960.

The Senator from Delaware in his speech challenged anyone to take exception to some very erroneous figures. I do not know whether any members of the subcommittee were on the floor at the time. If they were, I imagine they were so staggered by the failure of the Senator from Delaware to comprehend the nature of the bill that they did not desire to undertake any controversy with him.

The Senator fell into the most grievous error. He said—and I am reading from page 9670 of the Record:

Mr. President, the appropriation bill which has just been passed calls for the expenditure next year of \$220 million over and above the amount which the administration requested in its budget estimate.

That statement was repeated two or three times during the course of the Senator's statement. The Senator goes on to refer to some increases which were made in the authorization for expenditures for which appropriations will be made in the appropriation bill for fiscal 1961. He thus has pyramided the expenditures which will be made in fiscal 1960 on top of the expenditures which will be made in fiscal 1961.

He repeated that statement several times. I read from page 9670:

That leaves an increase of \$220 million which this bill, just passed by the Congress, will call for in expenditures in the next year over and above the administration request.

The statement is completely in error. Even conceding that all of the \$100 million which he also discussed, and which was reduced from the amount ultimately needed to restore the capital impairment of the Commodity Credit Corporation, would be necessary, the bill is \$5½ million below the budget estimates. I admit that that is a very small amount for such a large bill, but the facts in the case are that appropriated funds for expenditures in the next fiscal year under the bill as passed, even conceding the validity of the Senator's statement as to the \$100 million, is \$5½ million below the budget estimates submitted by the President to Congress.

I do not understand how the Senator could possibly have mistaken an authorization of a program, for which appropriations will be made next year, for an expenditure item. The money may have to be expended, but if it is it will be in the next fiscal year. It cannot be expended unless the appropriation is made for it in the appropriation bill for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year 1961.

I make that statement, Mr. President, merely for the purpose of attempting to correct the Record. I am sure the distinguished Senator from Delaware, when he looks into it, will admit that so far as the expenditure total referred to is concerned his statement was completely in error.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, it strikes me that the Senator from Delaware, who appeared to have made a very convincing case, should be privileged to be present, so that we could have these two stalwart Senators discuss the matter, which is of such importance to both of them and to the Senate. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JORDAN in the chair). Does the Senator from Wisconsin yield to the Senator from New York for that purpose?

Mr. KEATING. I understand the Senator from Delaware is on his way to the Chamber and will be here shortly.

Mr. MANSFIELD. May I ask the Senator from Georgia a question?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield to the Senator from Montana for the purpose of his asking a question of the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Did I understand the distinguished senior Senator from Georgia, the chairman of the Senate Subcommittee on Appropriations for the Department of Agriculture, to say that the bill as passed by the Senate yesterday is approximately \$5½ million below the requests submitted by the President of the United States?

Mr. RUSSELL. It is \$105½ million below, but there is a question as to \$100 million of it. It will be necessary to make an appropriation of \$100 million at a later time, to restore the capital impairment of the Commodity Credit Corporation. I believe that we will have to appropriate it. However, adding up the appropriations made for expenditure in the next fiscal year, the bill is \$5½ million below the President's budget.

Mr. MANSFIELD. At the very least? Mr. RUSSELL. Yes.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I thank the Senator.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from Texas.

NOMINATION OF LEWIS L. STRAUSS TO BE SECRETARY OF COMMERCE

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, as a member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, I was rather amazed to read in the New York Times this morning a report of the press conference yesterday quoting President Eisenhower on the question of the nomination of Lewis Strauss to be Secretary of Commerce. The President was quoted in the Times article as follows:

I have seen no criticism whatsoever of his work in the last 8 months, when he has been doing, filling the post. And, therefore, I see no reason whatsoever that he can't do it efficiently, no matter how long he stays there.

When the Chief Executive says that he has seen no criticism whatsoever of Mr. Strauss' work as Secretary of Commerce in the past 8 months, the natural question which comes to my mind is: Who has been misleading the President during the past 8 months? Are items derogatory of his appointments not brought to his attention? What are his advisers doing? Are they keeping the President misinformed?

In the hearings before the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce on his nomination, Mr. Strauss reluctantly admitted that he had chosen Mr. Armand Erpf, a large railroad stockholder, to head a study of national transportation policy. Once the press had revealed Mr. Erpf's background of the ownership of railroad shares, his partnership in a large investment banking house, which is one of the principal holders of railroad shares in this country, it being one of the top 30 shareholders in 17 out of 29 of the largest railroads in the United States, there was shown beyond a peradventure of a doubt a conflict of interest unparalleled, without question, in the history of this Government, and so serious as to make impartial recommendations almost an impossibility. There then began a fumbling series of denials and evasions by the Department of Commerce which resulted in the withdrawal of Mr. Erpf from the assignment.

Speeches made on the floor of the Senate, and published in all of the Nation's newspapers, attacked this very worst kind of conflict of interest. It was the loud public outcry of the press and of the elected representatives of the people which forced this retreat by the designee of Mr. Strauss.

In the light of the debate in Congress and the reports in the press of the United States, it seems more than passing strange that the President has said he has heard no criticism whatsoever of the nomination of Mr. Strauss during the past 8 months.

The hearings before the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce also brought to a head the question of

the veto by Mr. Strauss of an export of steel pipe. In answering a critical newspaper article, Mr. Strauss stated that "There was absolutely no difference between the State Department and the Department of Commerce on this"—the export license. We have positive proof that Mr. Strauss acted in the very opposite way from the State Department's recommendation.

Mr. President, I am not attempting to express an opinion concerning the merits of a controversy between the Secretary of Commerce and the Department of State on the export of steel pipe, because the nominee is so sensitive to press attacks that he will misrepresent the facts. But in the light of the controversy, it seems strange that we are told by the President that there has been absolutely no question raised during the past 8 months. So I am again forced to come back to the question: Who is misleading the President, and misleading him into loyalty to associates in preference to loyalty to the public?

I think it can be said most definitely that if the President has seen no criticism of Mr. Strauss' work as Secretary of Commerce, millions of other people have. I have. The criticism has been reported in all the newspapers of the country.

AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. PROXMIER. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I was not in the Chamber a few minutes ago, but I understand the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] took exception to a statement I placed in the RECORD yesterday in which I said that the agricultural appropriation bill as passed by the Senate yesterday carried expenditures of \$220 million over and above the budget estimates, and provided loan authorizations for the Farm Home Administration of \$33 million above the budget estimate.

Mr. RUSSELL. No; that was not what I said.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The appropriation bill does call for these appropriations over the budget estimates, and the figures to which I have referred were not in the tabulation appearing in the report submitted by the committee.

I said I would discuss the first figure, on page 12, which called for a cut in the ACP estimate next year of \$150 million. I know the Senator from Georgia's reasoning is that this is not an expenditure right at the moment; it is only a commitment for next year. But I call attention to the fact that last year the administration recommended \$100 million for this item. The Senate increased it to \$250 million. As a result, this became a contractual arrangement. Once Congress passed the bill, there is a contractual arrangement and the payment must be made.

In the same bill there is a request for \$241,500,000. This amount was incorporated as a request of the Budget Bureau. That is correct. But the Budget Bureau was forced to ask for \$141,500,000 in that instance over and

above what they wanted to spend as a result of the earlier action of Congress.

As a result of the action of the Senate yesterday when it rejected the amendment to cut the \$250 million item back to \$100 million, the Budget Bureau will have no alternative next year except to ask for an appropriation of \$240 million or \$250 million to pay for the contractual arrangements which must be made under that section of the bill.

I ask the Senator from Georgia if I am not correct in my understanding that yesterday was the last chance which the Senate had to vote on this item.

Mr. RUSSELL. No; I do not think the Senator is at all correct.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. When can we vote on it again?

Mr. RUSSELL. We can vote on it again when the conference report comes before the Senate. I think the Senator's statement just now is as much in error as the statement which the Senator from Delaware made yesterday.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. No; it is not anything of the kind. What was the amount in the House bill? Was it not \$250 million?

Mr. RUSSELL. That is correct.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. What was the amount as passed by the Senate?

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senate can vote against the whole bill; the Senate can vote against the conference report.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Yes; but this figure is not in conference and therefore cannot be changed. So if it cannot be changed, it will go to the White House providing for a direct payment of \$150 million which was not recommended by the Bureau of the Budget.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator from Delaware still has not replied to my statement.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I will reply to the rest of the statement in a moment. Will the Senator speak about the \$150 million?

Mr. RUSSELL. The \$150 million, the Senator says, will be expended next year.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. That is correct.

Mr. RUSSELL. I say it will not be expended in the next fiscal year.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I said it will be expended.

Mr. RUSSELL. No; the Senator did not. I have the RECORD of what was said.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I know what I said, too.

Mr. RUSSELL. Perhaps the Senator was misquoted by the reporter.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Let us discuss the question without any fancy shenanigans.

Mr. RUSSELL. I am willing to stand on the RECORD as to whose figures are shenanigans in this instance.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. If the bill goes to the White House with this figure, it will be the last chance Congress will have to do anything about the matter because the administration will be under a directive to commit that expenditure, and it will be committed in the first half of next year because, as the Senator very properly said in debate yes-

terday, we could not offer an amendment to cut all the \$241,500,000 yesterday because of other contractual relations.

The integrity of the U.S. Government is involved. It will be involved next year. And this time next year we will still be operating in fiscal 1960.

This is the last time that Congress will have an opportunity to operate on this matter so far as this particular item is concerned. There can be no doubt about that. Even the committee report says that the amount is \$150 million over and above that which was recommended by the Bureau of the Budget. Also, there is no question that that item is not included in the tabulation on the first page of the committee report. If there is any difference, I will yield to permit the Senator from Georgia to take exception to my statement.

Mr. RUSSELL. I take exception to it because this is an authorization, not an appropriation. These bills have been carrying appropriations for one year and authorizations for another year. The Senator has lumped the two together for the next fiscal year. He has done it time and again. The Senator says the bill provides an expenditure next year of \$220 million additional. The bill does not do any such thing.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. They are mandatory expenditures. It is the same line of reasoning in reverse from that of the Senator from Georgia. The \$241,500,000 item in this bill would have only been \$100 million had the Bureau of the Budget recommendation last year been carried out. But Congress overrode the Budget Bureau last year, just as the Senate did yesterday. As a result, yesterday the Senate was confronted with no alternative; all the Senate could do then was vote to pay the \$241,500,000.

If this year we say we take no responsibility for exceeding the amount of the budget estimate and if we say the same thing next year, then I ask the Senator from Georgia when will the Congress take the responsibility for exceeding the amount of the budget estimate?

On this program we are now spending \$150 million in excess of the recommendation by the administration. There is no argument about that.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, there certainly is a great deal of argument about it. The facts are greatly different.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. But I do not think the Senator from Georgia, in operating a business of his own, would make any such distinction. In other words, on yesterday the Senate in effect signed a note committing the Government to these payments. Following that action, next year the Senator from Georgia would be the first to rise on this floor and object to a proposal, not to make the full payment of \$250 million but to allow only \$100 million because in May of this year the Bureau of the Budget asked for only \$100 million. In that event, the Senator from Georgia would argue next year, just as he did yesterday in regard to the \$241,500,000, that it was a commitment of the Government and that the Government should not then attempt to dishonor its commitment.

I agree fully that once the Congress takes this action and once the bill is signed by the President, from that time on, the Secretary will have no authority under the law except to expend these funds as best he can under the instructions given by Congress. In other words, he will not then be at liberty to impound any of the money in this fund.

If all the money in the fund is not to be spent at one time or another, why did the Senator from Georgia include in the report a claim that the bill as reported to the Senate by the Senate Appropriations Committee represents, in connection with the item for restoration of the capital of the Commodity Credit Corporation, a reduction of \$100 million in the budget item? That estimate in regard to restoration of the capital of the Commodity Credit Corporation is based upon actual losses incurred, as reported. Those losses have actually been incurred, the commodities have been sold, and the losses have been established. So there is no possibility of any recovery. Therefore, under the law the Congress is required to restore to that extent the capital of the Commodity Credit Corporation.

I fully agree that it would make no difference whether the capital of the Corporation was restored yesterday or next year or exactly when. In any event, it must be restored. Such an item does not actually constitute a saving; it does not constitute a saving of \$100 million because that money has been lost. Whether the loss is recognized by us today, tomorrow, or next year is immaterial.

If that point is contested, then I ask why not remove or eliminate the entire item for \$1,500 million, which is the estimated loss. In that event there would really be a saving. But the Senator from Georgia and I know that that loss has occurred; the money has been spent and is gone regardless of when we say the loss occurred. In any event we must agree that there is no basis on which the loss could be recovered.

I agree that the Corporation could operate without our making this restoration at this time, for as of the moment the Corporation has additional borrowing authority which it has not yet used. So the Corporation could continue to make these obligations so long as it continued to have unused borrowing authority and so long as it continued to have an inventory which it could use. Once that authority was exhausted and once that inventory was used up, however, the Corporation would not be able to continue to operate unless further provision were made by the Congress.

In any event, certainly we agree that there is no need for Congress to recognize that loss at this particular time. In other words, the transaction is a bookkeeping transaction only; and I believe the Senator from Georgia admitted that only yesterday.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, the Senator's statement would seem to indicate that I have been charged with something. As a matter of fact, I have previously stated that the transaction was a bookkeeping transaction.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. And that it was not a bona fide saving.

Mr. RUSSELL. I said earlier that we would have to make an allowance for it in a subsequent appropriation bill. I made no claim about a saving in the case of the \$100 million.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. On the first page of the committee report, the Senator from Georgia claimed there is a saving of \$105 million—

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I did not make such a claim. I said that the bill as reported to the Senate by the committee called for appropriations which were \$105 million under the budget estimates. But on the front page of the report there is no statement that we claim any saving of \$100 million.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. On the front page of the report there is a statement that the amount of the bill, as reported, is \$105 million under the estimates for 1960.

Mr. RUSSELL. That is correct.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Does not that include the \$100 million?

Mr. RUSSELL. It does. But the report does not say that there is a saving.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I know that.

Mr. RUSSELL. We say the recommended appropriations are under the estimates. And they are under the estimates, despite the contention of the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. But the Senator says they are \$105 million under the estimates.

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. But \$100 million of that item alone is not a saving. Will the Senator from Georgia admit that?

Mr. RUSSELL. No, Mr. President; I do not admit that. I stated that. The Senator from Delaware would seem to seek to give the impression that he had dug into this matter and had made some wonderful discovery. However, everyone who knows anything about the bill has known all along that if there is any impairment of the capital of the Commodity Credit Corporation, Congress at one time or another must make it good.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. That is correct.

Mr. RUSSELL. And we will make it good.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. And that is the point I made.

But in the last line of the committee report, the committee states that the bill as reported by it to the Senate is under the estimates for 1960 by \$105 million. But \$100 million of that represents what the Senator from Georgia now admits—well, I shall state that both of us now agree—was not a saving.

The reason I corrected the record or the story which went out over the wires of the press is this: They very properly looked at the report, which states that the bill as reported to the Senate, and as subsequently passed by the Senate, represented a saving under the 1960 estimates of the budget of \$105 million plus.

Now the Senator from Georgia and I are in agreement—I will not say by means of an admission, but I will say it is by means of a statement—that at least

\$100 million of that amount was not a true saving and that in fact that figure should have been changed to \$5 million.

Mr. RUSSELL. No, Mr. President; I do not admit that.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I do not ask the Senator from Georgia to admit it. Will he state it?

Mr. RUSSELL. And I do not state it that way. I state that we shall have to make good whatever deficiency exists.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. That is correct.

Mr. RUSSELL. And undoubtedly it will be more next year.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. That is correct; there can be no doubt about it.

Mr. RUSSELL. Next year there will be before us an item, in the bill for 1961, for an additional amount for this purpose, but I was not referring to that. I was referring to the statement made by the Senator from Delaware—and he stated it four or five times.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. And I will state it four or five times more.

Mr. RUSSELL. And the Senator from Delaware will be in error every time he states it. He stated that the bill provides for expenditures in 1960 which are \$220 million above the budget estimates. But the bill does no such thing.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I said the bill provides for these expenditures, and I said we will be committed to them; and I still say so.

Mr. RUSSELL. Yesterday, the Senator from Delaware did not use the word "committed." He said, "That leaves an increase of \$220 million which this bill, just passed by the Congress, will call for in expenditures in the next year—"

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. That is right.

Mr. RUSSELL. "Over and above the administration request."

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Yes; and there is no question about it.

Mr. RUSSELL. There is no question about the fact that the statement, as made by the Senator from Delaware, is wrong.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. After all, both the Senator from Georgia and I expect to be here next year and the following year. And when the appropriation bill for the Department of Agriculture comes before the Senate next year, and when the item for the ACP is under discussion in the Senate next year, the Senator from Georgia will argue for the appropriation of \$250 million to pay for what the Senate voted yesterday, and he will say that that was a commitment and that it constitutes a contractual obligation which the Senate cannot ignore. But the Senator from Georgia is ignoring the fact that when one signs a contract for the purchase of an automobile at a total price of \$3,000, he really makes a \$3,000 purchase at the moment he signs the contract, even though the contract calls for a deposit of only \$200 on that particular day.

Of course, it might be argued that after the \$200 payment was made, the \$2,800 remaining would not actually have to be paid until a later time. But the fact is that the purchase in the amount of \$3,000 would really have been made at the time when the contract for

purchase of the automobile for a total price of \$3,000 was signed.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, the Senator from Delaware did not previously say anything about this matter in terms of the purchase of an automobile. He used the term "expenditures," and he used that term three or four times.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. And I say that again because when a contract for the purchase of an automobile for a total price of \$3,000 is signed, the purchaser is committed to payments totaling \$3,000, even though he does not necessarily pay all of the \$3,000 on the day he signs the contract.

None of the appropriation the Senate voted on yesterday will be spent until various times in 1959 and 1960—at periods scattered through those 2 years.

But I say that yesterday was the last chance the Senate or the Congress had to vote on that item, unless the item is taken up in the conference report.

The soil bank payments—the other item to which I referred—are \$75 million. That item is to be found on page 19, in line 6. But in the committee report the Senator from Georgia clearly states that that amount is \$75 million over the budget estimate.

In addition, under the soil bank provisions, if the Government, under the provisions of the bill as passed by the Senate, signs contracts under this program with farmers to pay them "X" amount an acre for placing their land in the soil bank, next year those commitments will have to be met and those payments will have to be made.

If Senators wish to be very technical in regard to expenditures, I may point out that although I spoke of \$75 million, the Senator from Georgia knows that approximately half of that particular item is in long-range contracts, which can run for 10 years; and, in reality, about half of those payments can be recurring payments which the Government will have to make 6, 8, or 10 years from now. I think the Senator from Georgia will have to admit that the soil bank payments are not limited to next year. They can be recurring payments, coming back year after year, for the life of the contract, for whatever period of time it is signed.

The House limited the period to 5 years. The subcommittee of which the Senator from Georgia is chairman struck out that limitation and provided that contracts could be made for 10 years, aggregating up to \$450 million a year. The Budget suggested that these contracts be for only \$375 million a year.

I say that once the Congress authorizes the U.S. Government to sign contracts for payments to an American farmer or an American industry, it becomes just as much an obligation of the U.S. Government as it would be if a check had been written and delivered.

Yesterday was the last chance we had to deal with the matter. It is not like authorizing construction of a dam or something that Congress can rescind the next year, or can slow down. These are contracts actually authorizing money. Altogether these contracts come to \$325 million. There is an additional \$75 million for the soil bank according to the

statement which appears on page 9 of the committee report, where it is stated that the committee exceeded the budget estimate by \$75 million.

On page 6 of that report it is stated that the budget estimate was exceeded by \$150 million.

By our statements—I do not like to use the word "admission," but by statements made on the floor—we both stated that the allegation of a saving of \$100 million was a false claim for savings.

Mr. RUSSELL. Nobody ever claimed it was a saving.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I did not understand the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. RUSSELL. No one has ever claimed it was a saving.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I beg the Senator's pardon. That is stated in the committee report. It states that is the amount below the budget estimate, and it is included right in the Senator's estimate as he submitted it to Congress.

The point I am making is that they are not savings. I say the committee has not saved that amount of money. The best evidence of that fact is, if this amount did not increase the figure above the budget estimate, why did the Senator reject the amendments to reduce the amount to the budget estimate?

The only statement I wish to make is that if we continue to save money as it is purported it has been saved in the committee report, we are going to save ourselves into bankruptcy. Perhaps that is the reason why we have such a large debt.

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

Mr. PROXMIER. I yield to the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. RUSSELL. After first referring to the soil bank item, the Senator from Delaware turned to another item, which I had not discussed yesterday, and wound up with a strong statement on the general dangers of a deficit. I am in hearty agreement with the Senator's last statement. While I did not approve of his amendments to the bill, I have been rather consistent in my insistence on reducing the expenditures of the Government, and for that reason I earnestly labored, in the consideration of this bill, to bring the appropriation of funds for expenditures to be made in the next fiscal year below the amount of the budget estimate that was submitted by the administration.

I think it will be conceded by any person who has any familiarity with this item, and who desires to approach it in a fair manner, that so far as appropriations for expenditures in fiscal 1960 are concerned, this bill is, according to any standard, even conceding the \$100 million for the restoration of the capital impairment of the Commodity Credit Corporation still \$5½ million below the budget estimates submitted by the executive branch of Government in the annual budget request for fiscal 1960.

However the budget for this item was created, whether it grew out of contracts entered into 1 year ago, 2 years ago, 3 years ago, or out of contracts sought to be entered into for performance in the future, the budget estimates were

submitted pursuant to law. Incidentally, most of these items, such as the soil bank item, to which he has made reference, came from the committee of which the Senator from Delaware is a member. I am not a member of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. These are programs proposed by the present Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Ezra Taft Benson, and by the President of the United States. They were presented to the Congress and urged on the Congress by the present administration.

For my part, I never had any great confidence in any part of the soil bank program. I never believed it could be effective in achieving a balanced agriculture, and I have no such belief today. But the administration asked for it, and the bill was enacted by the Congress. Under this law many contracts have been entered into and, so far as I am concerned, I shall undertake to see that adequate funds are appropriated to discharge those contracts.

I shall not undertake to correct all of the very obvious errors the Senator from Delaware made in the course of his discussion. One more illustration is reference to a \$25 million error in connection with the agricultural conservation program. He stated at least four times, and I think more, that last year the administration sent to the Congress an estimate of only \$100 million authorization for the agricultural conservation program. The fact of the matter is, and I have the figures before me, that last year the administration was a little more generous than it was this year, and sent to the Congress an estimate of \$125 million for the program authorization for the 1959 program.

That is one of the minor errors in the Senator's statement.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The committee granted \$250 million that year, did it not?

Mr. RUSSELL. The Congress did. The Senator is correct in that figure, and I am delighted that he is.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. If the—

Mr. RUSSELL. If the Senator will indulge me—

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Very well.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator stated that every dollar of authorization for contracts requires the same amount of appropriations to be made the next year, to meet the obligations. The truth is there is nothing in the history of this legislation to show that is a correct statement. We came about as close to it on the ACP program this year as we ever have. There was a \$250 million authorization for the 1959 program, which requires an appropriation of \$241.5 million to meet the estimated commitments under it.

Last year we authorized \$375 million for the soil bank, and this bill carries only \$340 million to meet the program and operating costs. So the Senator's crystal ball showing that we are going to spend every last dollar authorized for these programs—even conceding that he is right when he says it will take place in the same year—is certainly one that

informed men might look at with amazement.

Last year, for the soil bank program we authorized \$375 million, and appropriated \$200 million, and only about \$145 million of this will be needed to meet actual costs of contracts' payments and administrative expenses. About \$30 million was transferred for pay and other costs, and about \$20 million of the sum remaining will be carried forward to fiscal 1960. So, by any standard used to gauge it, when the Senator says the authorization requires an expenditure of \$220 million above the budget for next year, that kind of a statement simply is not sustained by the facts.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I only wish the Senator from Georgia had been as enthusiastic yesterday about this money not being spent as he is today, in which event he would have voted with me to cut the amount back to the budget request.

The Senator mentioned that the soil bank in the minds of many Members of Congress has not been a success. I agree with him and so stated yesterday. Only 2 days ago I heard one of the prominent orators on the other side of the aisle make reference to one of the Eisenhower "golf course" programs. It was interesting to note yesterday that those who think the program has been such a tremendous failure and who have talked about Benson's failure not only endorsed the program by their votes but actually added to it another \$75 million and said, "The only trouble is that we are not spending enough money on this program. All the money we have been saying we have been throwing away involves an error in that we have not been throwing away enough."

Even the Senator from Georgia yesterday not only voted for the continuation of the program as recommended by the administration, but he said in effect, "I want to give you more than you think you need. Go out and spend another \$75 million."

As I said yesterday, if we want to cut and balance the budget, there is only one time the Members of the U.S. Senate can do so, and that is when the vote is taken. Unfortunately, speeches on the floor of the Senate in favor of balancing the budget do not mean anything.

The only time we ever get anywhere is when we answer the call of the roll.

I say again that when the two yeas-and-nays votes were taken yesterday we added \$225 million over and above the President's budget estimates, and neither of those items was included in the tabulation in the committee report as it came from the Committee on Appropriations. Both those items will be conveniently dropped from the report this year. However, when the request comes in next year for the payment of those items, since they are over and above the budgetary estimates it will be said, "The administration requested it." It is the same as when the administration was forced to request the \$241½ million to pay for the \$100 million estimate of the preceding year.

I do not say that I did the right thing when I offered the amendments to cut these amounts yesterday. I recognize I could have been in error. I recognize that there are good arguments in favor of the programs.

On the other hand, when we vote to increase these appropriations, let us not be ashamed of it. Let us put it down and tell the taxpayers, "We are raising the amounts above the budget estimates because we think these are good programs and more money should be spent on them."

I say again that the bill carried a total of \$253 million, including the \$33 million loan authorization, over and above the amounts recommended by the President. However, the loan authorization should not be counted, even though that money may be expended from the Treasury as a direct expenditure because those loans will be secured by mortgages and will be repayable. I merely include them as items in the committee figures.

With regard to the other items—the \$75 million for the soil bank program over the budget estimates, the \$150 million for the ACP payments over the budget estimates, and the \$100 million with regard to restoration of capital for the Commodity Credit Corporation, which was claimed to be a savings—they are found in the report on pages 6, 9, and 12, and are identified by the committee itself, rather than by the Senator from Delaware, as being over the budget estimates.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, if the Senator from Delaware had made the statement yesterday which he has made today, I would never have taken the floor. The statement the Senator has just made is very extravagant, but the Senator did not repeat his error of yesterday, in stating two or three times that these were provisions calling for the expenditure in the next fiscal year of these funds. I am surprised the Senator from Delaware will not admit that was an incorrect statement.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I will admit that the provisions do not call for expenditure in entirety. I will call this a statement since the Senator will like the word better. I will say that 90 percent of the money will be required, and yesterday was the last chance we had to effect a saving.

What the Senator pointed out with regard to the soil bank appropriations is true. A year or two ago those appropriations were lowered, but we should not forget that the Congress made a major change in the soil bank law when we put a limitation on the amount which any one individual could receive. We cut out some of the million-dollar payments under the soil bank program by providing a \$5,000 ceiling. I commend the committee for carrying that ceiling forward and for even tightening it up. That will save some money for the taxpayers.

I think the ceiling which we put in the bill yesterday by providing a \$50,000 limitation will save a lot of money for the taxpayers. It will bring the payments down next year below the estimates.

I say again, so far as the soil bank payments and administration are concerned, when the Department signs a contract, whether we pay for it today or tomorrow, it must be paid for. Once we buy a car, take title, and sign the finance papers, we either pay for it or we owe for it.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, there is no question that the Congress has authorized the soil bank program. I would certainly be the last to challenge the statement that if the Government of the United States enters into a contract it will have to fulfill the contract at one time or another and by some means or another.

I do not know all the answers. I imagine before it is over, and over a period of years a large amount of money will need to be appropriated to pay for the contracts under the conservation reserve. Probably over a period of 10 years a billion dollars will have to be paid. The Senator certainly would not say that is an expenditure for next year.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I did not say it was an expenditure for next year.

Mr. RUSSELL. That would cover a 10-year period. That would be the total cost of the program.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. However, we are committed to pay it. The payments could increase over a 10-year period. There will be no recourse whereby we can get out of the commitments unless we renege on them, and neither the Senator from Georgia nor I would agree to that.

Mr. RUSSELL. I see that the Senator's complaint is against the soil bank program. In that case the Senator's position is completely justified.

The point I wish to make, Mr. President, and which I want to state this again—is that with regard to the expenditures in the next fiscal year, even allowing the \$100 million which was discussed by the distinguished minority leader, the bill calls for \$5½ million under the budget estimates.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record the statement made by the House Subcommittee on Appropriations for the Agriculture Department, relating to why the subcommittee reduced the item for the restoration of the impairment of the capital stock of the Commodity Credit Corporation.

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

EXCERPT FROM HOUSE REPORT

As discussed in considerable detail earlier in this report, the committee recommends a cut of \$100 million in this item for 1960. This reduction is made to encourage the Corporation to make greater efforts to sell commodities in world markets at competitive prices. Such a sales effort will result in great savings in storage, interest, and handling, and will enable the Corporation to meet its obligations from sales proceeds rather than from appropriated funds.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record the very brief statement of the Senate committee in the report, which states our reason for following the House action.

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

EXCERPTS FROM SENATE COMMITTEE REPORT

The committee recommends an appropriation of \$1,435,424,413, which is \$100 million under the budget estimate, and the amount of the House allowance.

The committee shares the views expressed in the House report that the Secretary of Agriculture and the officials of the Corporation should make greater efforts to dispose of Government-owned commodities in the world markets and to thereby reduce the cost of storage, interest, and handling charges.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, this is not extremely important, but I simply wish to keep the record straight and to show that there was a reason for the action taken by the committee and it was not simply a juggling of the figures.

The payments must come out of the pockets of the taxpayers in the long run, whether the money is appropriated now, whether the Commodity Credit Corporation borrows the money, or whether the Treasury Department borrows it. The taxpayers will ultimately pay any cost involved. This is an obligation, as I stated on yesterday, and it will have to be met.

Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the budget estimate of this year for the funds with which to meet the soil bank authorization of \$375 million of last year, as well as the record of authorizations and appropriations since the inception of the conservation reserve program.

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

Conservation reserve¹—Advance authorization

Estimate:	
1956.....	\$450,000,000
1957.....	450,000,000
1958.....	450,000,000
1959.....	450,000,000
Enacted:	
1956.....	450,000,000
1957.....	450,000,000
1958.....	325,000,000
1959.....	375,000,000
Estimates:	
1958.....	298,826,660
1958 (pay-transfer out).....	-9,752,478
1959.....	350,000,000
1960.....	360,370,000
Appropriations:	
1958.....	\$162,940,000
1958 (pay-transfer out).....	-9,752,478
1959.....	*200,000,000

¹ Public Law 85-352, 2d Supp. 1958, to reimburse CCC for costs incurred for 1956-57 programs amounting to \$38,845,780. Law provided \$450 million each year 1956-60 programs.

* Less \$28,668,107 pay cost transfer out in Public Law 86-30; and estimated carryover to 1960 of \$20 million.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I do this because it happens that the budget estimate was about \$360 million. Even in the Department's view—which is the most roseate—they have not been able to obligate all the money provided for this program in prior years. In spite of this the Senator has insisted that the appropriation and the increased authorization all represent an expenditure in the same year.

The Senate committee recommended an appropriation of \$35 million less for expenditure in fiscal 1960 than the authorization carried in last year's bill.

The figures with respect to the ACP program speak for themselves. There was an authorization last year of \$250 million. The budget estimate for this year is \$241.5 million. As a rule, the actual out-of-pocket expenditures run somewhat below the amount estimated as needed in the appropriations. It would be the first time in the history of the program if the actual expenditures should amount to the \$241.5 million authorization which is appropriated this year for the 1959 program.

Mr. President, in order to show that these appropriations are not always expended, as the Senator stated on yesterday, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the estimates for the advance authorization for the agricultural conservation program commencing with the year 1951, the amounts which were actually authorized by the Congress in the appropriation bill, and the amounts which were actually appropriated year by year to meet these authorizations.

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

ACP—Advance authorizations	
Estimates:	
1951.....	\$285,000,000
1952.....	285,000,000
1953.....	256,500,000
1954.....	140,000,000
1955.....	*250,000,000
1956.....	175,000,000
1957.....	250,000,000
1958.....	250,000,000
1959.....	125,000,000
Enacted:	
1951.....	285,000,000
1952.....	256,500,000
1953.....	250,000,000
1954.....	195,000,000
1955.....	*250,000,000
1956.....	250,000,000
1957.....	250,000,000
1958.....	250,000,000
1959.....	250,000,000
Appropriations:	
1951.....	\$256,500,000
1952.....	260,000,000
1953.....	251,747,866
1954.....	211,982,000
1955.....	191,700,000
1956.....	214,500,000
1957.....	227,500,000
1958.....	212,000,000
1959.....	235,000,000

* \$55,000,000 earmarked for use under diverted acres program.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, these figures indicate that although we have authorized \$250 million, on occasion it has only required an appropriation of \$191 million to meet the commitments made under the authorization. There has been a carryover of more than \$40 million.

I certainly do not wish to be charged with responsibility for every statement made by every Senator on the floor, about golf links, or other matters irrelevant and immaterial in connection with this appropriation bill. I shall state why I shall gladly vote the full amount of the authorization for the soil bank, and \$250 million for the agricultural conser-

vation program authorization for 1960. Appropriations will be made next year for that purpose. If the full amount of the authorization is required, I shall support such an appropriation. I rather apprehend that we shall not have any \$450 million program for the soil bank. I wish we could have it. But, knowing some of the dangers of legislative procedure, I say that in my judgment we shall not have that large a sum. A very substantial reduction will be made before the bill is finally enacted. But if the entire \$450 million were authorized, and if the Department were able to enter into contracts—which it has never been able to do—for the full amount of the authorization, I would support an appropriation in that amount. I would do so because that is the only farm program today which actually reaches the farmer and assures him of getting some good from it. Other programs have fallen apart because of maladministration and for other reasons. Today the farmer occupies the most unenviable position of any group in the American scheme of life. I shall be glad to support the programs referred to.

I hope the Senator from Delaware will not take any exception to these statements. The administration has requested that the soil bank be extended for 3 more years. I am opposed to that proposal. In my opinion Congress does not intend to extend it. That is another reason why I think the authorization by the Senate—even though it will not finally be approved in that amount—is justified.

I merely rose to point out that the statement that expenditures for the fiscal year 1960 had been increased by \$220 million was not justified by the facts.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin yield to me?

Mr. PROXMIER. I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I do not intend to prolong this discussion. There is a difference of opinion between the Senator from Georgia and myself. The Senate has voted, and that is the end of the dispute.

There is agreement that the \$100 million item should not have been included as a deduction, and that the figure in the committee report should have been \$5 million instead.

As to the other two items with respect to which the Senate voted by a ye and nay vote and added \$150 million to the ACP payments and \$75 million to the soil bank, I can only say that next year, when the appropriation bill comes before us, we can pick up this record and continue from there. We can then see who is right and who is wrong.

MR. STRAUSS' INTEGRITY

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks a letter to the editor of the Washington Post, published in the June 4, 1959, issue of that newspaper, on the editorial page, under the heading "Mr.

Strauss' Integrity." The letter is signed by Rabbi Norman Gerstenfeld, minister of the Washington Hebrew Congregation.

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

MR. STRAUSS' INTEGRITY

For weeks now I have been observing the debate over the confirmation of Lewis Strauss with a sense of deep frustration.

By temperament and philosophy I am strongly disinclined to involve myself, however, indirectly in any political controversy; but by conviction and sense of duty, I feel I must offer my personal witness to the integrity of Lewis Strauss in the face of the unceasing attacks on him. Your editorial recommending that Mr. Strauss withdraw can serve only to encourage these unfair attacks.

I am constrained to write you now only because I feel I must in good conscience and simple justice present the evidence based on years of association and friendship with Lewis Strauss. I do not want to be neutral while a man's most precious asset, his good name, is being callously sacrificed.

He has not asked my help and I have no idea of whether he will welcome this letter. But I think you ought to know that in a score of ways over many years Lewis Strauss has demonstrated to me and to many, many others a high sense of civic and social responsibility.

You have only to look at the record to see the variety of his civic and spiritual contributions and commitments. Believe me he has served these causes well and honorably.

It is simply inconceivable that the Senate should permit a record of attainment and character established over many years to be torn down.

Lewis Strauss will live in history as a splendid example of integrity and ability. If the Senate gives true weight to his qualifications—and indeed to the precedents it has established and followed for a hundred years—it will confirm him.

Rabbi NORMAN GERSTENFELD,
Minister,
Washington Hebrew Congregation.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I offer this letter for the RECORD because there is already in the RECORD a sermon from another spiritual leader, rather going in the other direction, against Mr. Strauss.

Normally we would not place such material in the RECORD, but it seems to me that in the light of the fact that one such statement has already been placed in the RECORD, it is in order to offer an affirmative statement, stating in the most direct terms the greatest confidence in his integrity, and that it is only fair to include it in the RECORD.

**POSTAL POLICY WITH RESPECT TO
PUBLIC SERVICE ITEMS**

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, last year this Congress approved Public Law 85-426. Included in this law as title I was a statement on postal policy.

This title is very clear. Certain items are listed as public service items—the total loss of which shall be earmarked and paid for from general appropriations.

The appropriation bill passed by the Senate and House yesterday failed miserably to conform with these sections. The statements included in the Senate

CV—621

report and the conference report on the part of the House on public policy are in direct conflict with the law.

Regardless of these statements in committee and conference reports—Public Law 85-426 still is the law—and will remain the law until an amendment has passed this Congress and has been signed by the President.

Public service costs in third- and fourth-class post offices do apply to fourth-class mail. To say otherwise, indicates complete unfamiliarity with the public law.

**NOMINATION OF LEWIS L. STRAUSS
TO BE SECRETARY OF COMMERCE**

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, the National Association of Secondary-School Principals, by action of its executive committee and its officers, has advised that this organization strongly opposes the confirmation of Admiral Strauss as Secretary of Commerce.

The association is a department of the National Education Association with headquarters in Washington. They claim they represent 28,600 secondary school enrolling 8 million students, 2 million of whom are new each year.

Their principal objection to Mr. Strauss is that he refused to accept correct information after he had used incorrect and inadequate facts in an address before Thomas Alva Edison Foundation. This was while Mr. Strauss was Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the letter from the National Association of Secondary-School Principals be printed at this point in the RECORD. The officers of the association are president, Mr. Cliff Robinson, director of secondary education, Eugene Public Schools, Eugene, Oreg.; first vice president, Mr. James E. Nancarrow, principal, Upper Darby High School, Upper Darby, Pa.; and second vice president, Mr. James D. Logsdon, superintendent-principal, Thornton Township High School and Junior College, Harvey, Ill. The members of the executive committee are Mr. Eugene S. Thomas, principal, Central High School, Kalamazoo, Mich.; Mr. Calloway Taulbee, principal, Artesia High School, Artesia, N. Mex.; Mr. John M. Sexton, principal, Northeast High School, St. Petersburg, Fla.; and Mr. Samuel M. Graves, principal, Gamaliel Bradford High School, Wellesley, Mass.

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

**NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF
SECONDARY-SCHOOL PRINCIPALS,
Washington, D.C., May 12, 1959.**

Hon. WARREN G. MAGNUSON,
U.S. Senate, New Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

By action of the executive committee and its officers of this association, representing 28,600 secondary schools enrolling more than 8 million students with a revolving pattern of 2 million new students each year, I am authorized to convey to you for admission to the records their attitude on the selection of Rear Adm. Lewis L. Strauss as Secretary of the Department of Commerce. This representative group strongly opposes the confirmation

of Rear Admiral Strauss as Secretary of the Department of Commerce.

In November 21-22, 1955, Rear Admiral Strauss, at that time Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, made an address at the sixth annual conference of the Thomas Alva Edison Foundation Institute in West Orange, N.J., which received the headlines of the press, including the New York Times the following day. Rear Admiral Strauss berated the quality of the teaching of science and mathematics, and based his opinions and conclusions on incorrect and inadequate facts. Any citizen is entitled to express his opinion on the quality of teaching in the American public schools. We, however, believe that when such a personal appraisal is propounded for the public press it should be based on facts that are thoroughly substantiated and established from authoritative sources. The main point of his declamation was the lack of teaching of science and mathematics supported by inadequate and shabby statistics which he submitted in his address and which were repeated in the press.

A short time after this address, officials in the National Education Association called his attention to the incorrect facts and statistics which were the basis of his presentation at the Edison Foundation. He, however, was entirely unwilling to go into conference or to acknowledge any assistance which would put him into possession of the full facts and information.

Any man can make an honest mistake; but if he continues to make the same mistake in public presentations after the error of his ways are called to his attention by responsible officials and after the full and correct facts and information are offered to him, we feel such a man is operating in a vindictive manner and on an unethical basis.

Rear Admiral Strauss' address was the forerunner of many such addresses throughout the country; and whenever a suggestion was made to other prominent persons regarding the inaccuracy of the statements, we were always told that the authority was Rear Admiral Strauss, which in itself, as far as the general public was concerned, seemed adequate and acceptable.

As prominent a man as ex-President Herbert Hoover addressing a group of engineers, Vice President NIXON, and others used Rear Admiral Strauss' half-true, inadequate facts to berate the inadequacies and quality of the teaching of mathematics in the preparation of engineers and scientists.

Rear Admiral Strauss did inestimable damage in shattering the public confidence people normally have in their schools and was unwilling by his future actions to make any correction, even though no public retraction was ever requested of him.

We, speaking from secondary education, do not believe that such a man, a purveyor of half-truths, operating in an unethical manner, and unwilling to correct what may have been an inadvertent or an honest error, should hold such a prominent position as Secretary of the Department of Commerce. The Secretary must always be above suspicion to all people and at no time should there be any question of the pronouncements, the reports, or the work of the Department of Commerce to the educational authorities of this country or to the public in general by the Secretary of Commerce.

We trust that you will give this full consideration and enter this statement on the records of the committee.

PAUL E. ELICKER,
Executive Secretary.

MEMORIAL DAY ADDRESS AT ANTIETAM BY SENATOR BEALL

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed

in the RECORD the eloquent address delivered on Memorial Day, Saturday, May 30, by the junior Senator from Maryland [Mr. BEALL] on Antietam Battlefield.

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

ADDRESS BY HON. J. GLENN BEALL, OF MARYLAND

On the hallowed grounds of the Battle of Antietam, on this Memorial Day of the year 1959, we who are here honor all Americans who have fallen in battle. In this observance, we are joined by hundreds of similar gatherings throughout our land.

One lesson which history—and especially our own—should have taught us is that we should work together—united. However, it sometimes appears that this lesson has been lost. A case in point is the present squabble between the units of our armed services.

We are now witnessing the sorry spectacle of the Army and the Air Force fighting publicly over whose antimissile missile is the better. The Army says that its Nike-Hercules is better than anything the Air Force can produce. The Air Force says: "No, no, our Bomarc is far better—no more money should be spent on the Nike-Hercules." And now, the Navy makes it a three-way fight by saying that both missiles would be obsolete by the time they could get into production.

One staff officer tells us that we have nothing to worry about—that we can break the back of any foe with present weapons. Another tells us we are way behind—that without new weapons in production at once we are in danger.

I am getting a little tired of the conflicting statements being made by supposedly responsible officers of our armed services. As a member of the Senate Committee on Armed Services, I shall demand some straight answers. The American people are entitled to know facts. We should not be the victims of fanciful tales based on petty jealousy. To get at the truth we may have to knock some heads together.

We members of the Armed Services Committee are briefed in advance on all plans for new weapons. Some are almost fantastic.

Certainly, they are different from those used in the Battle of Antietam. Instead of the battleax and the muzzle loader with the ramrod, we have all kinds of electronic and atomic weapons of war.

Here are a few new weapons of war:

A huge, semirigid atomic-powered airship that can zip along, with several hundred troops aboard, at a pace of 400 miles an hour.

Rocket planes, like the X-15 which has a speed of 4,000 miles an hour.

The Hound Dog, a new and powerful weapon. In combat, a single B-52 plane could carry four of the missiles aloft and hurl their hydrogen warheads at targets 500 miles away.

Missiles, like the 90-foot intercontinental Titan, with a 9,000-mile range.

A rocket train from which the solid-fuel Minuteman ICBM can be fired.

New mines that can be dropped from fast, high-flying planes and sink to the bottom to escape detection.

The Skipjack, the new atomic submarine, which can go deeper and faster than any other submarine.

An antisub torpedo capable of seeking out fast subs at great depth.

A seagoing flying saucer. This is to be officially tested this summer. It can float, rise 20 to 50 feet above the surface of the ocean, hunt out submarines by flying at low altitudes and high speeds.

Back on land, we'll have a flying tank able to skim a few feet above the earth's surface at terrific speed.

We are also to have a flying platform—a troop carrier designed to fly at high speed just above the tree tops.

All of this is not much like Antietam, is it?

An agency of the Government is now working on the project to put man into outer space—Project Mercury, the project of the NASA, the Space Administration. The object is to put an expedition on the moon, and eventually on the other planets of the solar system, Venus and then Mars. The successful rocket launching and recovering of a nose cone with two live monkeys as passengers only this week is a long step forward for Project Mercury.

Scientists believe the outer-space ships may be driven by engines powered by the sun's rays. Necessary in this plan would be a universe mirror, orbiting with the earth's rotation. With such a universe mirror, the scientists say we could free icebound harbors, give to cities heat for the winter and light for night, and could change the deserts into fertile lands.

Yes; things are changing.

In case of another war, the Department of Defense will be directed from a hole in the earth under the Cheyenne Mountains.

And, in this pushbutton war, what about the so-called foot soldiers? Well, Major General Stubbs tells us that the soldier of the future will hurdle obstacles and jump ditches with a rocket booster strapped on his back. His helmet will have a built-in radio and a screen to protect him from chemical and atomic attack. He won't even be digging his own foxholes. All he'll have to do is ram a pencil-like foxhole digger into the ground, detonate it, and then crawl in. And when he's not jetting over streams or strolling over housetops, he will scud about in a saucerlike air jeep.

But wait. There's another side to this.

Despite all progress, despite the advances in science, despite the idea of pushbutton war, warfare seems to remain a person-to-person conflict. The fighting in Korea just 7 short years ago was not much different from the fighting in the War Between the States, or, for that matter, in the American Revolution.

A few nights ago, Mrs. Beall and I were guests at a special showing of a motion picture about the Korean war—"Pork Chop Hill," starring Gregory Peck. This is a grim, realistic picture of the horrors of war.

Cy Bartlett, the producer, wanted me to see the picture to get my reaction. To say the least, I was deeply impressed. It is a stirring story of exactly what happened on Pork Chop Hill in Korea. It is stark drama.

I recommend that everyone see the picture when it is released. You will see that in this modern time it is still hand-to-hand fighting. (One of the several soldiers in a tough situation asks, "What happened to the pushbutton war?")

In the picture, you will see that the actions of one soldier here and another there may have decided an issue with international implications.

This is, in fact, the story of all warfare throughout history.

Individual men and boys have won or lost.

We must never discount the supreme sacrifices of our hero dead—at Antietam, at Pork Chop Hill, at Valley Forge, wherever they fell.

Here, at the Battle of Antietam, the spirit of patriotism and faithfulness to a cause was nobly demonstrated. History tells us that General Lee withdrew his forces to make a desperate stand here at Sharpsburg. There followed the bloodiest battle of the War Between the States—Lee losing 12,000 men and McClellan 13,000. Neither gained a vic-

tory. The men were brave, and seemingly fearless.

We honor those—of both sides—who fell. Lincoln exemplified this spirit when he came here and visited the wounded of both sides. Memorial Day had its origin with the decoration of the graves of both Union and Confederate soldiers while the war still raged.

Memorial Day is for honoring all Americans who have died in battle. God forbid that the time will ever come in this great land of ours when our people shall turn away from the patriotism of our forefathers.

The struggle for enduring peace with justice and liberty for all is a continuing one.

Let us rededicate our lives to support the ideals and principles which we know are right.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bill and joint resolution, and they were signed by the President pro tempore:

H.R. 5805. An act making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments and the Tax Court of the United States for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1960; and

H.J. Res. 254. Joint resolution to authorize participation by the United States in parliamentary conferences with Canada.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE] may yield to me temporarily for the purpose of moving that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business, with the understanding that at the conclusion of the action which we anticipate today with respect to the Executive Calendar, which will include a treaty, the Senator from Wisconsin will be recognized.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield with that understanding.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I wish to express my deep appreciation to the Senator from Wisconsin. His courtesy will be very helpful to several Senators who are present, and who desire a ye and nay vote on the treaty. I understand that this arrangement will work a hardship and inconvenience on the Senator from Wisconsin. I am grateful for his understanding.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I am glad to yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the call begin with nominations in the Department of Defense.

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

will state the nominations on the calendar, beginning with the Department of Defense.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Thomas Sovereign Gates, Jr., to be Deputy Secretary of Defense.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Fred A. Bantz to be Under Secretary of the Navy.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, may we now proceed to the nomination in the Department of the Air Force?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered, and the intervening nominations will be temporarily passed over.

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Joseph V. Charyk to be an Assistant Secretary of the Air Force.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

POSTMASTERS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask that the nominations of postmasters be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations of postmasters are confirmed en bloc.

APPOINTMENTS IN THE NAVY AND IN THE MARINE CORPS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of midshipmen (Naval Academy) to the rank indicated in the restricted line of the Navy, subject to qualifications therefor as provided by law.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask that the appointments in the Navy and in the Marine Corps be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed en bloc.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Frederick Henry Mueller to be Under Secretary of Commerce.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Carl F. Oechsle to be an Assistant Secretary of Commerce.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Rosel H. Hyde to be a member of the Federal Communications Commission.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Frederick Stueck to be a member of the Federal Power Commission.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Earl W. Kintner to be a Federal Trade Commissioner.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

U.S. COAST GUARD

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the U.S. Coast Guard.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations are considered and confirmed en bloc.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I should like to suggest the absence of a quorum, merely for the purpose of having the yeas and nays ordered on the treaty. I suggest the absence of a quorum, and I appeal to the Senate attaches on both sides of the aisle to request Senators to return to the Chamber, because we shall have a ye and nay vote very shortly on the treaty.

It is expected that we shall proceed to the consideration of the nomination of George M. Johnson, to be a member of the Commission on Civil Rights; and I am hopeful that we shall be able to act on the nomination of Mr. Ogden R. Reid, to be Ambassador to Israel, before the session shall have been concluded today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The absence of a quorum is suggested, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be dispensed with.

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the treaty which is about to be considered. The yeas and nays were ordered.

CONVENTION BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA AND CUBA FOR THE CONSERVATION OF SHRIMP

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Executive B, (86th Cong., 1st sess.), a convention be-

tween the United States of America and Cuba for the conservation of shrimp.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the treaty (Executive B, 86th Cong., 1st sess.), a convention between the United States of America and Cuba for the conservation of shrimp, signed at Havana on August 15, 1958, which was read the second time, as follows:

CONVENTION BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA AND CUBA FOR THE CONSERVATION OF SHRIMP

The Government of the United States of America and the Government of Cuba, considering their common interest in maintaining the maximum sustainable productivity of stocks of shrimp of common concern in waters of the Gulf of Mexico off the coast of Cuba and the Florida coast of the United States, and in promoting the scientific studies necessary to ascertain the conservation measures required for this purpose, and desiring to establish procedures for coordinating such studies and for placing in effect such conservation measures as may be necessary, agree as follows:

ARTICLE I

The area to which this Convention applies, hereinafter referred to as "the Convention area", shall be the waters of the Gulf of Mexico off the coast of Cuba and the Florida coast of the United States including territorial waters, in which are found stocks of shrimp of common concern.

ARTICLE II

1. The contracting parties agree to establish and operate a commission, to be known as the Commission for the Conservation of Shrimp in the Eastern Gulf of Mexico, hereinafter referred to as "the Commission," which shall carry out the objectives of this Convention. The Commission shall be composed of two national sections, a United States section consisting of three members appointed by the Government of the United States, and a Cuban section consisting of three members appointed by the Government of Cuba.

2. Each national section shall have one vote. Decisions of the Commission shall be made only by approval of both sections.

3. The Commission may decide upon and amend, as occasion may require, rules for the conduct of its meetings and for the performance of its functions and duties.

4. The Commission shall meet at least once each year and at such other times as may be agreed by both national sections. The date and place of the first meeting shall be determined by agreement between the Governments.

5. The Commission shall decide on the most convenient place for the establishment of its headquarters.

6. At its first meeting the Commission shall select a chairman from the members of one national section and a vice chairman from the members of the other national section. The chairman and vice chairman shall hold office for a period of 2 years. In each succeeding term, the office of chairman and vice chairman shall alternate between the respective national sections.

7. Each section of the Commission may appoint its own advisers who shall be invited by the Commission to attend all nonexecutive sessions of the Commission.

8. Each section of the Commission may hold public hearings within the territory of its own country.

9. The official languages of the Commission shall be English and Spanish, and members of the Commission may use either language during the meetings. The minutes, official documents, and publications of the Commission shall be in both languages, but official

correspondence of the Commission may be written in either language.

10. The expenses incurred by each national section shall be borne by its government. The share of each country in the joint expenses incurred by the Commission shall be related to the proportion of the total catch from the shrimp stocks of common concern in the Convention area taken by vessels which belong to that country.

11. The budget of joint expenses and the share of each government shall be determined by the Commission and submitted to the governments for approval.

12. The Commission shall authorize the disbursement of funds for the joint expenses of the Commission and may employ necessary personnel for the performance of its functions and duties.

13. The Commission shall designate a technically competent Director who shall serve at the pleasure of the Commission. Subject to such rules and procedures as may be determined by the Commission, the Director shall have full power and authority over the staff of the Commission.

ARTICLE III

1. The Commission shall have responsibility for:

(a) Obtaining scientific information regarding the abundance, life history, and ecology of stocks of shrimp of common concern in the Convention area in order to determine the measures necessary for their conservation.

(b) Publishing or otherwise disseminating reports relative to the results of its findings and such other scientific reports and statistical data as fall within the scope of this Convention.

(c) Adopting, with respect to the Convention area, such regulations, based on scientific findings, as are necessary to achieve the objectives of this Convention.

2. Each of the regulations adopted pursuant to paragraph 1(c) above shall become effective with respect to the contracting parties 60 days following notification of the regulation by the Commission to each of the contracting parties, except that either of the contracting parties may prevent entry into force of a regulation by lodging objection thereto with the Commission before the expiration of such 60-day period.

3. The Commission shall notify the other contracting party immediately upon receipt of objection to a regulation.

4. In discharging its responsibilities the Commission may establish working relations with any international, public, or private institution or organization, or any individual.

5. The Commission shall submit annually to the respective parties a report on its work, together with any recommendations, and shall also inform them, whenever it is deemed advisable, on any matter relating to the objectives of this Convention.

ARTICLE IV

The contracting parties agree to keep as far as practicable all records requested by the Commission and to furnish compilations of such records and other information upon request of the Commission. No contracting party shall be required hereunder to provide the records of individual operations.

ARTICLE V

The contracting parties agree to cooperate with each other in taking appropriate and effective action to enforce any regulations which enter into force pursuant to article III of this Convention. Accordingly, the contracting parties agree as follows:

1. Any national or vessel of a contracting party which engages in operations on the high seas in violation of regulations which enter into force pursuant to article III of this Convention may be seized by duly authorized officers of the other contracting party and detained by the officers making

such seizure and delivered as soon as practicable to an authorized official of the country to which such person or vessel belongs, at the nearest point to the place of seizure or elsewhere as may be agreed upon.

2. The authorities of the country to which such person or vessel belongs alone shall have jurisdiction to conduct prosecutions for violation of the regulations which enter into force pursuant to article III of this Convention and to impose penalties for such violation, and the witnesses and proof necessary for such prosecutions, so far as any witnesses or proofs are under the control of the seizing country, shall be furnished with all reasonable promptitude to the authorities having jurisdiction to conduct the prosecutions.

3. Each contracting party shall be responsible for the proper observance of this Convention and of any regulations adopted under the provisions thereof in the portions of its water covered thereby.

ARTICLE VI

The contracting parties agree to meet, during the 6th year of the operation of this Convention, to review the effectiveness of the provisions of this Convention and, if desirable, to consider means by which they may more effectively be carried out.

ARTICLE VII

Nothing in this Convention shall be construed as preventing either of the contracting parties or in the case of the United States, any of the States, from making or enforcing laws or regulations which in the absence of this Convention would be valid relative to any fisheries of the Convention area so far as such laws or regulations do not preclude the discharge of the Commission's responsibilities.

ARTICLE VIII

1. This Convention shall be ratified and the instruments of ratification exchanged at Habana as soon as practicable.

2. This Convention shall enter into force on the date of exchange of instruments of ratification and shall remain in force for a period of 10 years and thereafter until 1 year from the date on which either contracting party shall have given written notice to the other of its desire to terminate the Convention.

In witness whereof the respective plenipotentiaries have signed the present Convention.

Done in duplicate, in the English and Spanish languages, each of which shall be of equal authenticity, at Habana this 15th day of August, 1958.

For the Government of the United States of America:

EARL E. T. SMITH.

For the Government of the Republic of Cuba:

GÜELL.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, this convention with Cuba for the conservation of shrimp follows the general pattern of fisheries conventions to which the United States is a party. It covers shrimp resources of common concern—principally those in the Tortugas fishery—in the waters of the Gulf of Mexico off the coast of Cuba and the Florida

coast of the United States, and it provides for a Commission to investigate and carry out the means to develop maximum sustainable productivity of those resources. The convention was signed at Havana in August of last year and promptly ratified by Cuba in the following month.

Let me say that the background of the convention is most interesting and pertinent to consideration by this body. After indications in 1955 that a large proportion of the shrimp catch was undersized, the State of Florida adopted unilateral measures to conserve the Tortugas' resources, which yielded \$38 million worth of shrimp to American boats from 1950 through 1956. However, the area involved extends well beyond the territorial waters of the United States and is also used by Cuba, although to a relatively minor degree at present. Believing that Cuban cooperation was essential, leaders of the U.S. shrimp industry in 1957 asked the Federal Government for help. Extensive discussion took place between the Department of State, the Department of the Interior, and interested groups in the gulf area, including State officials, before negotiations were entered into with Cuba.

The United States and Cuba will have an equal voice, and decisions will have to be unanimous in the Commission established by the convention. The Commission will determine necessary conservation measures and will adopt regulations to give them effect. The joint costs arising from the convention will be divided on the basis of the proportion of the catch, and are estimated at not more than \$200,000 annually. The convention will continue in force for 10 years, and thereafter until terminated on 1 year's notice by either party.

The Committee on Foreign Relations heard testimony from representatives of the Departments of State and Interior, and received written statements of support from four organizations representing business interests in six Southern States. It was noted that Florida State legislative and conservation officials were consulted and gave their concurrence on the convention. The committee further noted that Cuba had promptly ratified the convention, and had carefully observed a "gentlemen's agreement" regarding Florida's regulations pending ratification by the United States.

Mr. President, there seems to be unanimous support for the convention from interested groups in the Gulf States; the committee received no objection from any source. I wish to add that the senior Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] has carefully investigated the matter and has given his full support. I hope, therefore, that the Senate will give its advice and consent to the ratification of this convention with Cuba.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the convention will be considered as having passed through its various parliamentary stages up to the point of consideration of the resolution of ratification, which will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Resolved, (two-thirds of the Senators present concurring therein), That the Senate advise and consent to the ratification of Executive B, 86th Congress, 1st session, a convention between the United States of America and Cuba for the conservation of shrimp, signed at Havana on August 15, 1958.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the resolution of ratification?

The yeas and nays having been ordered, the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNING], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Utah [Mr. MOSS], and the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] are absent on official business.

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], is absent because of death in the family.

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

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

I further announce that if present and voting, the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNING], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN], the Senator from Utah [Mr. MOSS], and the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], would each vote "yea."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTSTALL], are absent on official business, and, if present and voting, they would each vote "yea."

The Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER], is necessarily absent and if present and voting, would vote "yea."

The Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS], is detained on official business.

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 80, nays 0, as follows:

YEAS—80

Aiken	Cotton	Holland
Allott	Curtis	Hruska
Anderson	Dirksen	Humphrey
Bartlett	Dodd	Jackson
Beall	Douglas	Javits
Bennett	Dworshak	Johnson, Tex.
Bible	Eastland	Johnston, S.C.
Bridges	Ellender	Jordan
Butler	Engle	Keating
Byrd, W. Va.	Ervin	Kennedy
Cannon	Frear	Kerr
Carlson	Fulbright	Kuchel
Carroll	Gore	Langer
Case, N.J.	Hart	Lausche
Church	Hayden	Magnuson
Clark	Hickenlooper	Mansfield
Cooper	Hill	Martin

McCarthy	Prouty	Stennis
McGee	Proxmire	Symington
McNamara	Randolph	Talmadge
Monroney	Robertson	Thurmond
Morse	Russell	Wiley
Mundt	Schoeppel	Williams, N.J.
Muskie	Scott	Yarborough
Neuberger	Smathers	Young, N. Dak.
O'Mahoney	Smith	Young, Ohio
Pastore	Sparkman	

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—18

Bush	Green	McClellan
Byrd, Va.	Gruening	Morton
Capehart	Hartke	Moss
Case, S. Dak.	Henning	Murray
Chavez	Kefauver	Saltstall
Goldwater	Long	Williams, Del.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Two-thirds of the Senators present having voted in the affirmative, the resolution of ratification is agreed to.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the action taken today by the Senate on the treaty and on the nominations previously confirmed today by the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Young of Ohio in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMISSION ON CIVIL RIGHTS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to consideration of the nomination on the executive calendar to the Commission on Civil Rights.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The nomination will be stated.

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of George M. Johnson, of California, to be a member of the Commission on Civil Rights.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senate will proceed to consideration of the nomination.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask that on the question of confirmation of this nomination, a voice vote be taken.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, will the Senate advise and consent to this nomination? (putting the question) The "ayes" appear to have it; and the "ayes" have it, and the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of this nomination.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

Mr. TADMADGE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield to me?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield to the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. TADMADGE. I thank the Senator from Texas for yielding to me.

Mr. President, I desire to state that I voted against confirmation of the nomination of George M. Johnson, of California, to be a member of the Commission on Civil Rights. I opposed the creation of the Commission. I have opposed confirmation of all nominations of appointees thereto.

It is the opinion of the junior Senator from Georgia that a Commission of this type can only do irreparable harm, and

no good. For that reason, I opposed the creation of the Commission and I opposed confirmation of the nominations of appointees thereto.

Again I thank the Senator from Texas for yielding to me.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BARTLETT in the chair). Does the Senator from Texas yield to the Senator from Mississippi?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, I wish the RECORD to show that I voted against confirmation of the nomination of George M. Johnson, of California, to be a member of the Commission on Civil Rights; and I did so on the same grounds as those outlined just now by the distinguished junior Senator from Georgia [Mr. TADMADGE].

I also wish to state that I thought the nomination would be confirmed by this body by a large majority; and, therefore, I did not ask for a yea-and-nay vote on the question of confirmation of the nomination.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield to me?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield to the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I want to go on record, also, as having voted against confirmation of the nomination of George M. Johnson, of California, to be a member of the Commission on Civil Rights. In the subcommittee, I voted against favorably reporting the nomination; and in the full committee, I voted against favorably reporting the nomination. I want the RECORD to show that today I voted against confirmation of his nomination.

My reasons are as follows: When the Commission members appeared before the subcommittee, we could not get the members of the Commission to which Mr. Johnson has been nominated to come out strongly in favor of having the Commission continue in existence at this time. So, if the Commission is not to continue, certainly there is no need for any additional person to be appointed now to the Commission.

Another reason is that all along I have been opposed to the Commission. Therefore, for that reason, if for no other, I believe I should vote against confirmation of additional appointees to the Commission; and I have voted accordingly.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield to me?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield to the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I want the RECORD to show that I was opposed to confirmation of the nomination of George M. Johnson, of California, to be a member of the Commission on Civil Rights.

I think my position on this question is well known. In my opinion, the Civil Rights Commission is without foundation in the Constitution. In addition, I believe its establishment was both unwise and unnecessary.

I would vote against confirmation of the nomination of any person appointed by the President to be a member of the Civil Rights Commission.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield one-half a minute to me?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I wish the RECORD to show that I voted in favor of confirmation of the nomination of George M. Johnson, of California, to be a member of the Commission on Civil Rights. I am not a member of the Judiciary Committee. But had I been a member of that committee, I would have approved his nomination.

I think this Commission should be in existence, and that it can perform a very valuable function although its record to date has not been very effective. It has been slow in getting started and excessively timid in its actions.

Furthermore, let me state that it gave me a great deal of pleasure to vote in favor of confirmation of the nomination of George M. Johnson, of California, to be a member of the Commission on Civil Rights.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield to me?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield to my friend, the Senator from California.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, it is a pleasure to me to say a few words in support of Dr. George M. Johnson, the nominee of President Eisenhower to be a member of the Commission on Civil Rights.

I have known my fellow Californian's work for many years, particularly his outstanding labors as dean of the Howard University Law School, here in Washington.

Before coming to Washington, Dean Johnson was engaged in the practice of law in Berkeley, Calif., following his graduation from the University of California's College of Arts and Sciences and its school of jurisprudence. Dean Johnson has received the A.B., LL.B., and S.J.D. degrees from the University of California.

His law practice was with a distinguished Californian, Walter A. Gordon, who recently was appointed a Federal judge to the Virgin Islands, and whom I have known for many, many years. Prior to his judicial appointment, Mr. President, Judge Gordon was Governor of the Virgin Islands.

Dean Johnson's legal specialization was in the field of taxation, the course he taught at both the University of California and Howard University.

But he did not permit personal considerations to transcend his sense of responsibility to the public service. During the war, for example, Dean Johnson took leave from the law faculty, to serve as Deputy Chairman and Acting General Counsel of the wartime-created Fair Employment Practices Committee.

He again took leave of the law faculty to which he had returned in 1946, as dean, to serve as Director of the Office of Laws, Plans, and Research, of the Commission on Civil Rights. In recognition of his outstanding work in this

Office, the President recommended Dean Johnson to fill the vacancy created by the untimely death of my good friend, and distinguished American, J. Ernest Wilkins.

One of the finest tributes paid to Dean Johnson was that sent to him by Dean Robert G. Storey, Vice Chairman of the Commission on Civil Rights, dean of the Southern Methodist University Law School, a former member of the Hoover Commission, and a past president of the American Bar Association, who wrote to Dean Johnson as follows:

MY DEAR DEAN JOHNSON: Although I have extended personal congratulations to you upon your nomination as a member of the Civil Rights Commission, I want to record my delight at your appointment.

You are not only eminently qualified by reason of your knowledge, devotion to the sacred principles of our constitutional form of government, and your experience, but what I admire about you is that you are very calm, deliberate, and consider both sides of any question in a very admirable and lawyer-like manner. It has been a pleasure to work with you as one of the leading members of the staff, and I look forward to a pleasant association with you on the Commission.

With every good wish and kindest personal regards, I am,

Very sincerely yours,

ROBERT G. STOREY.

Mr. President, the Commission on Civil Rights is an important segment of the American Government. It cannot effectively discharge the responsibilities Congress gave to it unless it is at full strength. As you, Mr. President, who so devotedly favored the Commission's enactment into law, know well, the Commission is bipartisan. In order to hold hearings, subcommittees are authorized, provided one member is a Democrat and the other is a Republican. At present, there are three Democrats on the Commission: Former Governor Battle, of Virginia; former Governor Carlton, of Florida; and Dean Storey, of Texas. The Chairman, Dr. Hannah, of Michigan, is the only Republican. Father Hesburgh, the president of Notre Dame, is an Independent. Dean Johnson would be the second Republican member on the Commission.

It should be noted that J. Ernest Wilkins, a former Republican member of the Commission, died on January 19, 1959. Dean Johnson's nomination was sent to the Senate on March 10, and hearings on the nomination were held on April 21 before the Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights of the Senate Judiciary Committee. On May 19, the Senate Judiciary Committee reported that the committee voted 11 to 4 to approve the nomination of Dean Johnson; and on May 20, 1959, the nomination was placed on the Executive Calendar.

Mr. President, I am delighted that no one has raised the slightest question regarding the character, the ability, or the integrity of the nominee.

I believe that the President of the United States merits congratulations for his nomination of Dean Johnson; and I am delighted that his nomination has been confirmed by the Senate.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield to me?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, it was a privilege to me to be able to support in the Committee on the Judiciary, and also, to support and to vote for, in this Chamber, the President's nomination of Dean George M. Johnson, of California, to be a member of the Commission on Civil Rights.

With the establishment of the Commission on Civil Rights, the Congress of the United States for the first time created an independent, bipartisan agency to study and think about the great problem of protecting the civil rights of all Americans. In selecting the members of the Commission, the President chose men from different parties, different regions, different religious groups, and different races. Three of the six members came from the South and Southwest; three came from the North and Middle West. Three were educators: The president of Michigan State University, John Hannah; the president of Notre Dame, Father Theodore Hesburgh; and the dean of the Southern Methodist University Law School, Robert Storey. Three were lawyers experienced in government: Former Gov. John Battle, of Virginia; former Gov. Doyle Carlton, of Florida; and J. Ernest Wilkins, Assistant Secretary of Labor. The conditions were set for fruitful deliberations by reasonable men.

The death, last January 19, of Mr. Wilkins was a great loss to the Commission. His careful questioning of witnesses in the Commission's hearing, last November, on alleged denials of the right to vote in Alabama, had won the respect of the country. As former president of the Cook County Bar Association, not only was he a strong representative of Negro-American citizens, but he was also an outstanding member of the legal profession.

Now, with the nomination of Dean Johnson, who is both an educator and a lawyer, the vital work expected of the Commission can continue with full vigor. As dean of Howard University Law School from 1946 until he resigned last year, to become Director of the Office of Laws, Plans, and Research, of the Commission on Civil Rights, he made a great contribution to legal education. Under his leadership, the law curriculum was expanded, the Howard Law Journal was inaugurated, Howard students began participating, and with distinction, in the Inter-Law School Moot Court competition; the student organization joined the American Student Bar Association; a modern, \$2 million law school building was erected and dedicated; and the school reached a new level of achievement. During this time, he was a teacher, as well as dean.

Dean Johnson has an outstanding academic and professional background. He received his LL.B. degree from the University of California, at Berkeley, in 1929, and was awarded the Sheffield-Sanborn Scholarship for graduate study.

For his work in taxation, the University of California awarded him the J.S.D. degree, the highest academic degree in the legal profession. He practiced law in California, and served as an attorney for the California State Board of Equalization. In 1936, he became the senior assistant tax counsel to the board. In 1941, after teaching a year at Howard Law School, he took leave, to serve with the President's Committee on Fair Employment Practice. By 1945, when he returned to teach at Howard, he was serving as Acting General Counsel of the F.E.P.C.

I emphasize his work as a lawyer, because the problem of civil rights is one aspect of the rule of law, the great principle on which this Republic is founded. I was happy to read Dean Johnson's brief remarks before the Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights. He said that "as a lawyer, as an American, and as a representative of America's largest racial minority, I am of the opinion that this problem can be solved within our democratic processes and under the rule of law."

It was in part his deep devotion to our fundamental legal processes that earned him the respect of his colleagues on the Commission. The staff director of the Commission, Gordon Tiffany, testified that he spoke in support of Dean Johnson's nomination on behalf of the entire staff and all the members of the Commission. Father Hesburgh, the president of Notre Dame, telegraphed to the committee that "All of us who have worked with him have a high regard for his character, intelligence, and judgment." Former Governor Carlton, of Florida, also sent a telegram in support of this nomination. Dean Storey, the former president of the American Bar Association, and the vice chairman of the Commission, wrote that Dean Johnson was "eminently qualified by reason of his knowledge, devotion to the sacred principles of our constitutional form of Government, and his experience," adding that what he admired about Dean Johnson was that he was "very calm and deliberate and considered both sides of any question in a very admirable and lawyer-like manner."

Thus, this is a good and important nomination which should receive not only our consent, but our enthusiastic approval. Here is a man, eminent in his profession, a leader among Negro Americans, who enjoys the respect of the men with whom he is going to work. What could have been an irreparable loss to the Commission is made up in the only way it could have been made up by the appointment of one who has been intimately familiar with the Commission's work from the beginning. Dean Johnson will not need to try to catch up with his colleagues. He has been directing their legal office since the Commission first went into action. He has helped plan or has participated in all of their hearings. He has studied all the documents. It is obvious he has had excellent on-the-job training for the important post for which he has been nominated.

Mr. President, I hope we shall not be forced to fight the civil-rights battle all over again, every time one of these nominations comes up.

The majority of the Congress spoke on the subject when we enacted the Civil Rights Act of 1957. While much more remains to be done in this field, there is no justification for undermining the laws which already have received approval.

The Civil Rights Commission is required to study and appraise the policies of the Federal Government with respect to equal protection of the laws under the Constitution, and to investigate allegations that citizens of the United States are being deprived of their right to vote. The act explicitly requires that the Commission submit to the President and to the Congress a final and comprehensive report of its activities. Under the terms of the present law, this report must be filed in September of this year. It is of vital importance that this date be extended, since delays in organizing the Commission and the obstructionist tactics with which it has been faced since it began its operations, have substantially impeded its work. We would be doing a great disservice to the people of the country if we adjourned this session of Congress without taking action to extend the life of the Commission and, in other ways, further to protect the civil rights of the people.

Regardless of one's views as to the merits of the Commission, however, I believe it is incumbent upon all Senators to judge nominations to the Commission on the basis of the qualifications of the nominees. The Senate's power to give its advice and consent with respect to nominations should not be utilized as a means of preventing the President from doing his duty to execute the law. Any such course would be an abuse of our powers, and would weaken public confidence in the work of this body. We would certainly strenuously object if the President, after the passage of a law, refused to take whatever action was necessary to implement its provisions. Any such action by the President would violate his duty under the Constitution. It would be no less a violation of constitutional requirements for the Senate to attempt to make it impossible for a willing President to carry out his responsibilities.

Mr. President, I am hopeful that the nomination will receive the overwhelming approval of the Senate. I am eagerly looking forward to the report that the Commission will soon submit to the President and to the Congress. I know that the quality of that report will be enhanced by the contribution which Dean Johnson will be able to make as a full member of the Commission. I strongly urge the support of every Member of this excellent appointment.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President—

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield to the Senator from New York. But before I do so, I should like to inform the Senate that we expect to have the Senate proceed in a very few minutes to consideration of the nomination of Ogden Rogers Reid, of New York, to be Amba-

sador to Israel. I do not expect that a yea-and-nay vote will be taken on the question of confirmation of that nomination. So if Senators will remain on the floor, perhaps it will be possible for the Senate to take action on that nomination this afternoon.

I yield now to the Senator from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I shall be very brief.

I identify myself with the views of my colleague from New York [Mr. KEATING] and the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL].

I know personally about the excellent service of Dr. Johnson as Dean of Howard University Law School. The senior Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL] and my colleague, the Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING], and I supported the nomination of Dean Johnson to be a member of the Civil Rights Commission. I believe Dean Johnson will make a splendid member of the Commission; and I have been glad to vote today for confirmation of his nomination.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield to me?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the senior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN] asks that he be recorded against the Johnson nomination, just as he has voted against all nominations to the Commission, because he is opposed to the Commission itself.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield to me?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I wish to make a brief statement; I favored confirmation of the nomination of George M. Johnson, of California, to be a member of the Commission on Civil Rights; and I voted for confirmation of his nomination. I join my friend, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], in favoring the appointment of Mr. Johnson to the Commission on Civil Rights.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a statement by me in connection with the nomination of George M. Johnson, of California, to be a member of the Commission on Civil Rights.

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR COOPER

It was a privilege to support and cast my vote for the Honorable George M. Johnson, of California, to be a member of the Commission on Civil Rights.

I have met Mr. Johnson, and from every report I have had of his character, his experience, and his large abilities I am sure that he is eminently qualified to be a member of the Commission on Civil Rights.

A few weeks ago I had the honor of taking part in a symposium at the University of Notre Dame dealing with the various aspects and problems arising under the Brown decision of the Supreme Court of the United States, a decision which I support. At the meeting I met many of Mr. Johnson's colleagues in law, education, and other fields, who spoke of him with respect and admiration.

The Commission on Civil Rights is doing a necessary and fine work. Its life should be extended. I am sure Dean George Johnson will make an able and distinguished member of the Commission.

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to consider the nomination of Ogden Rogers Reid, of New York, to be Ambassador to Israel.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The nomination will be stated.

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Ogden Rogers Reid, of New York, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Israel.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senate will proceed to the consideration of the nomination.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President—Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT].

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I wish to say a few words about the nomination of Mr. Ogden Reid to be our Ambassador to Israel. The vote in the committee was 10 in favor of confirmation, and 4 against. I voted against the nomination.

I deeply regret having to differ with the judgment of a majority of my colleagues on the Committee on Foreign Relations. It is only because this matter is of great importance to the future security of our country that I feel compelled to draw attention, in a public statement, to this difference of view.

One source of serious danger to our security is to be found in the explosive and unstable conditions prevailing in the Middle East. To send an untried and inexperienced representative to this area is, I believe, improvident and irresponsible.

Early in February, I wrote to the Department of State, and indicated that henceforth the Committee on Foreign Relations would examine more closely than it had in the past the qualifications of all ambassadorial nominees. If the Senate is to discharge its responsibilities under the Constitution, it must, in my view, satisfy itself that the Ambassadors whose nominations to sensitive overseas posts it confirms are fully competent to discharge their duties. This concern of mine is neither recent, nor superficial, nor partisan in spirit. Since 1945, when I opposed confirmation of the nomination of a Democrat who had been nominated to be a delegate to the United Nations, I have stated and restated this concern so many times—and to so little apparent effect—that I feared I was growing tiresome to my colleagues on the subject.

The nomination of Mr. Ogden Reid has, if anything, strengthened my conviction that posts such as the one to which Mr. Reid has been nominated should be filled by the most able career men, or by exceptionally qualified non-career appointees. I should add parenthetically that I have been fortified by a heavy volume of mail supporting this

view. In a statement made at the beginning of this hearing, I said:

In every part of the world we are struggling in one way or another against the ever growing strength of Sino-Soviet expansionism. This struggle must be directed by people who, whether career or non-career, are qualified by experience and competence. The Middle East, as we have seen, is an especially troublesome area, more given to shifting political passions and outright violence than any other.

I also said:

There is a presumption that career foreign service officers nominated for ambassadorial posts are qualified. There is, however, I believe, no such presumption, especially in diplomatic circles, that non-career nominees are qualified to serve the Nation in ambassadorial posts.

Let me add that both viewpoints are certainly rebuttable. However, the burden on non-career people is to prove to the committee that they are qualified. This can be done. It has been done. We have had some extremely able non-career Ambassadors from both political parties, including such individuals as David Bruce, Douglas Dillon, John Sherman Cooper, and Chester Bowles. We have had some other individuals who have not always served the best interests of our country.

The issue before the Senate in acting on the nomination of Mr. Reid to be Ambassador to Israel clearly turns on the question of his qualifications. The nominee is 33 years old. He has had no diplomatic experience. He has no special knowledge of the area that might have been gained either by special study or by visiting and living in the Middle East. Indeed, he has never been either to Israel or to any of the countries in the Middle East. Given the opportunities he has had to travel anywhere he chose, this indicates a lack of any compelling interest on his part in this area of the world.

I am at a loss to know why the President should have selected Mr. Reid for this extremely challenging, highly sensitive job. Perhaps it is because he became president and editor of a large newspaper at the age of 29. However, as my colleagues all must know, this was a family enterprise, which Mr. Reid joined immediately after graduating with some difficulty from Yale University. Mr. Reid did not in any sense work his way up. And the nomination can hardly be attributed to his success as executive director of the Herald Tribune.

In his letter justifying this appointment, Secretary Herter noted that Mr. Reid has been a member of the first Hoover Commission and a staff member of the Committee on the National Security Organization. Actually, these were one and the same and amounted to a 6-week summer-vacation job, secured for Mr. Reid, while he was still a student at Yale, by a family friend.

The central issue here is that of qualifications. One qualification for a position of this kind is a sensitiveness to what is appropriate to any given set of circumstances. It seems to me that Mr. Reid demonstrated that he lacks such sensitiveness in trying to influence the Senate's decision regarding his appointment by calling upon nine Senators, and by having friends telephone or call on other Senators, including me. This is the first case of an ambassadorial nominee soliciting approval of his own ap-

pointment that has come to my attention. I realize any Senator has a right to see or not to see nominees for ambassadorial posts. I suggest, however, that the purpose of committee consideration of nominees is to measure the qualifications and character of nominees objectively, in the environment of a public hearing. This purpose is frustrated if nominees seek personally to lobby for their confirmation.

The record of the hearing shows Mr. Reid to have been less than forthright in many of his answers. On pages 67 and 68, for example, I asked him about his relationship with General Trujillo. In his first answer, Mr. Reid conceded visiting Trujillo, but added that he left with the impression that his newspaper should not print a special section devoted to the Dominican Republic and that "we did not do so."

This was either 1956 or 1957, according to Mr. Reid. However, the Herald Tribune did print a special section in June of 1958, which Mr. Reid did not acknowledge until I raised the question again. Asked why he had tried to leave a false impression on the record, Mr. Reid answered:

Well, I don't think the one that was published should have been published, but it was.

In conclusion, I deeply regret that a majority of the Committee on Foreign Relations has voted to approve this nomination. A few weeks ago I hoped—perhaps I partly hoped and partly believed—that at long last the Senate had awakened to the need for having experienced, first-rate people in our first line of defense. For all its faults, a book called "The Ugly American" has surely awakened a great many of the American people to this need. And recently, I have heard this book discussed by many Senators.

Yet now I must conclude that, while we may be in the process of absorbing the quite unoriginal message contained in this book, apparently we are still not ready to apply the lesson. It seems we must endure still more unqualified people demanding diplomatic jobs, and still further attrition of Foreign Service morale before we finally act. Perhaps it will take a really dramatic failure to dramatize our responsibility under the advice and consent clause of the Constitution.

I shall conclude by quoting a few paragraphs of a letter written, by a former Ambassador, to the New York Times not long ago:

The U.S. Senate itself should also take more seriously its constitutional responsibilities to give its advice as well as its consent when the President presents it with an ambassadorial nominee.

The cavalier notion, that despite personal objection it is the duty of the Senate to ratify all nominations, regardless of their logic or absurdity, is counter to the public interest and a trespass on the spirit, if not the letter of the Constitution.

It is clearly the duty of the President, as well as the Congress, to always keep it in mind that the appointment of Ambassadors should be regarded with the same concern as the appointment of commanding generals for theaters of military operations.

Military generalships swing into operation only after ambassadorships fail.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I am not a member of the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate, but the nomination before the Senate presents clearly to me a matter about which I have thought for some years. We know not only that world conditions are now unsettled and uncertain, but I think they will be for years to come; and this country is certainly called upon to play a leading role in world affairs.

We are spending more than \$40 billion a year on a worldwide military program. As a member of the Committee on Armed Services, I am necessarily thrown into close contact with that program year after year. We must continue this military preparedness. However, it seems to me we are doing far too little in trying to build up our foreign service, our diplomatic corps.

After all, I believe our success in this field and in related fields as well as in trade relations, is where hope lies.

This is not simply a theory with me. As I have visited a few foreign countries, I have tried to view things with this thought in mind. I have had a growing realization of what our diplomatic corps and Foreign Service personnel are up against. I have had a growing realization of how highly important it is to have experienced and trained men in those important positions.

On occasion I have discussed this matter with the Senator from Arkansas for a period of some 2 years. I do not refer to the particular nomination before the Senate, but to the general subject matter. Especially after my experiences last fall, I made up my mind it was my duty as a Senator to try to do something, at least, to support the idea of providing a professionally trained and experienced Foreign Service and diplomatic corps, as an inducement to men of talent and character to devote their lives to such careers. We shall have a growing need for men of training and experience in this increasingly important role.

I briefly discussed this general subject with an Ambassador to our Nation a few days ago. He told me of his experiences in various areas of the world and how unthinkable it would be to him to be assigned to some country as a top level diplomat if he had not served there, or near there, in former years and had experience to back him up.

I am really not passing upon Mr. Reid as an individual. I do not know him. I know nothing about him except in a general way. My vote against the confirmation of his nomination will be no reflection on his character, on his integrity, on his general capacity or on his ability. I have decided that it is my duty, as one Member of the Senate, to vote for, or use my influence, for those who serve in the diplomatic corps as a career and who have the background and experience I have briefly outlined. This is not a rigid rule of course, and highly exceptional cases should doubtless be made an exception.

Under my responsibility and because of that idea I shall cast my vote against the confirmation of the nominee.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I had not intended to discuss this nomination on the floor of the Senate until I heard the speeches just made by the Senator from Arkansas and by the Senator from Mississippi.

I discussed the nomination in the Committee on Foreign Relations, both in the public hearings and in executive session. I made the motion in the committee to report the nomination favorably to the Senate. In view of my participation in the committee, in the discussion of this nomination, I think I owe it to the record to make some brief remarks.

Mr. President, first, I desire to raise what seems to be a very important constitutional question which is involved in connection with this nomination and all other nominations. We are exercising our constitutional duty as a Senate this afternoon, with respect to this nomination, as we do with respect to others, under the advice and consent clause of the Constitution.

I have been heard to say, but I think it needs repeating, that the advice-and-consent clause of the Constitution does not give the Senate power of appointment. If the Constitutional Fathers had so intended, they would have used, not language of limitation in the Constitution in regard to the function of the Senate in connection with nominations, but broader language conferring the power to appoint. The Constitutional Fathers did not so do. They gave the power of appointment to the President of the United States, with the advice and consent of the Senate. The advice-and-consent language, I respectfully submit as a lawyer, is what we call language of limitation.

As we study the constitutional history of the President's power of appointment, including the debates in the Senate of the United States with respect to the application of the advice-and-consent clause, I think it is perfectly clear it was intended that the President should have not only the power of appointment but that the presumption was in favor of his selection. However, it is a rebuttable presumption. The President's appointment should be accepted by the Senate unless it can be shown, in the case of an individual nominee, that the nominee fails to meet one or more of the historic criteria which the Senate has applied throughout its history in respect to a given nominee.

I have never varied from those criteria, Mr. President since 1945, when the first debate on a nomination in which I participated, under the advice-and-consent clause, was conducted by the Senate; namely, in regard to the nomination of Henry Wallace to be Secretary of Commerce. At that time I did my best to make a study of all the nomination controversies in the history of the Senate on which there was any written record available.

My first major speech in the Senate was in regard to those criteria. As I have said many times and as I said in the committee in respect to this particular nomination—and I think it needs to be restated—the history of the advice-and-consent clause shows that the

criteria are as follows: First, character and mental soundness; second, freedom from conflict of interest; third, loyalty to our form of government; fourth, general competency to perform the tasks of the particular assignment for which the President has made the appointment.

In regard to Ambassadors, Mr. President, there is not a word in the Constitution to the effect that the President must select his ambassadorial nominees from the Foreign Service or the so-called career service. If that had been the intention of the constitutional fathers, they could have so stated.

I do not think this is the time or the place to engage in a legal argument whether we would have the legislative authority to lay down such a criterion, although I wish to say, in my judgment, we would not have such authority. To the contrary, the writers of the Constitution provided that the President should make the appointments, and they did not place any such limitation upon a President of the United States.

Alexander Hamilton, in Federalist Paper No. 76, as I recall, discussed this question somewhat. He pointed out that the advice-and-consent clause was written into the Constitution as a check upon the President, but only as a check, and only, I respectfully submit, Mr. President, in connection with the applicable rebuttable presumption.

In my service in the Senate since President Eisenhower has been President, I think the RECORD will show I have supported 98 percent or more of his nominations, because I believe that those nominations have met the four historic criteria I have just related.

I remember that not so many years ago—I think it was in 1955—there was a very interesting debate on the floor of the Senate with regard to a nomination by the President of the United States to the position of Chief of the Bureau of Locomotive Inspection. It seemed to me at the time that some partisan considerations were being given weight in that debate. The RECORD will show that I sought to find out in what respect that particular nominee did not meet one or more of these historic criteria. When the roll was called—I think the final vote was 43 to 41, with the nominee confirmed by a 2-vote majority—I was one of those on this side of the aisle who voted for confirmation, because I found nothing in the debate which disqualified the nominee under the advice-and-consent clause, in the light of the criteria to which I have referred.

Applying that principle to the specific case before us, I do not know of a single one of the four criteria which this nominee does not fulfill. There is no question about his character and mental soundness; at least I have heard no question raised in that respect. Certainly there is no question as to his loyalty to our form of government. There is not a scintilla of evidence in the record which would reflect upon him so far as the conflict-of-interest criterion is concerned.

When we come to the question of general competency, sincere men may differ on that qualitative judgment. I came to the hearing when Mr. Reid was under

examination by the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT]. I thought it was a very fair, thorough, penetrating, and able examination to which the Senator from Arkansas subjected the nominee. I sat there in judgment, as one does when given that high trust, and I listened to the nominee. I thought he did a remarkably fine job of forthright, frank, intellectually honest response to the questions put to him by the Senator from Arkansas.

I know that when an interrogator has a witness before him, and he proceeds to ask him a great many questions about events which occurred several years before in his life, as was the case with regard to this questioning, he cannot have at the tip of his tongue an immediate answer to every question. Nor can it be expected that he will answer every question with complete accuracy. But if a witness does not accurately recall some detail of some event in his life which may be involved in a question, or if it becomes necessary to refresh his recollection in regard to some detail, that does not make him a dishonest witness. That does not make him a less-than-frank witness. I was sitting there weighing this witness' answers to the questions in order to form an impression as to the intellectual honesty of the witness. I was delighted with his forthrightness, and with what I thought was obvious intellectual honesty.

Moreover, I was well impressed with the general competence of the witness. We cannot ask the President, no matter how much we favor the selection of ambassadors from the career service, to follow such a rule without exception. We have no right to say to the President, "Unless you appoint someone from the career service we will not vote for him." We have no right to do that, so far as the duty imposed upon us under the advice-and-consent clause of the Constitution is concerned, because the President is under no such constitutional mandate.

But let us face the question as to whether or not the President of the United States should be required to follow such a rule, or whether we should lay down such a rule as a Senate-imposed requirement on the President of the United States, even if we had the constitutional authority to do so—and I deny that we have such authority. Would we then be following a course of action necessarily in the public interest? I deny it, because, as I said in the committee, the principle of checks under our Constitution is the great balance wheel of democratic government.

I think it would be a great mistake, even if we were to look at this question from the standpoint of a check on the Foreign Service, to have a rule that only career diplomats could be appointed to ambassadorial posts. I believe that a President of the United States, carrying out his Executive duties and powers, ought to have, as the Constitution gives to him, the right to select a person for an ambassadorial post who he thinks is particularly desirable for the particular post at the particular time.

When we check that rebuttable presumption against the criteria which have

generally been followed in the history of the United States, I think the record is clear. Some names have been mentioned this afternoon, and I should like to mention them again, because some of them were mentioned in the committee. I think the record is clear that some selections of so-called political appointees by our President in times past have been very wise. Sitting as a member of this body today, as I mentioned in the Foreign Relations Committee, and have mentioned elsewhere, is one of the great Ambassadors of our time, John Sherman Cooper, of Kentucky, who was appointed as Ambassador to India. I thought it was an excellent appointment. But it certainly was not an appointment based upon selecting someone from the career service.

There is in Russia at the present time, on a sort of roving correspondent mission, another great American who was appointed as Ambassador to Russia at one time. I refer to Averell Harriman. He was not selected from the diplomatic career service, but he made a great record as Ambassador to Russia, and later as Ambassador to the Court of St. James.

I cite also the example of Chester Bowles, who served as Ambassador to India. Throughout our history we have had a series of very able men and women who have served in ambassadorial posts. I think it would be a great mistake to impose upon this President, or any other President, a restriction that, unless a person has been selected from the career service, his nomination shall not be confirmed by the Senate. I think we have done all we should do as a Foreign Relations Committee. We have notified the State Department—and I have shared in that notification—that we think it is good policy, as a general rule, to make nominations for ambassadorships from the career service. But we do not believe that such a rule should be exclusive. I think it would be a mistake to adopt any such restrictive rule.

So for many reasons, and for one which I wish to stress, I do not believe that it would be in the best interest of the Foreign Service to have a rule that only persons in the career service should be selected as Ambassadors. I think that such a rule would destroy a very much needed check on the career service itself.

I believe it is good for the career service to know that the President has the right to go outside that service in selecting ambassadors.

Thus, in closing my remarks, I wish to say, as I check off each one of these criteria, I reach the value judgment that Mr. Reid meets all of these criteria. Therefore, he is entitled to have his nomination confirmed, and I hope it will be confirmed. He is certainly deserving of the motion I made in committee that his nomination be favorably reported to the Senate.

Particularly in view of the fact that I have been involved in what I consider to be some controversial nominations, in which the nominee has not met all these tests, I am pleased to stand on the floor this afternoon and support this nomination of President Eisenhower, because

I believe it to be a qualified and good nomination.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, the task of each Senator in determining whether or not to give his individual advice and consent to the nomination for an ambassadorial post is a heavy one, and our collective responsibility is also heavy.

I do not share some of the views expressed by my good friend from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], who has just spoken. I shall, nonetheless, support the nominee in the vote, which will shortly take place. I see no great constitutional questions involved. To me, it is clear that the Senate's duty is to weigh each nominee carefully, testing him or her, as the case may be, by the normal standards of competency, and to render our vote accordingly.

No one, so far as I know, has suggested that nominations should be confined to the Foreign Service. It is good that they should not be.

I believe that the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations was quite correct when he said that if a nominee is proposed by the President of the United States who is not in the Foreign Service, there should be, if not a presumption that he is not qualified, at the very least the burden of going ahead with evidence to show that he is qualified. I believe that every nominee who is not in the Foreign Service should meet the burden of going ahead with such evidence, if he is to be confirmed by the Senate.

I ask unanimous consent to place in the RECORD at this point in my remarks, two letters, the first dated April 3, 1957, from the former distinguished chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], and presently the chairman emeritus of that committee, to Secretary Dulles; the second, a letter dated February 5, 1959, to Secretary Dulles, signed by the present distinguished chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT]. These letters appear at pages 4 and 6 of the hearings with respect to this nomination.

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

APRIL 3, 1957.

The SECRETARY OF STATE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SECRETARY DULLES: I desire to express to you in a completely nonpartisan spirit my deep concern about ambassadorial appointments.

In view of the heavy responsibilities of the United States throughout the world and the importance to us of relations with other countries, we should have first-rate ambassadors in every post. We choose ambassadors both from the ranks of the career service and from outside the Government service, and the benefits of this practice can be readily demonstrated. We should not, however, accept the conclusion that some years of satisfactory service either in the Foreign Service, or in some nongovernmental activity, automatically qualify a man to be a good ambassador. The test in every case should be whether a nominee for a particular post is the American who can best serve the interests of this country there.

There are special problems arising from the fact that certain posts are very expensive. I am glad to have the Department's

letter of March 6, 1957, stating that a study of the matter is under way. The Committee on Foreign Relations will no doubt give sympathetic consideration to such recommendations as you may make.

It is generally known that Presidents and Secretaries of State of both political parties have been under pressure from those who feel that an ambassadorship is a reward for past service or help. In my opinion, we can no longer afford to give away to such pressure in appointment making.

The Committee on Foreign Relations has always recognized the primary responsibility of the Executive in making such appointments and has been reluctant to refuse consent to a nomination unless there is an obvious reason to do so. The committee has on occasions given the benefit of the doubt to nominees. It seems to me, however, an insufficient reason that there is no real objection to the nomination; there should also be an affirmative reason for it—namely, that the nominee has outstanding qualifications for the position. It should be obvious in each case, whether the nominee is a career man or not, that his record, his intelligence, his background and his attitude are such that he will ably serve our country in his assignment.

I have made this letter the subject of discussion in executive session by the Committee on Foreign Relations and it represents the consensus of the views of all the members of the committee.

Sincerely yours,

THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN,
Chairman.

FEBRUARY 5, 1959.

The Honorable JOHN FOSTER DULLES,
Secretary of State, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: As you know members of the Committee on Foreign Relations have been concerned for several years that some of our ambassadorial appointments have not been up to the standard that should be maintained if our interests abroad are to be fully promoted. Indeed, on April 3, 1957, Chairman GREEN wrote to you stating:

"In view of the heavy responsibilities of the United States throughout the world and the importance to us of relations with other countries, we should have first-rate ambassadors in every post. * * * The test in every case should be whether a nominee for a particular post is the American who can best serve the interests of this country there. * * *

"It is generally known that Presidents and Secretaries of State of both political parties have been under pressure from those who feel that an ambassadorship is a reward for past service or help. In my opinion, we can no longer afford to give away to such pressure in appointment making.

"It should be obvious in each case, whether the nominee is a career man or not, that his record, his intelligence, his background, and his attitude are such that he will ably serve our country in his assignment."

It has seemed to me that if the committee is properly to exercise its advice and consent function in connection with ambassadorial appointments, it is important that it have not only the usual biographic data and statement regarding security clearances, but that it also receive for its confidential use certain other information which the President must consider prior to filling one of these important posts. Frankly, I do not know precisely what form this information may take. I would assume, however, that prior to submitting such appointments, the Department and the President must have information before them of the kind which would normally be utilized by a corporation—or perhaps a college president—prior to filling important positions. With respect to ambassadorial appointments, for example,

I would think the authorities concerned with the appointments would want to know of the candidate's language ability, his ability as an administrator, his ability to make friends, the nature and depth of his interest in foreign affairs generally, as well as specifically in the country to which he is being sent, the interests which may be brought to bear on him in his post, and similar matters.

Because the President and the Senate share the power to appoint ambassadors, it seems to me that when the Senate confirms a nomination it should have before it the same kind of information which the Executive had in making the nomination. I hope, therefore, that you will be able to supply me with background information on candidates of a more nearly complete nature than has been available to us in the past.

I suggest that such information might be supplied beginning with the nomination of Mr. Reid to be Ambassador to Israel.

Sincerely yours,

J. W. FULBRIGHT.

MR. CLARK. Mr. President, those letters, I believe, lay down the standards which should govern the Senate in passing on these nominations. Those standards are high. I believe they should be high. I for one, have, in my brief period of service in the Senate, insisted that the nominees should be thoroughly and competently qualified before my advice and consent as a Member of the Senate is given. I believe firmly that that advice and consent should not be lightly given. Let me say, however, that when all the evidence is in, and when we are at the point of appraising a nominee, if there should be any doubt in a Senator's mind, he should resolve the doubt in favor of the nominee of the President. That is what I, for one, will do. Certainly, under such circumstances the President is entitled to have the nomination confirmed.

My list of qualifications which a nominee should meet is perhaps substantially the same as that of my friend from Oregon, but I would put it a little differently. The first is: Has the nominee's integrity been called into question? Second, has he demonstrated in his life and in the hearings before the committee emotional stability? Third, is there some evidence, at least, that he has good judgment? Fourth, what is the extent of his experience which would qualify him for a diplomatic post? Fifth, is there anything in his association which would make it inadvisable for him to be sent to a post of responsibility in our Foreign Service?

I have read with great care the testimony which was taken before the Committee on Foreign Relations. I have never met Mr. Reid. I am not a member of the committee. Exercising to the best of my ability the task of determining whether to vote for or against the confirmation of the nomination, I have concluded that there is no creditable evidence which might lead to the conclusion that he is other than a man of integrity. In his conduct before the committee, as I read his testimony, he showed substantial emotional stability under some stress, because, as the Senator from Oregon has said, the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations conducted a very vigorous cross-examination of the nominee. I would say that the nominee handled

himself with judgment. I would say also that there is nothing in his previous career, other than a few boyish pranks when he was in the Army—pranks such as I am sure any one of us in the Senate might easily have indulged in under the same circumstances—which would cause any substantial doubt that Mr. REID is a man of good judgment. His experience, I suggest, is substantially greater than appears from the mere fact that he has never been in the diplomatic service. Beginning at the bottom of page 23 and carrying over to the middle of page 25 of the hearings, is Mr. Reid's own statement as to why he considers himself qualified to fill this post. I ask unanimous consent that that excerpt from Mr. Reid's testimony be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

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

NEWSPAPER EXPERIENCE AS QUALIFICATION FOR POST

MR. REID. Now, with reference to the second question, let me try to answer briefly, not in a rambling fashion, and as seriously as possible.

First of all, my understanding of a diplomat is that he is concerned with reporting the facts in a given country, the state of mind, public opinion, the positions of the various members in this case, of Knesset government, business facts, reporting as accurately as he can to the State Department and to the President.

This suggests, to my mind at least, that a newspaper discipline, precision, and accuracy in reporting, is totally perhaps not irrelevant.

Second, the responsibilities, as I understand it, of an envoy are to calmly, quietly but firmly, represent the policies of this Government, and to clearly and articulately, wisely and judiciously, if you will, with a sense of timing and perception, present these views to the Government to which he is accredited. Again partly a question of exposition.

Now, you have asked, as I understand it, somewhat more directly what are my qualifications or experiences relative to an extremely important part of the world. What have I been doing these last 6 or 7 years? Why do I have the presumption to believe in the slightest degree that perhaps I could do one or two things that would usefully serve?

PERSONAL RELATIONS WITH HIGH GOVERNMENT OFFICIALS

Here I would like to mention one or two things. I have had occasion during the last month or two to review the Herald Tribune during the last 6 years. I wanted to see that almost on a day-to-day basis there was a heavy news file from the Middle East and frequent editorials, one of which you were kind enough to allude to.

In the European edition of my responsibility when I was there specifically for a year, but in touch with it for a longer period than that, I had personally, relations with a number of principals, the officials, the Foreign Ministers, of the countries of Europe, Middle East, north Africa, over a period of time. I have had some occasion to get to know them as individuals as well as an opportunity to learn something of their public policies and the way in which—the principle and the method in which—these views and principles are presented.

As you perhaps know, the Herald Tribune has, I think, done more than any other paper in connection with special sections. We have done a number on Israel; we have had discussions on other countries in the Middle

East. We have also published special sections on other countries in the Middle East.

These sections dealt with the business facts of life, the opportunities for capital; they did not touch on the political side.

I have had some opportunity, as you know, to see, and upon occasion to try to work closely with some of the senior officials of the United Nations, and I think I know something of their views. This is true also to a limited degree of some of our banking institutions, both of a private and of an international character.

You referred rather specifically, as you remember, to the situation at the time of Suez, and I might add, and I don't think this is breaking any confidence, that I had more than one discussion at that particular juncture with Selwyn Lloyd and Golda Meir about some of the problems and their views at that time.

I also had occasion in trying to formulate with the other senior executives of the paper a policy, as to the paper, on the Middle East at that time; I was in touch not only with the State Department, but with the White House, with Cabot Lodge at the U.N., and others. I have had some occasion, therefore, to follow the development of the policy prior to Suez and post-Suez.

As a matter of fact, I believe I spent the last evening that Sir Anthony Eden was in this country discussing with him some of the problems of the Middle East. That was the time when he was here to see President Eisenhower.

So I have tried for a period of some 6 years or so to talk and principally to listen to the views of the principals responsible not only in the area but to others who have had a collateral or a direct interest in the Middle East.

The paper has long supported the Charter of the United Nations and the principles that it embodies. I went to the 10th anniversary ceremonies in San Francisco, for example, in connection with the U.N., and I have tried to follow their views, the views of Secretary, former Secretary Dulles, President Eisenhower, and as a newspaperman, follow on a day-to-day basis the developments in the area.

But I do feel that having worked somewhat closely with some of these governments, and occasionally discussing matters with them that they felt they had not completely registered with some of the officials in this country, I believe I have had some slight opportunity to know their views, their principles, and their high purposes.

I have valued that opportunity; I have tried to absorb it. We have tried to bring some of that thinking to bear in editorials, in news stories and in special sections, and rather continual visits with these individuals or through the medium of the telephone.

Mr. CLARK. On the basis of that statement, I have concluded that Mr. Reid meets the tests which I have laid down as the criteria in determining whether his nomination should be confirmed.

As I look at the final test, that of association, it occurs to me that this gentleman is obviously a member of the political party which is opposite mine. He is a member of a wealthy family. He is from New York, and he has conducted for many years a strongly Republican newspaper. These do not seem to me to be disqualifications which would overcome the presumption in favor of the nominee whose nomination I believe, in the last analysis, the President is entitled to have confirmed. While I do not believe that, if I had the difficult task of making such a selection, I would

have selected Mr. Reid as my nominee, I believe the President of the United States was well within his rights, considering his political philosophy, and the fact that the President has been elected twice to high office by the people of the United States. Accordingly I shall support the nomination.

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

Mr. CLARK. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator from Pennsylvania is familiar with Gilbert and Sullivan. I wonder if he remembers the line from one of the Gilbert and Sullivan operas which runs like this:

Hearts just as pure and fair
May beat in Belgrave Square
As in the lowly air of Seven Dials.

Mr. CLARK. The Senator's quotation from Gilbert and Sullivan rings a familiar bell with me. I should like to add that merely because he is a man who happens to have attended an Ivy League college does not mean that he is disqualified to be an Ambassador or a Member of the Senate.

Mr. DOUGLAS. It is probably something against him, but it can be lived down.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, it is seldom I disagree with the very able chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations. There is no one in whose capacity and integrity I have more confidence. I would rather hear his opinions with respect to our foreign policy than those of any Member of Congress or this administration.

In this case, however, I am forced to disagree with him. I believe that Ogden Reid will make a good Ambassador. I have known Mr. Reid for many years. He is a man of character and of great energy, and is a dedicated patriot. I hope the Senate will confirm his nomination.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, Ogden R. Reid, although a comparatively young man, has had an extraordinarily broad experience in the field of international relations and in the business world as well. He strikes me as being uniquely qualified to be U.S. Ambassador to Israel.

For 6 years he directed the production of the New York Herald Tribune's European edition, which circulated to 70 countries, and during that time he lived, for the most part, in France. He is personally acquainted with the leading political and governmental figures of virtually all the principal countries of Europe and the Middle East.

Mr. Reid's nomination to be Ambassador to Israel has been extremely well received in Israel. The fact that he is young has not been regarded as any bar, for Israel is a young country, with new and fresh ideas; Israel will welcome a young man with new and fresh ideas. Moreover, it might be pointed out that Abba Eban, the Israeli Ambassador to the United States who was such a success in this important post, was only 33 years of age when he came to this country as Ambassador—and this happens also to be the present age of Mr. Reid.

Mr. Reid was elected president of the New York Herald Tribune in 1955 and served in this capacity until the end of 1958. He has served as a Director of the Panama Canal Company, the Massachusetts Mutual Life Insurance Co., and of Loew's, Inc., serving as chairman of the executive committee of Loew's.

In that connection, I have received, upon my inquiry, a letter from the president of the Massachusetts Mutual Life Insurance Co., Mr. Leland J. Kalmbach, in which he comments upon the services of Mr. Reid upon the board of that company. Mr. Kalmbach points out that in his business relationships with the New York Herald Tribune, he became well acquainted with Mr. Reid and soon became very favorably impressed with his judgment, his objective thinking, and his inquiring mind. Mr. Kalmbach then said:

During the period in which Mr. Reid has served on our board, my respect for him has continued to increase.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the entire letter from Mr. Kalmbach may be printed at the conclusion of my remarks.

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

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, both Mr. Reid and his charming wife are studying Hebrew. I might note that neither of our two previous career Ambassadors to Israel spoke the language. Both the Reids are fluent in French. I may observe that Mrs. Reid, a Phi Beta Kappa who was graduated from Barnard College summa cum laude, would certainly be a considerable asset to the United States in this post.

The point has been made that Mr. Reid is not a career diplomat. Our career foreign service usually, although not always, gives us much cause for pride. A career diplomat is not automatically a genius; some of ours have been pretty awful stuffed shirts and dunderheads. Political appointments have included some horrible mistakes, too, both in this administration and in previous administrations, as well. The principal point I wish to make is that noncareer appointees are not necessarily bad, career appointees are not necessarily good, and in both cases, vice versa. The point is that we must decide whether a nominee's previous experience has helped to fit him for the post to which he is nominated.

Mr. President, I submit that extensive newspaper experience, both domestic and international, certainly does help to equip a man for a role in diplomacy, particularly when that man is vigorous, attractive, and extremely able to get along well with all sorts of people.

A diplomat is concerned with reporting the facts in a given country, and with communicating accurately and fully, to the State Department and the President, the events, state of mind, and coming events which would have a significant bearing upon this Nation's relations with the nation to which the diplomat is accredited.

Further, a diplomat must represent the views and policies of his own coun-

try; he must communicate them to the government to which he is accredited, and insofar as he can properly do so, to the people of the country to which he is accredited.

It seems to me that newspaper experience, and particularly newspaper experience of the far-ranging variety Mr. Reid has been privileged to enjoy, is most excellent training for diplomacy. In fact, I can think of some diplomats I have met who would have benefited considerably from early training in the newspaper business if only for the purpose of enriching their skepticism.

The assertion has been made that Mr. Reid may have some political ambitions which might prompt him to desire this appointment. Mr. Reid has flatly denied that this nomination has anything to do with any domestic political ambitions on his part; in fact, he has stated categorically that he has no political ambitions, and is interested only in serving his country as best he can.

I think the hearings before the Committee on Foreign Relations have demonstrated Mr. Reid's maturity, his judgment, and his calmness under trying conditions. I am entirely satisfied that Mr. Reid would make a most excellent Ambassador to Israel, just as his grandfather was an outstanding Ambassador to the Court of St. James. I hope the Senate will proceed without undue delay to confirm the nomination of Mr. Reid.

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

Mr. KEATING. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. I am very much distressed that the distinguished Senator from New York has brought up the matter of the political ambitions of Mr. Reid. I was in attendance when Mr. Reid appeared before the committee. He made a very fine presentation. As I stated at the time, I think it is fine when a young man has political ambitions. So far as I am concerned, Mr. Reid could be a candidate for Governor of New York, President of the United States, or any other position.

I do not like to have the impression created that in order to be appointed ambassador a young man must promise to forego political ambitions, because I think Mr. Reid is the kind of man of whom all Americans can be proud.

Mr. KEATING. I share the general principles enunciated by the distinguished Senator from North Dakota. However, this argument has been advanced as a reason for not confirming the nomination of Mr. Reid. I have full confidence in Mr. Reid's categorical statement that he does not have any political ambitions to run for any elective office. I cannot change his ambitions.

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

Mr. KEATING. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. If Mr. Reid decides to change his mind, he will not be violating any of the rules or traditions of the Senate.

Mr. KEATING. I entirely agree with the distinguished Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. President, I have in my hand a copy of a letter dated March 28, 1957, sent to Mr. Reid by the President of the United States, long before there was any consideration of Mr. Reid for nomination to an ambassadorial post. At that time Mr. Reid had received the Eternal Light Award. I shall read the letter from the President:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, March 28, 1957.

Mr. OGDEN REID.

DEAR BROWNIE: Both as an American citizen and as the publisher of a great American newspaper, your voice has been eloquently and persuasively raised in the championship of freedom for mankind and in the enunciation of this Republic's role of responsible leadership among the nations that cherish human freedom with justice in a world at peace.

The Eternal Light Award, presented to you by Rabbi Louis Finkelstein, symbolizes in the most worthy fashion the admiration and respect you, though young in years, have already earned by your courage, dedication, and leadership.

With all joined in its presentation to you, I congratulate you and wish you many more years of achievement and fruitful contribution to the enduring good of your city, your country, and the world.

With warm personal regard,

Sincerely,

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

EXHIBIT 1

DEAR SENATOR KEATING: I noted with interest that during the hearing of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on the nomination of Mr. Ogden R. Reid as Ambassador to Israel he was questioned regarding his business connection with the Massachusetts Mutual Life Insurance Co. On the bare possibility that this matter may come up for discussion when Mr. Reid's nomination is considered by the Senate, I am taking the liberty of writing you regarding some of the questions which were raised. You are entirely free to use the statements contained in this letter in any manner which you consider desirable if this question should become an issue.

In 1954 the Massachusetts Mutual granted a mortgage loan on the assets of the New York Herald Tribune in the amount of \$2,250,000, and through regular amortization payments the amount of the loan has been reduced to \$1,478,000. This loan was consummated before Mr. Reid was elected president of the Herald Tribune and before he was elected a member of our board. In view of this business relationship between our two companies, I became well acquainted with Mr. Reid after he was elected the chief executive officer of his company. I soon became very favorably impressed with his judgment, his objective thinking, and his inquiring mind. Also, I felt that the many constructive changes which he brought about in the operations of the Herald Tribune were evidence of good business judgment. In view of my high regard for Mr. Reid, I invited him to become a director of the Massachusetts Mutual after a discussion with the other members of our board; he was elected a director as of January 23, 1957, to fill the vacancy resulting from the death of one of our former directors.

When Mr. John Hay Whitney granted a loan to the Herald Tribune and finally bought stock control, the Massachusetts Mutual directors were not displeased in view of the increase in the value of our collateral. On the other hand, at no time prior to the change in the stock control of the Herald Tribune was I concerned about the adequacy of the collateral back of our mortgage.

During the period in which Mr. Reid has served on our board, my respect for him has continued to increase. He has taken a real interest in the affairs of the company, and he is now a member of the salary committee of the board. He appeared on the program of our latest general agents' convention and the ovation which he received was evidence of the very favorable impression which he has made on the officers of the company and on our entire general agents' organization.

I am sending a similar letter to the Honorable JACOB K. JAVITS.

Sincerely yours,

Leland J. Kalmbach.
LELAND J. KALMBACH.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President—

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from New York. I hope that at the conclusion of his statement and, perhaps, a statement by the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], the Senate will take action on the nomination of Mr. Reid.

I think the Senate is disposed to confirm the nomination of Mr. Reid today, if it is possible to reach, during today's session, a vote on the nomination. The hour is growing rather late, and I would not like to have consideration of the nomination go over until tomorrow, unless that is forced upon us.

I yield now to the Senator from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I shall be brief in commenting on the pending nomination.

The nominee is going to an important country, both in terms of the United States and in terms of the entire free world. Therefore, I believe we should make the record on the nomination as complete as we can within the bounds of reason.

Mr. President, we are a sporting country; and the nominee was given a sporting proposition when he appeared before the committee and was introduced by me and my colleague, Mr. KEATING. That is shown on page 7 of the committee hearing, where the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee is recorded as follows:

The burden on noncareer people is to prove to the committee that they are qualified.

Mr. President, it seems to me that the nominee proved to the committee that he is qualified, because the committee voted 10 to 4 in favor of reporting the nomination favorably to the Senate.

I respect greatly the views of the chairman of the committee. Being an enlightened person, he would be the first, I am sure, to admit, however, that he, too, must be guided by the preponderant view of persons of sound judgment who are competent to hear the facts and to pass on them; and I know the chairman of the committee does take that view.

Mr. President, I have known the nominee a long time, in connection with his work on the New York Herald Tribune. At that time I had no legal connection with the management of that newspaper, although today my law firm does have some legal connection with its management.

I think the nominee has clearly demonstrated, over a considerable period

of years, great ability and entire integrity and very high character.

At the hearings, it was pointed out by my colleague, the Senator from Oregon, that Israel is a young country, and that therefore it is appropriate that a young man with youthful ideas be appointed as our Ambassador to that country.

Mr. President, the refreshing approach of the nominee is shown by the fact that when he was appointed, he began to study the language of the country to which he has been appointed. In fact, the book entitled "The Ugly American" demonstrates that too few of our diplomats speak the language of the country in which they serve.

Furthermore, at the hearings, when they began, it appeared—and the nominee so realized—that a number of the members of the committee might be opposed to confirmation of his nomination—notably among them, my colleague, the Senator from North Carolina. But when the hearings were over, the Senator from North Carolina said he was satisfied that the nominee was qualified for this task.

Furthermore, Mr. President, my colleague, the Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING], has made the point that the nominee will be well received in Israel; in fact, the Ambassador from Israel to our country made a strong point of that fact, before he returned to Israel.

In addition, Mr. President, there is organic in the hearings the fact that the nominee is a serious young man who understands his business. On that point, I should like to make three brief comments.

First, as appears at page 34 of the hearings, the nominee himself stated his conception of the correct definition of an ambassador. It seems to me that he defined it in the finest terms, as we understand the duty of an ambassador-to-be, when he said that an ambassador heads a country's team of experts, and that "it is the ambassador's function to help coordinate some of this thinking."

That is exactly what we have been trying to teach our ambassadors—both career and noncareer.

Furthermore, the nominee picked out the two most signal and important elements of the foreign policy of Israel, as they relate to the United States and the rest of the free world; for example, he pointed out that one of the most needing problems there is that of the Arab refugees. Certainly it is one of the most needing problems in Israel, today, Mr. President; and the nominee has his eye exactly on the right target.

The nominee also pointed out that one of the greatest services which Israel could render, and is rendering, to the free world is in giving technical assistance to a number of other new countries which it believes can, by means of the giving of such technical assistance, be saved for the free world—among them Ghana, Burma, and similar countries in Africa and Asia. Certainly the contribution which Israel is making in that connection is most useful and helpful.

Mr. President, when a young man is able to see as clearly as that his function in connection with his service to our

country, it seems to me that in addition to his other attributes and in addition to his very high level of experience, we must recognize that not only has he shown that he has learned that, but also he has shown that he has learned that lesson very well, indeed.

I deeply hope that his nomination will be confirmed. I believe he will make not only a creditable Ambassador, but also an excitingly helpful and inspiring Ambassador from the United States to Israel. I believe he will serve our cause superbly well, to the satisfaction of all the people of the United States.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President—

Mr. PROXMIER. Mr. President—

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President—

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I wish to yield the floor to the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIER], who has been waiting patiently for a long time.

But, first, I yield briefly to the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING].

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, I shall take only a moment to support most warmly the proposed confirmation of the nomination of Mr. Reid.

I have known the Reid family for many years, and I warmly support confirmation of the nomination.

I have read the record of the hearings. I think the nominee will make an excellent Ambassador. He is not too youthful in age. He has maturity and vision. I think he has shown an admirable attitude by the studies he has made.

I very greatly hope the nomination will be confirmed; and I heartily support confirmation of the nomination.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President—

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I thank the majority leader for yielding to me.

Mr. President, in the case of any nomination before the Senate, my inclination is to go along with the position taken by the committee which has jurisdiction of the nomination. The Members of the Senate who serve on the committee which has jurisdiction over the nomination have far greater knowledge, familiarity, and intimacy with the qualifications of the person nominated than do Members of the Senate who do not serve on the committee.

I followed that particular policy in connection with the nomination of Mrs. Clare Boothe Luce to be our Ambassador to Brazil; and I intend to follow the same policy today, in regard to the nomination of Mr. Reid.

I do not know Mr. Reid personally; but I know his family, and I consider it to be an outstanding family, dedicated to public service of a very high caliber and order.

In this country we have a tradition that journalists and writers who have served as our ambassadors have served illustriously. For example, I have in mind Josephus Daniels and Claude G. Bowers. Both of them were journalists and writers, and both of them were great ambassadors.

I think Ogden R. Reid has the ability to carry on in that tradition, bringing with him, to the post of ambassador, the

attributes of distinguished journalism and literary work.

I intend to vote for confirmation of the nomination of Mr. Reid. I wish him well in his very important responsibilities in Israel, in particular, and in the Middle East, in general.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, it is a privilege to support and to vote for the Honorable Ogden Rogers Reid, of New York, to be Ambassador to Israel. It is not necessary for me to dwell on his qualifications. His testimony in the hearings held by the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations confirmed the intellectual quality and judgment which his career has displayed.

Mr. Reid is the son of distinguished parents and a member of a family which has devoted itself to public service. His mother, Mrs. Ogden Reid, is yet engaged in public service and patriotic work for our country.

Ogden Rogers Reid in his mission to a new but great country, Israel, will serve our country well and will strengthen our friendly relations with Israel.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BARTLETT in the chair). The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to this nomination. [Putting the question.]

The "ayes" appear to have it; and the "ayes" have it; and the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of this nomination.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the nomination of Lewis L. Strauss to be Secretary of Commerce. The report on the nomination will be filed at 8:30 or 9 o'clock this evening. There will be no debate on the nomination today; I expect the further consideration of the nomination to go over until tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the nomination.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

EMILE F. LEVIN

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, the Immigration and Naturalization Service, headed by General Swing, is one of the most efficient of our Government agencies; and one of the most outstanding employees of the Immigration Service is Mr. Emile F. Levin, an investigator in the Boston office.

In April of this year, Mr. Levin won the Service Incentive Award for his work

in connection with the annual alien address program for 1959. I offer for the RECORD the letter to Mr. LeVin from General Swing.

The Commissioner of Immigration is to be congratulated for surrounding himself with men of Mr. LeVin's caliber.

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

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE,
IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION
SERVICE,

Washington, D.C., April 23, 1959.

EMILE F. LEVIN,
Investigator, Immigration and Naturalization
Service,
Boston, Mass.

DEAR SIR: The Service Incentive Awards Committee has recommended that you be granted a cash award of \$100 for your outstanding performance in connection with the annual alien address program for 1959. Enclosed is check, less tax deductions.

I want to take this opportunity to join with the committee in expressing our thanks and appreciation to you for a commendable contribution to the Service.

Sincerely,

J. M. SWING,
Commissioner.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT UNTIL NOON TOMORROW

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its business today, it stand in adjournment until noon, tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President—

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I desire to express to the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE] my appreciation for his cooperation this afternoon. He has waited long and patiently to address the Senate. I now yield the floor to him.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I thank the majority leader.

POSITION OF SENATOR MORSE ON THE NOMINATION OF MRS. CLARE BOOTHE LUCE TO BE AMBASSA- DOR TO BRAZIL

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CLARK in the chair). Does the Senator from Wisconsin yield?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed individually at this point in the RECORD, a series of editorials which support my position on the recent controversy in the Senate on the nomination of Mrs. Clare Boothe Luce.

As my colleagues have undoubtedly noted, Time magazine and some other periodicals, as well as some newspapers, have made a special point of quoting from editorials which opposed my position on the Luce nomination. From reading their writings, one would assume there was no support across the country for my position.

The fact is there was a considerable amount of journalistic support of my

position; and my mail showed an overwhelming support at the grassroots of America.

Therefore, I am requesting that the editorials which I now send to the desk be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

[From the Baker (Oreg.) Record-Courier,
May 7, 1959]

MORSE VICTORY

The resignation of Clare Boothe Luce as Ambassador to Brazil following the furor of her row with the Senate was in the best interest of the country's Latin American policy. This policy at best has not been moving forward in recent years and to have had a weak political appointee in a key spot in our South American corps would have been no good.

The blocking of the Luce ambassadorship is a victory for Senator Morse of Oregon, although partisans may attempt to make personal criticism out of it for the Senator as usual.

Mrs. Luce as well as her publisher husband had a background of inflammatory partisan and foreign affairs statements. Her service, if any, could have been embroiled in distrust both at home and abroad. Furthermore, word from Washington indicates that privately the Senate as a whole is glad she resigned, even though the customary confirmation was voted out of party loyalty and custom. It fell to Senator Morse to interpret this undercurrent and oppose the confirmation. It was indeed a strong argument he had that the woman who said that Roosevelt and this country were responsible for World War II—in a world of power-bound dictators—was not the best Ambassador of the American people abroad. Actually the partisan reactionary, wealthy political appointee would not have been the best spokesman for the heart of America among the good neighbors to the south. Big business and the dollar sign must not determine our foreign policy.

Furthermore, the subcommittee named by the Senate to include Senator Morse as its chairman to handle Latin American affairs could have expected no harmony out of the partisan Mrs. Luce. President Eisenhower should not have disregarded the need for bipartisanship in our foreign affairs in making so crude an appointment.

[From the World, Coos Bay, Oreg., May 2,
1959]

LUCE QUIT IS GOOD FOR ALL

Senator WAYNE MORSE's personal triumph in almost singlehandedly forcing Clare Boothe Luce to give up her ambassadorship to Brazil is a beneficial development. Our envoys overseas, which have always been subject to being made into prizes for political favor, have seldom been as badly used in the appointment of Mrs. Luce as Ambassador to one of America's most critically needed friends, Brazil.

Senator MORSE hung his criticisms of President Eisenhower's appointment on the record of the Time-Life favors, financial and journalistic, to the Republican Party cause, and upon Mrs. Luce's exceedingly wicked, almost traitorous, utterances against the President of the United States when the country was in the grips of a terrible war.

These things were accurately used by MORSE. But what is even more important against Mrs. Luce than the obvious political favor-flavor of the appointment, was the miserable mistakes she made while Ambassador to Italy, by managing to get herself embroiled in Italian politics and, through the extremely poor taste left in the mouths of Italian voters by her antics, getting

enemies of the United States elected by the dozens.

The debate between MORSE and Mrs. Luce eventually sank into name calling and suggestions by each that the other was "emotionally unstable." Mrs. Luce proved her emotional instability by resigning in a pique over MORSE's attacks, even though she had gained substantial Senate confirmation to the post.

But let's not look gift horses in the mouth. At least she will not be Ambassador to Brazil. In that the nations, both the United States and Brazil, are lucky.

[From the Capital Press, Salem, Oreg., May 15, 1959]

PASSING IN REVIEW

(By Dewey Rand)

President Eisenhower said at his news conference this week that he searches for the finest people he can get; people with competence, character, and integrity, for appointment to public office. There is no reason to doubt the President's sincerity in making this statement but his choices, at times, raise a question as to his definition of the words "competence, character, and integrity."

Two of the recent selections of the President illustrate this. These are Mrs. Clare Luce, whom the President named Ambassador to Brazil and who resigned after she was confirmed by the Senate. The other is Lewis L. Strauss, former Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, who is now serving as Secretary of Commerce and whose confirmation is now being debated by the Senate.

The difficulties Mrs. Luce had with Senator WAYNE MORSE and 10 other Senators who opposed her confirmation hardly need reviewing. But lost in the rather sensational uproar the incident produced was the plain and important fact that Mrs. Luce was not particularly competent nor does her character qualify her for an important ambassadorial post. Her integrity was not at issue but if the President claims three requisites, it is reasonable to expect the candidate to have them all.

Strauss, who is now facing the same scrutiny Mrs. Luce experienced, is competent enough but both his character and integrity is being questioned. Strauss has no less power in his corner than had Mrs. Luce who was backed by her husband-owned \$100 million publishing empire of Time, Life, and Fortune, and the President of the United States. Strauss is a multimillionaire banker and operator in the stratosphere of high finance. He is typical of the rich, and sometimes arrogant, men the President admires most and has chosen for so many important posts.

Outside of the millionaire clique surrounding the President, Strauss has won few admirers during his years in Washington. His wealth does not disqualify him for the post of Secretary of Commerce nor does the fact that his popularity is limited. There are, however, a number of things in his record which leave his integrity in doubt. Chief of these is the notorious Dixon-Yates case.

Dixon-Yates has been compared by Washington observers to the Teapot Dome scandal of the Harding administration, and it is generally agreed that Strauss was at the center of the affair. With the full support of the President an attempt was made to give Dixon-Yates a \$100-million-plus power producing plant in the TVA area and a substantial part of the cost would have come from the pocketbooks of the taxpayers.

The Dixon-Yates deal blew up in the President's face when it was discovered that an employee of the banking firm backing the project was also on the Government payroll and holding a position from which he could

influence the enterprise. Strauss, then Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, was holding the key position of power and supported the plan, it is reported, up to the point of deceiving the President. Since the exposure Strauss has claimed executive immunity and has refused invitations to appear before investigating committees.

Dixon-Yates was exposed and averted. But what about the integrity of the key figure in the conspiracy, Strauss? Are his ethics those of a man who should represent the public interest as Secretary of Commerce with control of the many boards and commissions which can, if the Secretary permits them, hand out millions of dollars in valuable concessions?

Admittedly, it is not easy for a President to bring men of competence, character, and integrity into Government service. But President Eisenhower has had more difficulty finding men of integrity than have most of his predecessors. His administration has had more conflict-of-interest scandals than any since Harding or, perhaps, the days of General Grant.

It is understandable that a complete amateur in the political field, as the President was when elected, would find himself betrayed by his appointees when even the most honest and skilled politicians have this experience. But what puzzles the observer is how the President, after 7 years in office and many bitter experiences, would name a man with Strauss' record and, at the same time, talk of character and integrity as though there was no question of Strauss' fitness for this new and high responsibility.

[From the Washington Teamster, May 15, 1959]

WHAT PAPER DO YOU READ?

Through the comments in the liberal, limited circulation magazines on the case of Clare Boothe Luce runs the thought that it would have been better if the matter had never come up. There's no getting around it, though. Mrs. Luce was appointed by the President to go to Brazil as Ambassador; Senator Morse did protest vigorously; she was confirmed; her husband, the publisher of Time magazine, suggested she resign; the President urged her to stay on; but she quit. It was all real as life.

The news magazine owned by Mrs. Luce's husband devoted almost eight columns to her fight, but it still didn't seem to find room for some rather important facts. Although there was room for excerpts from 16 U.S. and Brazilian newspapers, Time couldn't manage to get in some relevant reflections. There was space for criticism of Senator Morse by the New York Times, but not space enough for other observations by columnists in the same paper. We will attempt to overcome that deficiency by advancing those comments here:

Washington Correspondent Russell Baker: "For several years now there have been rumblings from within the Senate about the political character of appointments made in the State Department. . . . The Luce incident, however, was a close brush with disaster. The emotional current produced in the Senate Tuesday afternoon by her gratuitous reflection on Senator Morse's sanity was a spontaneous outburst of passion that might have easily resulted in some sort of on-the-spot censure. . . . What should now be clear, however, is that senatorial objections to partisan appointments in the foreign-policy area and insistence on professional diplomatic qualification can no longer be dismissed as hollow platitudinizing."

James Reston: "Senator WAYNE MORSE was certainly the main reason why Clare Boothe Luce quit her job as Ambassador to Brazil, but he was not the only reason. She was caught in a whirl of personal and political problems she could not hope to resolve in the

time available to her. Brazil is in the midst of a desperate financial crisis. The . . . Government needed . . . foreign credits. . . . Mrs. Luce would have been expected to produce that credit. . . . Yet she had no chance of persuading her own administration to provide the credits under any foreseeable circumstances."

It is possible that Time will not have room this week for publishing excerpts from the current Reporter magazine. So we offer several: "We cannot help saying just a few parting words about the two protagonists. WAYNE MORSE has proved once more that he is a fearless man, always ready to carry out the duties that his passionate mind assigns him. We don't imagine he is in any way happy to have defeated the ambition of a woman, particularly since he could not have done it without the assistance of that woman. With her bitter gibe at Senator MORSE, Mrs. Luce exhibited that compulsive inclination to verbal violence which she has overabundantly exhibited in her multifarious career."

There is much more, too, that Time did not have room for. Missing are the remarks made on the Senate floor by seven Senators who joined Morse in opposing the appointment. Pertinent comments they were. They show that Morse had strong support. It is no wonder there was no Time for them.

[From the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, Apr. 27, May 3, 1959]

THE COUNTRY WILL SURVIVE

The U.S. Foreign Service will not, in our opinion, be irreparably damaged by Clare Boothe Luce's decision to resign her ambassadorship to Brazil.

As a matter of fact, President Eisenhower now has a splendid opportunity to do what he must wish he had done in the first place—appoint to this post a top-quality career officer with Latin American experience, a knowledge of Brazil's language and people, deep sympathy for and understanding of the acute problems that face the country.

Mrs. Luce says in effect that she has decided not to take the post because of what Senator Morse or unidentified political elements might do in the future. They could, she says, water the seeds of hostile suspicion planted by the Senate debate on her confirmation, and thus impair the usefulness of her mission to Brazil.

Well, maybe they could, but would it not make more sense for Mrs. Luce to wait until they did? She is convinced that Senator Morse would subject her mission to continuing harassment. But a resignation would be more explicable as a result of harassment than it is in anticipation of it. One suspects that her public statement does not tell the whole story as to why she felt it best to give up the post for which the Senate confirmed her by 79 to 12. And it is certainly understandable that Senate leaders would "laugh off" Senator CAPEHART's proposal to reprimand Senator Morse.

Like her husband, Mrs. Luce is convinced that all the trouble stems from the determination of Senator MORSE and others to undermine her usefulness. It may just be possible that her usefulness was undermined not entirely by a few unfriendly Senators, but in part by the mixing of politics, foreign policy and journalism which she and her husband had come to stand for.

[From the Walla Walla County Chieftain, Enterprise, Oreg., May 7, 1959]

NO GREAT LOSS

The resignation of Clare Boothe Luce, wife of the publisher of Time, Fortune, Life, and other magazines, as Ambassador to Brazil is not resulting in any general laments. What particular qualifications this lady has for a post of this kind have never been tabulated. Presumably, in line with a number of other

appointments to diplomatic posts, the principal qualification was that Mrs. Luce is the wife of a very wealthy and influential supporter of the Republican Party. Her knowledge of Latin America and her acceptability to the people of Brazil have not been stressed.

It offended some people when Senator MORSE raised questions about the fitness of this admittedly charming lady for the important post to which President Eisenhower had appointed her. It is always unpleasant and never seems quite gentlemanly to question the abilities of a woman who possesses poise and grace and perhaps other significant attributes. But it is the job of the U.S. Senate to see that the United States is represented abroad by men and women who have sympathy and understanding for the countries in which they represent us, and who have the stability and the diplomacy to avoid arousing ill will. Mrs. Luce, with her intemperate, and wholly unnecessary comments about the sanity of Senator MORSE, and her references to the "dirt" alleged by her to have been stirred up over her nomination, were hardly in keeping with the dignity of a U.S. Ambassador.

Critics of Senator MORSE may counter with the observation that the Senator's investigations into the mental stability of Mrs. Luce were not very kind, but in the Senator's case there was a responsibility to determine the fitness of Mrs. Luce. In Mrs. Luce's swinging accusations against MORSE there was no purpose other than anger.

We have never seen anything in the comments of Mrs. Luce or in the magazines edited by her husband which indicate any real understanding of the problems of Latin America, and the insulting language used in a recent issue of Time magazine about Bolivia did more damage to good relations between this country and our South American friends than anything which has occurred in a long time.

Perhaps an honorary post can be found for Mrs. Luce as an envoy to Monaco or Luxembourg where she can be a charming hostess without hurting anybody. But if we need representation abroad by women of charm, however, perhaps we should look for material in Hollywood.

Anyway, it is a pretty safe bet that we will wind up with a better Ambassador to Brazil, and nobody in Brazil seems to be taking the loss of Mrs. Luce too bitterly.

[From the Milwaukie (Oreg.) Review, May 21, 1959]

DISTANCE OBSCURES DETAIL

Latin Americans will not be voting in Oregon's 1962 election, but, if they were, the U.S. Senator who tripped the almost-Ambassador Clare B. Luce would have a nearly-unanimous vote.

In the perspective of remote distance the details of name calling and the physical process of upending a lady of diplomatic stature are obscured by the end result. In this instance Oregon's Senator WAYNE L. MORSE almost singlehandedly brought about the set of circumstances which halted her trip to Rio de Janeiro. Latin Americans everywhere deeply resented the role of the Luce publications in defaming Bolivia in a recent incident almost unnoticed by Americans. This was certainly not Mrs. Luce's doing, but it besmirched her availability. Furthermore, when Senator MORSE cited Mrs. Luce's wild attacks on President Roosevelt, the fact they were made in the heat of the 1940 campaign and that Senator MORSE and others had been almost equally biting, became details of no importance. All the Latinos saw was that this woman, now about to be sent to Brazil had vilified FDR—who is as much a hero to many South Americans as to North Americans.

Most of the Nation's press has assailed Senator MORSE's leadership against Mrs.

Luce, notwithstanding the fact in Oregon that Senator Morse has improved his political position with the average vote by this incident. In the Nation, as in the hemisphere, he has enhanced his prestige.

Oregon Republicans, having already conceded Senator DICK NEUBERGER's election by default in 1960, have pinned their hope on the defeat of Senator Morse in 1962—probably with Gov. Mark Hatfield, the "Golden Boy" of Oregon Republicanism as the Saturday Evening Post has dubbed him.

We have just this word of warning for the Republican Party leaders: No man in American politics has shown the bounce and resiliency of Oregon's WAYNE MORSE. In perspective he looms big on the horizon of history, even if some of the detail along the way is not so magnificent. It is the big contrasts, not the detail, which usually wins elections—and in the perspective of history, too, distance obscures details. Only the black and the white, the dark and the light, remain.

[From the Benton County Herald, Corvallis, Oreg., May 7, 1959]

A QUESTION OF FITNESS

Some of the Portland newspapers have had letters to the editor from persons (no doubt Republicans) who are critical of Senator Morse's action in objecting to appointment of Clare Boothe Luce as our Ambassador to Brazil.

We often wonder how many people who write such letters ever bother to write the person they are criticizing—we would venture a guess that the majority have never written their elected officials in their life. They would much rather see their compositions in print.

Be that as it may, we do not deny that every citizen has a right to air his own views. Likewise, we do not see how anyone can deny our legislators or our Senators and Representatives the right to air their views on matters of public importance.

There has been a great "to-do" in the press about Senator Morse's opposition to Mrs. Luce's appointment. We have seen little explanation, if any, of the sound reasons on which he based his argument; what little there has been gave rather a distorted view in that it was taken out of context—and this we know to be true, because we have read his speech in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, word for word.

Evidently most of the letter writers believe that Mrs. Luce was picked on by our Senator because of past castigation by her of President Roosevelt and President Truman and because the magazines her husband controls have attacked Senator Morse at various times.

Actually, these were not essential reasons for our Senator's opposition to her confirmation * * * although certainly the defamation of character attacks on our Presidents speak none too well for someone who is going to represent our country abroad. Mrs. Luce's tongue more than once has caused a great deal of trouble for her—for example, the "GI Joe" talk she gave at the Republican Convention.

In fact, her vicious rejoinder to Senator Morse's objections caused many Senators to publicly state that if they had it to do over again they never would have voted to confirm her appointment.

As for her connection with Life and the other magazines published by the Luce interests, it must be pointed out that it was the articles in Life magazine which fomented anti-American riots in South America, to which she was to be sent as Ambassador. Certainly this was not going to make her very acceptable to Brazilians; in fact, quite the opposite.

The real objection to Mrs. Luce's appointment on Senator Morse's part stems from his very real determination that our country

shall send only the best qualified people as our official representatives to other nations, no matter whether it be a big country or a tiny one in some remote corner of the world.

He has long fought for the appointment of our officials abroad on a basis of qualified personnel rather than paying off a political debt. And Clare Boothe Luce is no career diplomat trained for many years and in various posts in the Foreign Service for the important post of ambassador. Never for a moment.

Why is it we have been losing ground to the Russians in the cold war? One reason, and perhaps the most important of all, is that in far too many instances our ambassadors have been mere political hacks whereas the Russians make sure that every person in their diplomatic delegations is so well trained that each knows the language, the history, the culture, the economic and political situation, everything in fact about the country to which he or she is sent. They would never make the mistake we do of sending people abroad who make enemies for us rather than friends, and it is high time we stopped this foolish practice.

Clare Boothe Luce can be gracious and charming—when she wants to be—and has a quick wit, though not always a tactful one. She and her husband and the powerful chain of magazines they control gave considerable support to the Eisenhower campaign and to the present administration. And she wanted very much to go to Brazil as our ambassador. But would she be a good one?

As ambassador in Rome, Mrs. Luce had none too good a record. Her record of absenteeism is astonishing—156 days in 1955 and 202 days in 1956. Her actions were not stable. As ambassador in Italy she should not have shown partiality in domestic elections but was extremely partisan; she astonished people by bursting into tears and leaving the diplomatic box when it was announced that the candidate she had backed had lost in the election.

We would not like it if ambassadors from other nations took such partisan interest in our elections while serving here. Yet Mrs. Luce meddled in this way, as did her husband who spent much time advising her and trying to influence President Eisenhower about Italian affairs. Apparently she cannot disassociate herself from her husband's activities.

As chairman for Latin American relations on the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, Senator Morse quite naturally was vitally interested in whom we would send to represent our interests in Brazil. He wanted the best person possible to fill this important post. Should he have let Mrs. Luce be appointed, with no questions asked? Just kept quiet and hoped for the best despite her lack of training, her outspoken attacks on our former Presidents, her connection with Life magazine which Brazilians could but view with distaste?

In Senator Morse's opinion—and in our opinion—the appointment of our ambassadors is a question of fitness, and Mrs. Luce did not qualify on many counts. The friendship of the people of Brazil, or of any country, must not be sacrificed to political obligations * * * no matter at what cost to the individuals involved.

Sensor Morse is not one to sidestep his responsibilities, and he did not do so in this case. He asks no favors of anyone, and we are glad of it, because he is free to speak out in the interests of the people. Even though it may be the unpopular course to take, WAYNE MORSE does not hesitate to take it. We only hope that our other Senators will follow his lead in helping us make our foreign policy the effective influence it should be—not only for our own benefit, but on behalf of world peace.

One American diplomat—and we mean diplomat in every sense of the word—is

worth far more to us than thousands of dollars when it comes to winning friends for us abroad.

We hope Senator Morse continues to speak out in these matters concerning foreign relations, with which he has years of experience through serving on the Senate committee. If we know our WAYNE, he will—though knowing full well it will not win him any friends. But then, he is not interested so much in winning friends for himself as in winning friends for the American people.

[From the Seattle (Wash.) Argus, May 15, 1959]

Sensor WAYNE MORSE may be intemperate. But he found a public figure even more so in Mrs. Clare Boothe Luce.

As a Congress Member, she exercised her caustic wit (always at the expense of others) in a way that was sometimes amusing, always a novelty. But, in the long run, this constituted a record which left much to be desired.

As chairman of the Foreign Affairs Subcommittee on Latin American Affairs, Morse was quite within his rights to question the woman's fitness to represent us in Brazil. He convinced me that the President could (and ought to) make a better choice.

[From the Washington Teamster, Seattle, Wash., May 8, 1959]

THE LUCE PLUM

The resignation of Mrs. Clare Boothe Luce as Ambassador to Brazil came as a great relief last weekend. For a while it looked as though the woman behind the man at Time, Life, Fortune, Sports Illustrated, and other publishing ventures was established in the U.S. diplomatic mission to the South American country. This was no prospect to be received joyously by anyone who was distressed by the record of Mrs. Luce as Ambassador to Italy, or by anyone familiar with Time and its distorted news policies.

The man who deserves credit for saving Brazil from Mrs. Luce is, of course, Senator WAYNE MORSE, one of the few in Congress not afraid to stand up to the queen in the Time empire. In her letter of resignation only a few days after her appointment was confirmed by the Senate, Mrs. Luce acknowledged that the opposition of Senator Morse had hastened her decision to withdraw from the post. She chose to phrase her reason in different terms. Senator Morse had "poisoned" the climate of good will necessary for her to carry out the assignment, she asserted. Her selection of words is enough to condemn her as a mighty poor selection as a diplomat.

During the days that debate waged over her appointment, Senator Morse endured criticism not only from Mrs. Luce, but from Republican Senators and the press. This was to be expected, since MORSE does not yield in his beliefs simply to endear himself to the wives of magazine publishers, the opposition party, or powerful news outlets. We were surprised, and dismayed, with the size of the vote Mrs. Luce won. It reflects more the respect Senators hold for the influence of the press than their regard for Mrs. Luce. That is our suspicion.

The arguments given by MORSE would have convinced more Senators if the nominee under consideration had been a career diplomat. As MORSE declared, "Her statement that Roosevelt had 'lied the country into war' is a monument to her qualifications in political demagoguery, but the Senate should not be asked to confirm such a person for an important diplomatic post."

While defendants of Mrs. Luce have risen to support her accusation against Roosevelt, one of the sources cited by her, Prof. Basil Rauch, informed MORSE that her statement misrepresented his book.

"My book proves on the basis of the documents that those who make charges against President Roosevelt such as those by Mrs. Luce have abused the facts of history," the author said.

It was obvious that the appointment of Mrs. Luce was based on other than diplomatic considerations. Senator MORSE has detailed how the Luce contributed Time and money on behalf of Eisenhower in the 1952 and 1956 campaigns; he has described how opinions enunciated in Life and Fortune eventually came to be public policies.

MORSE warned the Senate that nomination of Mrs. Luce was a result "of the downgrading of diplomatic missions into political plums."

We can thank Senator MORSE for creating the climate that will keep this plum from falling into the march of Time.

INTEREST RATES ON GOVERNMENT BONDS

Mr. PROXMIER. Mr. President, on Monday night of this week there was held at the White House a bipartisan, secret policy conference or meeting, involving the President of the United States and congressional leaders of both parties.

I shall now read very brief excerpts from a report of the New York Times about that meeting; the following are excerpts from an article written by Edwin L. Dale, Jr., and published in the New York Times of Tuesday, June 2:

A Presidential request to Congress to increase or abolish the legal ceiling of 4½ percent on Government bonds is expected shortly, the Senate Republican leader said today.

Senator EVERETT MCKINLEY DIRKSEN, of Illinois, told of this prospect following a secret meeting last night at the White House attended by congressional leaders of both parties.

Senator DIRKSEN said the request would probably also include an increase in the ceiling on the national debt and some form of improvement in the return on savings bonds.

The Treasury continued to insist today that no final decision had been made on the interest ceiling. Outside of Senator DIRKSEN, the Members of Congress present were reluctant to talk about the meeting because they had been pledged to secrecy.

The ceiling applies only to securities maturing in more than 5 years. Senator DIRKSEN described last night's suggestion from the administration as for doing away with the ceiling altogether.

The reaction of the Democratic leadership was not known in detail, but Senator DIRKSEN quoted one of the House Democratic leaders as saying: "When there is a need, it is the responsibility of Congress to consider the matter seriously."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the entire article by Mr. Dale be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. PROXMIER. Mr. President, the only other report of this meeting was made by the President of the United States at his press conference yesterday, when he answered two questions about the meeting. Mr. J. Anthony Lewis, of

the New York Times, asked this question:

Mr. President, at a meeting the night before last the question of the ceiling on interest rates on Government bonds was discussed with congressional leaders. I wondered whether you had come to a decision yet, Mr. President, on asking for a raise in that ceiling.

The President's answer was not responsive, but I thought it was quite interesting as indicating the kind of meeting that was held. He said:

I said in my state-of-the-Union message that because of the very facts of that particular fiscal year, there would have to be a raise of some kind effected in the debt ceiling. There was a conference with the congressional leaders present, and with two or three of my own staff, with Secretary Anderson, and there was a general discussion of this whole problem, the problem of the debt and the management of our governmental finances.

Now, the purpose of the meeting was not to reach decisions then, but to see whether we could concert our thinking so that the Treasury Department would be in position to make specific proposals and give them to the Congress. And this has not yet been done, and no specific decisions made.

A little later in the press conference, Sarah McClendon, of the El Paso Times, asked the President this question:

Mr. President, sir, in these discussions on raising the interest rate that were held here the other night, will you please tell us what was said about the impact that this might have on the people generally?

The President replied:

I don't know that this particular point came up for discussion at that meeting for the simple reason that the impact ought to be well understood, I should think, by all our people, if the country—if the Nation cannot borrow money.

As of now, the rate is fixed for any money except below 5-year money, and if you put the total \$283 billion, or \$288 billion finally in short-range money, then the people will be so badly hurt that we have just got to do something.

Mr. President, I understand these meetings are necessary. I think they are desirable. Obviously, there should be communication between the President of the United States and congressional leaders. I think congressional leaders have a duty, as well as a right, to go to such meetings. But because these policy conferences are usually concerned with legislative action for which the majority party in the Senate is going to be responsible, it seems to me they raise the question of whether it might not be equally desirable to have some kind of regular Democratic Party conference—if only for information, so we too know what is going on, without simply reading the published reported declaration of the minority leader in the newspapers or the transcript of the President's press conference.

Secondly, as the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] suggested, some kind of party policy on these vital matters would be useful, especially in a matter in which our national party policy has been so explicitly stated.

Mr. President, any plea by President Eisenhower to ask for an increase in

the statutory interest rate for Government bonds confronts the Senate with the issue on which those of us who oppose hard money and high interest rates will have to draw the line and make our fight.

This Democratic Congress has permitted its own creature, the Federal Reserve Board, to shove interest rates up, at breakneck speed, to the highest level in a generation.

Despite the overwhelming majority of my party in the Senate—it has a majority of 64 to 34—and despite the emphatic pronouncement in our Democratic platform, this has come about.

I should like to read now the specific pledge we made in our Democratic platform in 1956. We freely adopted this pledge:

The first time bomb of the Republican crusade against full prosperity for all was the hard-money policy. This has increased the debt burden on depressed farms, saddled heavier costs on small business, foisted higher interest charges on millions of homeowners (including veterans), pushed up unnecessarily the cost of consumer credit, and swelled the inordinate profits of a few lenders of money. It has wrought havoc with the bond market, with resulting financial loss to the ordinary owners of Government bonds.

I continue to read from that platform:

A fully expanding economy can yield enough tax revenues to meet the inescapable obligations of Government, balance the Federal Budget, and lighten the tax burden. * * *

The Republican debt management policy of higher interest rates serves only to benefit a few to the detriment of the general taxpayer, the small borrower, and the small and middle-class investor in Government bonds. We pledge ourselves to a vigilant review of our debt management policy in order to reduce interest rates in the service of our common welfare.

Mr. President, that was the Democratic pledge. It could hardly be more explicit, and it was freely arrived at in our last convention.

We Democrats promised lower interest rates and our leaders said why all over the country.

I read an excerpt from a speech by Harry S. Truman before the Amalgamated Clothing Workers 40th convention in Atlantic City on May 13, 1954:

The first big economic step the new administration took, in early 1953, was to tighten up on the money supply. This was the so-called hard-money policy. Making money harder to get for the average fellow, and paying higher interest rates to the banking fraternity has always been the policy of the trickle-down theorists. Andrew Jackson had to battle against the hard-money policy of the bankers of his day. The Harding administration tried the hard-money policy after World War I, and by the middle of 1921 it had started American agriculture on the road to the poorhouse. The same idea was held by Secretary Mellon in the Coolidge and Hoover administrations, and this helped to bring on the great depression.

When the present Republican administration took over in 1953, it started down the same old road and tightened up the money supply. The elephant hadn't learned a thing. The management of our national debt was imperiled, and Government bonds declined. The squeals of pain and fear could be heard all the way from the farmers of the Far West to the bankers of Wall Street. And

when the bankers commenced to squeal, the new administration started to loosen up on the hard-money policy. But a great deal of damage had already been done.

Former President Truman said, at a Democratic dinner in Washington, D.C., on May 4, 1957:

But I will tell you what can bring on a depression. It's the tight money policy and high interest rates. This is a reversion to the trickle-down theory that has guided the Republican Party from the time of its inception. It is a means of transferring income from the poor who need it to the rich who don't. The results are increasing maladjustments in our economy with danger signals rising higher on every hand. And of course one of the worst results of the tight money policy is that it increases the costs of the Federal Government.

The final excerpt I should like to read from a statement by former President Harry Truman, who is certainly an outstanding Democratic Party leader, is from a speech delivered only last year, April 21, 1958, also in Washington, at a campaign conference for Democratic women:

Higher interest rates on Federal borrowings have forced up all types of interest rates—the interest rates paid by the farmer, the veteran, the homeowner, and every family who buys on time an automobile or a TV set, a lawnmower, or a piece of furniture.

By the end of 1957 bank rates on short-term business loans were almost 39 percent higher than in 1952. By January 1958 the interest rates paid on State and local bonds were almost 43 percent higher than in 1952. This has injured the building of schools and practically every type of vital domestic improvement financed by State or local public funds.

Today the people of the United States are paying out in public and private interest charges about \$4 billion more per year than if interest rates had been held at the 1952 levels. For about 50 million families this comes to an average of about \$80 per family per year. If all outstanding public and private indebtedness were to be refinanced at the current Republican interest rates the American people would eventually be saddled with about \$15 billion per year in additional interest burdens compared with 1952. This would amount to an average of about \$300 per year per family.

In this same speech, Mr. Truman said:

Shylock was a gentleman compared to our Republican interest-happy government.

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

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield to the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, I have listened to the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin as he has discussed hard money. Presumably that is what the Senator believes is most popular now with the present administration. Is that a correct understanding?

Mr. PROXMIRE. That is absolutely correct.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I should like to tell a story. It will take only a minute. There was a banker who went to his physician and said, "I have not been feeling as well lately as I believe I should. I should like to have my condition checked." So a complete physical was undertaken, and a few days later the

physician called upon the patient to render his verdict. He said to the banker, with a smile, "You need have no worry; you are in excellent condition. You are as sound as a dollar." The banker said, "Is it as bad as that?" And he fainted.

Perhaps the value of the dollar today is not what it once was.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I thank the Senator from West Virginia very much.

Of course, our good friends in the Republican Party claim that the high interest rates are going to preserve the value of the dollar. I am sure if they will reexamine the consequences of the hard money policy—if they will study what has happened when we have had a high interest rate policy, in regard to prices—they will see that the story told by the Senator from West Virginia is mighty true. I will show at a later date that for many people high interest sharply increases the cost of living.

Mr. President, I should like to read another brief comment from our party leaders. I refer to the Democratic Advisory Council statement with regard to the control of inflation. As I am sure everyone recognizes, the Democratic Advisory Council includes a former nominee for President, Adlai Stevenson; a former President, Harry Truman; and others such as Averell Harriman, some outstanding Democratic Senators, and many others.

In the most recent statement on the control of inflation the council said:

The Congress should give serious consideration to the following matters:

First, the impact of the monetary and high interest rate policies of the administration which repress production and cramp economic growth.

Second, the lack of public machinery to air the facts of pending inflationary steps in the private economy and of debt management policies that have raised the cost of financing the increasing public debt to all-time highs.

The council also stated, later:

A thoroughgoing review is urgently required of the fiscal and monetary policies of the administration and the Federal Reserve Board that have contributed to a gross imbalance of the national budget; to a serious recession with continuing rising prices; and to serious problems now arising in the refinancing of a sizable portion of the Federal debt at unreasonably high interest costs to the taxpayer. It should be the object of such an investigation to determine who the beneficiaries of these policies have been, and what harm has been done to the future of the Nation's economic strength.

Mr. President, I should like to quote one further outstanding Democratic leader, who is the present majority leader of the Senate, the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON]. On November 7, 1958, immediately after the election, the Senator from Texas listed 12 issues which he considered of prime importance for the 86th Congress. One of these 12 was:

We need to face up to the high interest rates which are slowing the needed growth of our economy.

In opening the debate on the 1958 housing bill on March 11, 1958, the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] made a

speech entitled "In Opposition to Hiking Interest Rates on Housing." He yielded to the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON], who, after discussing impounding by the Budget Bureau of funds authorized and appropriated by Congress for construction of conservation programs, went on to say:

As a result of high interest rates, and the impounding of funds Congress has authorized and appropriated, there was forced upon the people of the country a restrictive monetary policy which has resulted in great damage. Unless we cut high interest rates, loosen up the money markets, refuse to pay high premiums to money lenders, and pass some legislation needed by the whole Nation, we shall find ourselves in a situation perhaps not so bad as in 1932, but better only because of some of the cushions we have provided for the economy.

Mr. President, these are the statements of the leaders of the Democratic Party.

I will say further, there is clear direction in the Constitution that it is the Congress which must assume responsibility for borrowing money and regulating value of the money.

I wish to quote from the Constitution of the United States, article I, section 8, paragraphs 2 and 5, which state:

The Congress shall have power. * * *

To borrow money on the credit of the United States; * * *

To coin money, regulate the value thereof, and of foreign coin, and fix the standard of weights and measures.

In view of the fact that we have an overwhelming Democratic majority in the Congress; in view of the fact that our platform has pledged a reduction in interest rates, as specifically and emphatically as we could pledge it; in view of the fact that our outstanding party leaders have agreed this is the policy we should follow; and in view of the fact that the Constitution says the Congress of the United States shall assume this responsibility and gives the responsibility to the Congress; it seems to me we congressional Democrats have a clear duty to recognize what the Federal Reserve Board, as our own creature, has done—and to act.

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

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CLARK. I have listened with great interest to the very able speech being made by my good friend from Wisconsin. I am in complete accord with the views which the Senator has expressed, and with those of the distinguished leaders of our party whom he has quoted.

It occurs to me that we shall shortly have the opportunity to determine whether to consent to an increase in the interest rate on Government bonds. I, for one, should be very loath to do so. I assume my friend from Wisconsin feels the same.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I could not agree more with my good friend from Pennsylvania. I would also agree it looks as if we are going to have that responsibility, and to have it quite soon.

Mr. CLARK. Let me pose a problem for my friend, who also serves with distinction on the Committee on Banking and Currency of the Senate, to see how he will respond.

It is said, I think with some justice, that the interest rate, within certain wide limitations, is determined by the supply and demand for capital.

Capital consists largely of savings which are available for investment. Primarily, capital is in the hands of insurance companies, pension funds, and investment companies. Capital includes time deposits in banks, and also includes savings and loans balances and a number of other items, with which my friend from Wisconsin is familiar. Over all those normal fields of savings, the law of supply and demand I think would pretty well govern, so that if there were more savings available than there were demands for savings in a free market, the interest rate would go down.

If the reverse were true, and there were a greater demand for savings than could be met by the savings available, the interest rate would go up.

This situation is seriously affected by the powers of the Federal Reserve bank to influence the interest rate, at least to some extent, by determining the rediscount rate of commercial banks and by engaging in open market operations. However, whenever it is suggested that the Federal Reserve should exercise such powers for the purpose of bringing down the interest rate and supporting the Government bond market, the reply is always made that that would merely result in monetizing the Federal debt, loading up the commercial banks with Government bonds, and getting into a condition of glut, so that the banks would have far more bonds in their portfolios than would be sound, creating, with respect to each Government bond, the ability to loan to the tune of about 10 to 1; and that in the end the money supply would be so inflated that there would be a runaway inflation.

If the Federal Reserve continues with its present policy of tight money, and the Congress determines not to increase the permissible rate on Government bonds, I wonder if the end result will not be that Government bonds will be floated at the highest permissible interest rate, and will be sold at a substantial discount, so that we shall be no better off than we were before. I wonder how, in the long run, my friend would achieve the result which he and I both so much desire, of creating a low interest rate, without causing such an increase in the supply of money as to cause an unfortunate inflation.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I thank the Senator from Pennsylvania. I think he has made a brilliant analysis of a process which is very little understood. I think he is completely correct in his analysis, except that I would change the emphasis. The interest rate is what the Federal Reserve Board wants it to be, at any time. That has been made so emphatically clear again and again that it cannot be denied. The interest rate was low in early 1958. Why? Because the Federal Reserve Board decided that a monetary policy which would lower the interest rate

was necessary in view of the recession. Then later last year it anticipated that we would get into an inflationary situation. That was its judgment, although there were and are many unemployed, and although there was and is a great deal of idle plant capacity. The Board felt that the thing to do was to tighten the monetary screws by using the measures to which the Senator from Pennsylvania has referred. There are three measures which can be used, namely, open market operations, the rediscount rate, and reserve requirements. The Board can use those at any time to make the interest rate what it wishes to make it.

What the Senator from Pennsylvania has asked me is whether policies which would lower the interest rate would not so inflate and increase the money supply as to have an inflationary effect. My answer is that, within reason, I believe that both the supply of money and the interest rates have a very modest, moderate, and perhaps no significant effect on the cost of living and on prices generally.

At present I am in the process of attempting to obtain from economists and businessmen specific evidence—concrete, hard evidence, not the Ricardian theory, or what they learned in money and banking classes in colleges, but hard evidence as to how an increase in the supply of money and the lowering of interest rates could actually contribute to inflation. I have never seen any proof of it. No one has ever been able to convince me. I do not believe that that is the effect.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. My understanding is that the Joint Economic Committee, under the chairmanship of the distinguished senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], will this summer hold a series of hearings dealing with this specific subject. It seems to me that it would be of the greatest possible importance for those of us who advocate low interest rates and the promotion of an expanding economy to see to it that the best possible expert testimony is adduced before that committee, to prove the point which my friend from Wisconsin has made, that further activity by the Federal Reserve Board, through the powers already given to it to decrease interest rates, would not have the disastrous result which so many of the classical economists, including most of our friendly economists from Wall Street and the majority of our friends on the other side of the aisle who discuss this subject, seem to think would result. That is what might be called the conventional wisdom. Does the Senator not agree with me that we on our side of the aisle have an obligation to make the case that the Federal Reserve Board could exercise its existing powers without the threat of inflation, which our friends across the aisle so very much fear?

Mr. PROXMIRE. Indeed I do; and I should like to emphasize the timing of the Senator's statement. I believe that the colloquy we are having may be subject to dispute later in the session.

Mr. CLARK. I have no doubt that it will.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I should like to point out that when the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] suggested that we take action on monetary policy, it was suggested that he go to the committee headed by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the Joint Economic Committee, and discuss the subject with that committee.

The Senator from Pennsylvania has pointed out that the hearings to which reference has been made will be held this summer. The increase in the $4\frac{1}{2}$ -percent statutory limit on long-term Government obligations will occur very soon, within a matter of days or weeks. We must act now. This is a decision we must make in the near future. I believe the Senator has made an excellent suggestion. I believe that we have an absolute duty to appear before the committee. But this is not a legislative committee; and we are confronted with an immediate legislative challenge in the change in the statutory limit on long-term Federal bonds.

I am sure that there is no Member of the Senate, and few others in the country, who are better qualified than is the Senator from Illinois to head the committee. He is an expert economist. He thoroughly understands monetary policies. I have no fear at all that when all the evidence is brought before the committee, it will be seen that, within reasonable and moderate limitations, fluctuations in interest rates have a very secondary or tertiary effect on the cost of living.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. My concern is that, when the Senator from Wisconsin says we must act—and I agree with him—the only action we can take at present may be to hold the line on the interest rate on Government bonds.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The Senator is correct.

Mr. CLARK. Is there not, however, a still further step which can be taken by the Congress—by the Senate, in part—to require the Federal Reserve Board to exercise the powers which it has? I ask that question in all seriousness, because the present policy of the Board, as set forth by its Chairman, William McChesney Martin, for whom I have great personal admiration, but with whose economic views I do not find myself in accord, is to continue what is now being done. The Federal Reserve Board has substantially withdrawn its support from the Government bond market. To my way of thinking, this is a most serious defect in its policy, because it has resulted in a very extreme decline in the value of Government bonds.

The Federal Reserve bank is the only central bank in the entire civilized world which, in the last analysis, is not under the control of the Treasury of the country in which it operates. A divorce between the Federal Reserve bank and the Treasury was pushed through in 1951, under the kindly sponsorship of the distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr.

DOUGLAS]. I think he still feels that he was right in that regard. I am not at all sure that he was.

I am wondering whether those of us who feel as the Senator from Wisconsin and I feel are under some obligation to come forward with a specific piece of proposed legislation which can change this unhappy condition before the country gets into further difficulties than it now faces. I wonder also whether the primary responsibility for developing such legislation is not in the Committee on Banking and Currency, on which we both serve.

Mr. PROXMIRE. We are indeed under that obligation. The instant speech was provoked by the action of the President, or this prospective action, as it has been reported, according to his press conference, that we are going to be faced with higher interest rates, and holding the line is the practical thing that we must do.

There is no question that the Constitution is explicit and clear. Congress has this obligation. Monetary policy is in our field. The Committee on Banking and Currency is the proper committee to consider it. I see no reason why our views should not be made as emphatically clear as possible to the Federal Reserve Board. I believe that the views of the Committee on Banking and Currency, in support of the position that the Senator from Pennsylvania and I take, would have some weight with the Federal Reserve Board. Furthermore, I believe we can go further than that. Of course it will take some hearings and some legislation, but we can affect the powers and policies of the Federal Reserve Board. I have been working on prospective legislation of this kind for some time.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield once more? Then I shall not interrupt him again.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CLARK. I am wondering if some one of us should consider the desirability of submitting a resolution generally to the effect that it is the sense of the Senate that the Federal Reserve Board, as the agent of Congress, should exercise its powers in the direction of decreasing interest rates and supporting the Government bond market in order that this unfortunate condition may be remedied. Otherwise, it would be necessary to increase the interest rate legally permissible to be paid on Government bonds.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The Senator's suggestion comes as a surprise. I had not expected it. I think it is an extremely interesting suggestion. I should like to study it. I think that the kind of sense-of-the-Senate resolution which the Senator suggests would be extremely useful.

Congress has been trapped by technical sophistries into increasing the cost of financing veterans' housing. It is about to do the same with other Federal programs. Only recently, on the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, on which I serve, I learned that the Farm Credit Administration found that it had to have an increase in the statu-

tory interest rate limit on borrowings. Virtually all or at least nearly all Government agencies are finding themselves in the same position.

I say it is time to stop. Here is why. If we change the law to push up interest rates on Government bonds, as the President is about to propose, we will encourage the Treasury to sell more long-term bonds at higher interest rates than the cost of short-term obligations. This is certain. The long-term rate is higher than the short-term rate. It is long-term financing, which is being restrained by the present $4\frac{1}{4}$ percent limit. This means the President's proposal would further increase the cost of financing the national debt.

Secondly, and even more important, it would freeze the obligation of the Federal Government into paying higher rates over a longer period of years, and would make it far more difficult for a new administration taking office in 1961 to take full advantage of lower interest rates to reduce the cost of servicing the national debt. This would mean that the new administration, Democratic or Republican, for that matter, which came into office in 1961, would be faced with the higher burden of servicing our national debt, because it would be many years before the obligations which are selling in 1959 and 1960 would mature.

In the third place, the action which the President seems to be proposing would put the Federal Government into greater competition for long-term capital with schools, hospitals, slum clearance projects, municipal building of all kinds, and homes. In doing so, it would drive up the cost of what this country most needs in its domestic economy.

Fourth and finally, by increasing the cost of financing local services, it would drive up local taxes, and of course by increasing the cost of servicing the national debt it would directly tend to unbalance the budget and drive up Federal taxes, or both.

Mr. President, I have a few insertions to make. They relate directly to what I am talking about. The first is an article published in the Wall Street Journal of Thursday, June 4, 1959.

The article was written by John Grimes and Richard Madden. It deals with the flight of gold from this country. In the course of the article—and I regard it as an excellent and extremely important article—the argument is made that interest rates may retard the loss of gold and the diminution of the value of the dollar. The argument is made that if we keep our interest rates high there will be less tendency for American capital to go abroad, and there will be a greater tendency for foreign capital to invest in this country. Obviously the effect of that would be to arrest the flight of dollars and increase the flow of foreign currencies here. That would mean that gold would flow into this country, rather than out of it. Furthermore, it would prevent what most or all of those who have studied this subject believe to be the prospective danger of devaluing the dollar.

However, the Wall Street Journal in this article states that the outflow of gold, which has so concerned economists

and outstanding members of the Committee on Banking and Currency, and others, in their judgment might well be solved by an increase in our exports. I think it may also be solved by a diminution of foreign aid and a sharing in such aid and in the military burden of the free world with some of our allies, who are getting extremely prosperous.

This morning the New York Times published an editorial on this issue. The editorial talks about the objection to an interest rate rise as more sentimental than rational. The editorial is typical of the objection to the position taken by the Senator from Pennsylvania and myself during the colloquy and to the position that I am taking in my speech. The editorial argues that with free markets and free exchanges, ceilings on interest rates do not last very long. However, the editorial ignores the fact that the interest rate is established in accordance with our Constitution by the Federal Reserve Board as the agent of the Congress of the United States. The Federal Reserve Board can increase interest rates and it can decrease interest rates, and it can do so by the methods I have already discussed—by means of the rediscount rate, open market operations, and adjusting reserve requirements.

The Federal Reserve Board lowered the interest rate in 1958, and it increased it sharply in 1953 and 1954. It increased it very rapidly in the last year. This has nothing to do with the free market. It has everything to do with the policy of the Federal Reserve Board. This is the deliberate and premeditated plan and program of the Federal Reserve Board. In fact, the Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board has made several speeches on it, and he has justified hard money and high interest rates.

Many economists say more power to them, and that it is restraining what would otherwise be a sharp rise in the cost of living. It is stated that it is anti-inflationary. Those arguments are wrong. In another speech, at a later date, I shall dispute them. However, whether that is right or wrong, the New York Times editorial is wrong about the free market forces. It is at least 45 years out of date, ever since 1914, when the Federal Reserve Board was established, because since then the Federal Reserve, not free market forces have determined the interest rate. If that is not the job the Federal Reserve Board is doing, the Governors ought to be convicted of taking money under false pretenses, because that is what they are hired to do.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Treasury Interest Rate."

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

TREASURY INTEREST RATE

It is an unfortunate reflection on the economic attitudes of some Congressmen that the Secretary of the Treasury, Robert B. Anderson, should have to hesitate about asking Congress for a law raising or abolishing the $4\frac{1}{4}$ -percent ceiling on the interest that can be paid on Treasury bonds of 5 years or

more. The only right thing to do is raise the ceiling.

At the moment, the yields set by the marketplace—reflecting the supply of and the demand for long-term borrowed capital—are higher than $4\frac{1}{4}$ percent, meaning that today the Treasury could not sell a bond. This is an extremely unsound position to be in for any length of time. Funding of the national debt at appropriate moments is one important weapon in the battle against a new round of inflation.

Even though the leaders of Congress have been sounded out on the matter, Mr. Anderson and President Eisenhower continue to insist that no final decision to submit the necessary request has been made. It appears obvious that they fear a legislative Donnybrook over this ancient issue. There is a very deep-rooted strain in the American political conscience about interest rates, dating all the way back to Andrew Jackson and even earlier. While there is little outright "cheap money" sentiment any more, there remains a sort of elemental belief that things are not right with the world if the U.S. Government has to pay more than $4\frac{1}{4}$ percent to borrow money.

The attitude, however, is more sentimental than rational. In the first place, today's interest rates are high by comparison only with the recent past. There is no magic by which Congress or anyone else can force rates down for any length of time. In a system relying upon free markets and free exchange, ceilings on prices or interest rates simply do not work for long.

There will be no disaster from a rise in Government borrowing costs, but there could be serious trouble if the Government is foreclosed indefinitely from selling any security longer than 5 years to maturity.

Mr. PROXMIER. Mr. President. I refer to another article, published in the Wall Street Journal of June 3, 1959. The article clearly concedes that a higher statutory limit would make private borrowing more costly, and that is a part of the burden of my remarks.

I ask unanimous consent to have the articles and editorial, which I have discussed, published in the RECORD at this point, as a part of my remarks, and I yield the floor.

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

[From the Wall Street Journal, June 4, 1959]

GOLD ON THE GO—U.S. HOARD STILL SHRINKS BUT MOST ECONOMISTS PREDICT A REVERSAL—THEY BANK ON EXPORT SURGE LATER IN 1959, DENY NEED FOR DOLLAR DEVALUATION—RX: BALANCE FEDERAL BUDGET
(By John Grimes and Richard Madden)

An armored truck pulls out through the double steel doors of the U.S. Assay Office near New York City's waterfront and purrs off to another fortress-like building in the city's financial district—the Federal Reserve Bank of New York.

The five-block trip, which is being made frequently these days, has significance because it represents the gold "outflow" from the United States that Governmental financial officials and business leaders all over the world are watching.

When a foreign government buys gold from the United States, the metal merely is taken out of the Treasury's stock at the Assay Office and toted over to the fifth sub-basement of the Federal Reserve Building, where it is put in a locked cage earmarked for the foreign government. The gold doesn't physically leave the country—but that doesn't diminish the importance of the transfer of ownership.

RECORD LOSS IN 1958

In 1958 the United States in this way lost \$2.3 billion of gold, a record for any one year. And this year the flow has continued, though more slowly, with some \$350 million trickling out, about \$235 million of it since mid-April. To assess the significance of this trend—and prospects for its continuance—the Wall Street Journal talked with Federal officials, bankers and other financial authorities both in the United States and abroad. The consensus:

The United States will continue to lose gold through 1959 and perhaps into 1960, but at a decreasing rate. The outflow then is likely to be reversed.

Contributing to the reversal will be a pick-up in U.S. exports later this year, in the belief of most of the authorities interviewed. In addition as trade with the United States grows, foreigners will tend to retain somewhat larger dollar balances in the United States and will use fewer dollars to buy gold from Uncle Sam.

The current gold outflow is not likely to push the United States into boosting the price of gold and thus devaluing the dollar. And the dollar will remain the world's leading currency.

Why the gold outflow? "It's basically simple," says one New York money man. "As a nation, we're buying more from others and giving away to others more than we're selling." Put another way, while U.S. merchandise exports still exceed merchandise imports, the resulting net income isn't enough to pay for U.S. foreign aid, the Government's military expenditures abroad and the growing rate of new investments being made abroad by U.S. private interests.

SMALLER TRADE SURPLUS

Up to now, there's nothing in U.S. trade figures that points to a reversal of the gold outflow. In the first quarter of this year, the merchandise trade surplus fell to \$600 million, compared with \$1.2 billion in the like period a year earlier. Exports still were running below a year ago while imports were holding at a high level.

A minority of the authorities interviewed look for exports to continue at about the present level through 1959, or perhaps decline still more, causing the gold outflow to continue indefinitely. They point to growing competition from Germany, Japan, and other nations. And they argue that the United States, largely because of rising wage costs, is pricing itself out of many markets.

But most authorities take a more optimistic view.

U.S. SHARE IS STABLE

Edward M. Bernstein, an economist who was formerly an assistant to the Secretary of the Treasury of the United States and later director of research and statistics at the International Monetary Fund, has figured the percentage of the world's export trade done by the United States every year in the present decade. The percentage was 17.7 percent in 1950, and it was 17.2 percent in 1958. In between, the figure had been as low as 17 percent in 1953 and 1954, and as high as 19.4 percent in 1957, when the Suez crisis caused an abnormal bulge in oil exports.

"As business begins to expand in Western Europe (following a 1958 recession there) and continues to expand in Canada," says Mr. Bernstein, "U.S. exports will probably show a cyclical recovery later this year and perhaps a considerable expansion next year."

Arthur Marget, head of the Federal Board's Division of International Finance, agrees. He says, "It seems to me that it is difficult to speak with assurance of a widespread lack of competitiveness of U.S. exports when that competitiveness is not even being allowed to be tested as a result of discriminatory restrictions against U.S. exports" by other na-

tions. Another financial authority predicts the decision of Great Britain to end or reduce import restrictions against U.S. goods next Monday will be reflected in some improvement in shipments to that country in the second half of this year.

AID FROM SMALL CARS?

One foreign trade specialist predicts that the new small cars which the big three auto makers here are going to bring out this fall and winter will cut into imports of foreign cars, and might stimulate auto exports.

Besides the hope for larger exports, two other factors are relied on to lower the outflow of gold this year. One is that borrowing here has become less attractive to foreigners than last year because interest charges have risen. The Federal Reserve discount rate, reflecting this, stands at $3\frac{1}{2}$ percent, compared with only $1\frac{3}{4}$ percent a year ago. Floating of foreign securities issues here picked up last year to \$950 million from less than \$600 million in 1957, and any decline this year would reduce the funds going into foreign hands from this source.

The higher interest rates here also would tend to persuade foreign government officials to keep more of their foreign exchange reserves in U.S. Government securities and less in gold. "It's business-like from their standpoint," says a British official in London, "as gold earns nothing while U.S. Treasury 3-month bills earn 3 percent and 6-month bills almost 4 percent, as against only 1 percent for both a year ago."

No less an authority than Per Jacobsson, managing director of the International Monetary Fund, remarks that European countries are in stronger shape than last year and the year before, and are adopting expansionist policies, including lowered interest rates, while U.S. authorities seem likely to hold to tighter credit policies and continue efforts to balance the Federal budget. In this situation, he says, "the prospects are that the outflow of gold from the United States may be moderated, if not reversed."

BUILDING RESERVES

Another factor, which Washington experts count on to reduce the outflow this year, is that much of the 1958 accumulation of dollars abroad landed in the hands of governments that like to hold a high proportion of their hard-currency reserves in gold. The United Kingdom, especially, started 1958 with an unusually low proportion of reserves in the form of gold, but now has restored its balances to more than 90 percent gold.

The buildup of Britain's reserves also was motivated in part by an agreement of International Monetary Fund member countries to contribute additional gold to IMF capital funds. Britain paid its \$162 million share last month.

Britain holds not only its own gold reserves but those of the sterling area nations which have close currency ties with the United Kingdom. These other sterling area nations were scheduled to contribute an additional \$114 million of gold to the IMF, so they may have been adding to the sterling area gold reserves in anticipation of this payment. As far as is known now, no gold purchases for these purposes will be necessary again. On the other hand, the United States' own contribution to the Fund, when it is paid in a few months, doubtless will pull the U.S. gold stock below \$20 million for the first time since 1940.

A GOLD PRICE RISE?

As the United States continues to lose gold, some financial authorities are predicting that one day the United States will have to raise the dollar price of the metal—a move that would require an act of Congress. "A price increase would make the foreigners less

eager to buy—just as you can cut down the demand for anything by increasing its price," says an advocate of this move. "In addition," he goes on, "it would automatically increase the value of our gold reserves as backing for our money and banking system."

Another argument advocates of such a move put forward is that, by increasing the number of dollars an ounce of gold could be exchanged for, it would cut American prices in terms of gold and other currencies. Such a change, they believe, would stimulate our exports and thereby improve our balance of payments. The gold outflow then would halt, they claim.

However, most international economists and officials dispute the need for any such action. Says one, in Washington: "The United States could pay off all foreign short-term dollar claims in gold and still have gold left. But look at Britain. It owes foreign balances amounting to three times its gold reserve."

These economists also disagree that a gold price boost would accomplish anything. In fact, they warn, it might do more harm than good. For one thing, they believe other nations would quickly devalue their currencies correspondingly, so that our supposed export advantage would be canceled. In addition, they insist it wouldn't even discourage gold buying, because it would destroy confidence in the dollar, built up over many years of stability, and make foreigners even more anxious to put their funds into gold, despite the higher price, than into dollars.

IMPACT OF DEVALUATION TALK

Some economists claim it would be especially foolish at the present time for the United States to consider devaluation. Even talk of devaluation could lead to a step-up in the gold outflow, they say.

"The expectation of a change in the price of gold would bring a run on gold," says a Government official. "The key to preventing a run is confidence in the U.S. dollar and confidence on the part of foreigners in a constant dollar price for gold."

As to whether there isn't already a sort of run, he snorts his disagreement. "Last year the foreigners bought \$2.3 billion of gold but they also added \$1 billion to their dollar assets here. And this year those dollar assets have increased further. Do you say a bank is suffering a run if its deposits increase?"

And Dr. Karl Blessing, president of one of West Germany's big banks, the Bundesbank, said in a speech the other day that "I do not share the view that the dollar might be devalued." Other nations and peoples, he went on, must keep a great part of their present \$16 billion of short-term dollar funds in the United States as working balances for use in current business transactions, and therefore cannot convert them into gold. "Hence I am confident," he added, "that the dollar, in the future as in the past, will remain the leading world currency. America's productive capacity is so great that it can compensate for and overcome temporary financial or monetary weaknesses."

This matter of America's productive capacity, most economists agree, lies at the root of the question of how the dollar will stand up. But some economists disagree in part with Dr. Blessing, claiming in the currently popular phrase that inflation here has raised our costs so much "we are pricing ourselves out of world markets." The first evidence, it is said, came when our 1958 exports fell to \$17.7 billion, from \$20.7 billion in 1957.

If our exports fail to come back for some prolonged period of time, says a trade specialist, "we might get to the point where devaluation is needed." But he adds: "The

United States wouldn't gain anything by devaluation to improve its competitive standing because other nations would just do the same and nothing would be changed." The conclusion of such analysts is that what we need is balanced Government budgets and stability in wages and prices to keep our costs and hence the prices of our exports from climbing all the time. That's the only real solution, they claim.

The drive of the Eisenhower administration to balance the Federal budget for 1959-60 has been based in part on the ground that this Nation's competitive position in export markets needs to be bolstered by stopping inflation at home. William McCleskey Martin, Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board, was one of the first Washington officials to make this point publicly, and the President himself has used the argument.

There are a number of other possible steps the Government could take to try to curb the gold outflow.

The Government can impose new restrictions or tariffs on imports. The most recent such action was to set quotas on foreign petroleum coming into the country. However, this kind of thing is a double-edged sword, warns one trade specialist. "The United States can't block imports and then cry about restrictions on U.S. goods," he adds. "We're too rich a Nation for that."

Another possible move would be to cut foreign aid. This is composed of two kinds—foreign aid spent abroad and foreign aid spent here for goods to be shipped out. To the extent it's spent here, most officials object that such action would reduce exports to the same extent. And, of course, they're afraid of the political repercussions.

THE COMMON DEFENSE

One Government official who favors foreign aid cuts also suggests urging nations which are in improved financial shape—those that have been adding to their gold and dollar assets—to start helping the United States support the underdeveloped nations. "They should shell out more money for the common defense of the free world," he maintains.

Mr. Bernstein, taking much the same line, puts the principal blame for the U.S. gold outflow on the U.S. Government's military and other spending and grants abroad. These grew steadily, he shows, from less than \$4 billion in 1950 to more than \$8 billion in 1958. He favors greatly reduced aid and expenditures for Western Europe.

Also an important factor in the gold outflow is the investment of American private funds abroad. On a net basis this outflow has grown from a little more than \$1 billion a year in the early nineteen hundred and fifties to around \$3 billion in the last 3 years.

But no one advocates interfering with this trend. There is even a bill up in Congress now to encourage such investment by deferring the income tax on American businesses established abroad until they send their earnings back home. And the Treasury favors the bill if it is limited to investments in underdeveloped nations.

"The effect of these investments outside the country on the gold flow ultimately will be favorable," says an economist. "Most American companies with new foreign operations haven't yet brought back the profits but have plowed them back into the establishments over there. When they start bringing the money home it will make a big difference." He figures American assets abroad total close to \$60 billion, including almost \$20 billion of Government assets, while total foreign assets here, including those of foreign governments, are only \$20 billion.

THIRD OUTFLOW SINCE 1949

The current gold outflow is the third since 1949, when the U.S. gold stock reached its

record high of \$24.5 billion. In 1950 America's merchandise trade surplus fell to \$1.4 billion from \$5.4 billion in 1949, and in 1950 the United States lost \$1.7 billion of gold.

In 1951 and 1952 there was a small inflow, but in 1953 U.S. outlays abroad had risen so much that the Nation lost \$1.2 billion of gold even though its merchandise trade surplus was \$4.9 billion. There were only small losses for the next 2 years, and in 1956 and 1957, when the trade surplus climbed to \$6.5 billion, and then to \$7.8 billion, the trend was reversed and more than \$1 billion of gold came in.

But in 1958, having gotten accustomed to spending abroad in the style of 1956 and 1957, the United States lost \$2.3 billion of gold in spite of a merchandise trade surplus of \$5 billion. That brought the U.S. gold stock down to \$20.5 billion, a net loss since 1949 of \$4 billion. The 1958 outflow has continued into this year.

The importance to the United States of the outflow of gold lies in the fact that our whole money and bank system by law is based on gold. The correct definition of a U.S. dollar is that it is one thirty-fifth of an ounce of gold. This rigid value for the dollar is maintained by the policy of the United States Treasury, which stands ready to buy gold at \$34.9125 an ounce, and sell it at \$35.0875, the difference being for the costs of handling.

On top of this, the banking law of this country requires that a reserve of gold be maintained in the Federal Reserve System equal to 25 percent of the system's liabilities, consisting of the cash deposits belonging to its member banks and the amount of paper currency issued. At present the U.S. gold reserve of \$20 billion or so is 44 percent of the total of those two liabilities, far above the legal minimum.

STIFFER INTEREST RATES—CRASH PROGRAM TO JUGGLE U.S. DEBT MAY HAVE IMPACT ON ALL BUSINESS—LIFTING CEILINGS ON FEDERAL BONDS MAY MAKE PRIVATE BORROWING MORE COSTLY—SWITCH AWAY FROM STOCKS?

(By Alan L. Otten and John A. Grimes)

WASHINGTON.—The Eisenhower administration is putting together an urgent program designed to help solve Uncle Sam's mounting debt problem by allowing the Treasury to pay higher interest rates on Government securities.

These proposals which would be of broad significance to the general economy, may go to Congress this week. They would:

Eliminate, or at least increase, the 4½ percent interest rate ceiling on marketable securities due in more than 5 years.

Remove, or at least raise the 3¼ percent ceiling on Treasury savings bond interest rates.

Raise the debt ceiling itself to \$290 billion or \$295 billion. Under present law the debt limit drops on June 30 to \$283 billion from the existing temporary limit of \$288 billion.

"TIGHT MONEY" DEBATE

President Eisenhower's request, if current thinking is followed through, would intensify the congressional debate on what Democrats call the Government's "tight money policy." But the best judgment in Congress yesterday was that, after all the shouting, the legislators will go along with some increase in the interest rate ceilings.

High officials insisted that no final decision has been reached on asking Congress for more leeway in fixing interest rates. But congressional leaders, after a secret White House meeting Monday night, agreed there was no doubt the administration, finally, has just about decided to ask Congress for higher interest rate limits.

If Congress approves and the Treasury then boosts the interest rates it offers on its securities, the impact could be broad:

Businessmen almost certainly would face higher bond borrowing costs; the Treasury competes directly with them for funds.

As interest rates rose on Treasury and corporate bonds, a growing number of investors might switch funds from the booming stock market into bonds.

Higher savings bond interest rates could stimulate lagging sales of these securities and perhaps induce banks and savings and loan associations to offer higher rates to savers.

Payment of higher interest rates would boost the Treasury's debt management costs, already a sizable budget item.

If the Treasury steps up sales of long-term securities, this action, like higher sales of savings bonds, would aid the administration's fight against inflation.

MORE LONG-TERM BONDS?

The administration's concern over inflation is one factor that is pushing it toward asking for higher interest rate ceilings. With higher ceilings, Treasury officials believe they would be able to sell substantial amounts of long-term securities to nonbank investors. In recent months, the Treasury has been relying chiefly on short-term issues, which are purchased largely by commercial banks.

When a nonbank investor buys a Government security, he pays for it by taking funds from his bank; the total money supply is unchanged. When a bank buys a U.S. security, it pays for it by setting up an account on its books for the Treasury. As the Treasury draws checks on this account to pay for goods and services, the money supply grows. If the money supply grows faster than the supply of available goods and services, the result is inflation.

Sales of more long-term securities also would benefit the Treasury in a highly practical way. As the average maturity of the debt increased, the Treasury would have to make fewer trips to the market to refinance existing securities. It also would have more control over the timing of new issues; with maturities spread farther apart, the Treasury would find it easier to step into the market to refinance an issue in advance if it decided market conditions were favorable. The whole debt management job would be simplified.

COMPETITIVE FACTORS

The Treasury in recent months has had difficulty selling long-term securities for two reasons: Investors' worry over inflation and growing competition from stocks and corporate bonds. For example, underwriters today are offering to the public \$50 million of Public Service Electric & Gas Co. 30-year bonds at a price to yield the investor 5 percent—well above the top yield available on Treasury bonds.

Many private investors have been buying stocks heavily in preference to either corporate or Government bonds. Such investors reason that inflation would push up the prices of stocks along with the value of all other property.

With business recovering, the Treasury faces the prospect of increasing private competition for the lender's dollar. The Treasury also is running into growing competition from State and local borrowing in securities whose interest is free of Federal taxes. Interest on U.S. Government securities, of course, is taxed both by States and by Uncle Sam himself. Still another potent competitor for Treasury bonds is the Government-backed housing mortgage, which yields 5 percent or better.

If the Treasury offers long-term bonds at higher interest rates, the first result would be a drop in prices of existing Treasury bonds and a resulting rise in yields on such

securities. "If the Treasury offers a 4½-percent long-term bond—and they'd have to offer at least that much to find many buyers—prices of other Treasury issues would fall by two to four points," predicts one New York City bond dealer.

"If the Treasury offers higher rates, businessmen will have no choice—they'll have to boost their rates if they want to sell any bonds," says a New York City banker.

"If the Treasury gets the authority, it will use it," says a New York bond market specialist. "I foresee a 4½-percent Government issue, and that will tend to boost yields throughout the bond market."

The competition between Government bonds and corporate bonds is direct. A rise in yields on Treasury bonds would induce many investors to buy such securities in preference to corporate bonds—unless there was a corresponding rise in yields on the corporate issues.

The competition between stocks and bonds is less direct, especially in a period such as the present when inflation fears are a major factor. But it is, nonetheless, present.

The stock market declined sharply yesterday on the news that the Government's interest ceilings might be lifted. The Dow-Jones industrial average fell 6.06 points from the previous close to 637.45. Brokers theorized that the selling pressure that pushed prices down yesterday came from investors and traders who were speculating on the impact of a boost in Government bond interest rates. According to the brokers, the investors and traders figure that higher Treasury interest rates would lead many investors to switch from stocks into bonds and thus put downward pressure on stock prices.

HIGHER YIELDS IN BONDS

Treasury bonds already offer higher yields than many common stocks. The most recent calculation showed that the 30 stocks comprising the Dow-Jones industrial average were selling to yield an average of about 3.14 percent, compared with the yield of well over 4 percent available on existing longer-term Government bonds.

Before the Government offers long-term marketable bonds at higher interest rates, it should first boost the interest rate on savings bonds, many New York City bankers say. "The savings bond structure, which is very important to the economy, is teetering," says one banker. "If all that money slips away, what does the Treasury do then?"

Savings bonds outstanding at the end of April totaled \$50.8 billion, down \$1.4 billion from a year earlier. Savings bond redemptions for some time have been exceeding sales as individuals have found more profitable ways to invest their savings.

Many savings and loan associations are offering 3½ percent and more to savers, compared with the 3¼ percent rate on savings bonds. "If the Treasury boosted the savings bond rate," says one New York banker, "it could put some pressure on savings and loan associations and banks to boost their rates, too."

CUTTING THE DEBT

In addition to considering higher Treasury interest rates, President Eisenhower and his subordinates are thinking more and more of using any Treasury surplus to reduce the mammoth debt rather than to provide tax relief. To a lesser extent, this same sort of sentiment shift is discernible in the House and Senate.

The switch to debt reduction can be gleaned between the lines of public pronouncements of Treasury Secretary Anderson, Budget Director Stans, and by Mr. Eisenhower himself. Just recently, Mr. Stans raised the question, "When will we ever begin to reduce our \$285 billion public debt" if it isn't done in these prosperous times?

To a large extent, the debt program explains the administration's drive to balance

the budget for the fiscal year that starts next July 1. And to some extent, it also accounts for the slowdown in Congress of Democratic determination to force the President to spend more than he wants to spend. Continued budget deficits would add to the Treasury's already heavy chores of refinancing present issues as they fall due.

The Treasury's idea of asking for a higher interest rate ceiling on marketable securities in itself indicates Mr. Anderson would like to begin selling long-term bonds again. But officials insisted yesterday that, even with complete freedom, they'd have no idea of a wholesale switch into long-term securities. And the Treasury, like any other borrower, likes to get its money as cheaply as possible. Interest rates on short-term securities are well below those on longer issues.

"We'll look largely at the short-term area for the next few months," remarks one Treasury official.

BEHIND THE PROPOSALS

A look at the Treasury's debt predicament explains the urgency behind the legislative proposals now being prepared. In calendar 1958 the Government had to borrow \$19 billion in cash, in addition to issuing \$50 billion of new marketable securities in exchange for maturing debt, excluding the regular weekly bill sales. Of this \$69 billion, only \$2.9 billion went into long-term bonds. So far this year the Treasury has borrowed \$14 billion in cash, in addition to \$14.1 billion to replace old securities. Of this \$28.1 billion, only \$1.5 billion has gone into long-term securities.

For the rest of this calendar year alone, the Treasury will have to borrow an estimated \$10 billion just to bridge the gap between current expenses and tax revenues. In addition, about \$29 billion—again excluding Treasury bills—comes due and has to be either paid off or refinanced.

Financial authorities, both in and out of the Government, agree the Treasury would be unable to borrow this kind of money without sticking largely to short-term securities.

When Mr. Eisenhower came into office in January 1953, one of his major financial aims was to tidy up the debt—to lengthen out maturities, for example, and to place more of the debt in nonbank hands. Candidate Eisenhower emphasized his debt aims during his 1952 campaign, including the debt problem in his summation of "the mess in Washington."

On June 30, 1953, a few months after Ike took office, the total debt stood at \$226 billion. The average maturity of the marketable debt was 5 years and 4 months. Of the total \$65.3 billion was to mature within 1 year. An additional \$36.2 billion was to mature in 1 to 5 years.

On June 30 of this year, the debt is expected to total \$285 billion. The average maturity of the marketable debt is now 4 years and 8 months, or 8 months shorter than when Mr. Eisenhower took over—and the Treasury is fighting to hold it there. Of the \$285 billion, \$76 billion will mature within 1 year. An additional \$58.2 billion will come due in 1 to 5 years.

The Treasury insists it hasn't slipped backward quite so much when it comes to bank versus nonbank financing. On June 30, 1953, commercial banks held \$58.8 billion, or 22 percent of the \$266 billion. As of February 28, 1959, commercial banks held \$66 billion of the outstanding total of \$285.2 billion, or 24 percent.

EXHIBIT 1

PLEA TO CONGRESS ON DEBT EXPECTED—PRESIDENT BELIEVED READY TO ASK INTEREST RISE ON U.S. OBLIGATIONS

(By Edwin L. Dale, Jr.)

WASHINGTON, June 2—A Presidential request to Congress to increase or abolish the

legal ceiling of 4½ percent on Government bonds is expected shortly, the Senate Republican leader said today.

Senator EVERETT MCKINLEY DIRKSEN of Illinois, told of this prospect following a secret meeting last night at the White House attended by Congressional leaders of both parties.

Senator DIRKSEN said the request would probably also include an increase in the ceiling on the national debt and some form of improvement in the return on savings bonds.

The Treasury continued to insist today that no final decision has been made on the interest ceiling. Outside of Senator DIRKSEN, the Members of Congress present were reluctant to talk about the meeting because they had been pledged to secrecy.

Senator DIRKSEN quoted the Secretary of the Treasury, Robert B. Anderson, as having said last night that the need for action was urgent at the moment, market rates of interest are such that the Treasury could not sell a bond bearing only 4¼ percent interest.

The ceiling applies only to securities maturing in more than 5 years. Senator DIRKSEN described last night's suggestion from the administration as for doing away with the ceiling altogether.

This issue is by far the most controversial of the three involved in the expected proposal. Congress has long known of the need to increase the debt limit again this year, at least on a temporary basis. Presumably there will be considerable appeal in the idea of sweetening savings bonds for small investors.

However, there is a bloc in Congress of considerable strength that feels strongly about the recent upward movement of interest rates generally and it can be expected to oppose any increase.

DEMOCRATIC LEADER QUOTED

The reaction of the Democratic leadership was not known in detail, but Senator DIRKSEN quoted one of the House Democratic leaders as saying: "When there is a need, it is the responsibility of Congress to consider the matter seriously."

Others at the White House last night included Senator LYNDON B. JOHNSON, of Texas, the Democratic leader, Representative SAM RAYBURN, of Texas, the Speaker of the House, and the chairmen and ranking minority members of the House Ways and Means Committee and Senate Finance Committee.

The ceiling of 4¼ percent on long-term Treasury bonds was set in 1918. The highest coupon on any outstanding bond is 4 percent.

However, these bonds—unlike savings bonds—are traded freely in the market. When they fall in price their effective interest rate to a new buyer is higher than the nominal rate. A number of outstanding issues are now selling at prices that yield new buyers 4½ percent or more.

MUST ATTRACT BUYERS

Thus the Treasury would have to put an interest rate of more than 4¼ percent on a new issue to attract any buyers.

An increase in the national debt limit is needed, despite the reasonably good prospect of a balanced budget in the forthcoming fiscal year, because tax receipts are low in the July-December period of each year.

The Treasury expects to have to borrow \$6 billion to \$7 billion in the last half of this year to cover this seasonal deficit.

The present debt is \$285,900 million. It is covered by a temporary ceiling of \$288 billion, which reverts to a permanent ceiling of \$283 billion on June 30. At that time the actual debt is expected to be about \$285 billion.

The seasonal borrowing plus an allowance for contingencies would require a new "temporary" ceiling of about \$295 billion.

An increase in savings bond interest, now 3¼ percent if held to maturity, would also require congressional approval.

Savings bond sales have fallen off slightly from last year's levels and redemptions have risen.

In April, purchases of bonds were \$350 million against redemptions of \$453 million. In April 1958, sales were \$398 million and redemptions, \$412 million.

NATIONAL DEFENSE

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, for years the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] has been bringing to the American people the truth about our national defense.

This has been done despite a smoke-screen of misleading statements from this administration.

Last month, the Senator from Missouri brought out that the IRBM's in England are not operational, as they have been advertised. When confronted with this fact, the Department of Defense finally admitted to the press that what the Senator had said was true.

The chronological history of this situation is revealing. On November 27, 1957, Secretary of Defense McElroy told the Senate Preparedness Investigating Subcommittee:

By making use of the production capacity now available for both the Jupiter and Thor, an operational capability can be achieved by the end of 1958 in the United Kingdom (p. 194).

On December 17, 1957, Secretary of the Air Force Douglas told the Senate Preparedness Investigating Subcommittee:

In my prepared statement, I said that we would have an operational unit of IRBM's in December of 1958 (p. 869).

On November 18, 1958, Secretary of the Air Force Douglas told the Bankers Club of Chicago:

The first Thor missiles are already in England and the first squadron will be operational in December, as scheduled.

On January 23, 1959, General Twining, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, gave the following testimony to the Defense Subcommittee of the House Appropriations Committee:

Mr. MAHON (chairman). * * * who is in the best position in 1959 from the standpoint of the employment of missiles in an all-out war?

General TWINING. The United States, by far. We have Thors up there which are just as effective or more effective than those ICBM's. They are located in England. An IRBM will no doubt be more accurate and carries just as big a warhead. We have them sitting there and ready to go.

On February 20, 1959, Admiral Burke, Chief of Naval Operations, in a speech to the Charleston, S.C., Chamber of Commerce, said:

The United States has the ability, right now, in being, to destroy the Soviet Union. We can do it in several ways and several times over with our powerful Strategic Air Command of the U.S. Air Force, with carrier striking forces of the U.S. Navy, with tactical air, and with intermediate range ballistic missiles.

On March 12, 1959, General White, Chief of Staff of the Air Force, told the

Senate Preparedness Investigating Subcommittee:

They [the British] have the first of their missiles [IRBM's] on launch pads which they consider to be operational and ready to be fired (p. 111).

On March 16, 1959, President Eisenhower, in a radio-television address, listed the Thor IRBM as one of the "missiles now in use by our Armed Forces."

On April 28, 1959, the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] told the National Press Club:

Last January the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff testified there were intermediate-range ballistic missiles in England "which are just as effective or more effective than those ICBM's" and that these American IRBM's were "sitting there and ready to go."

Ten weeks after that statement was made to the Congress, I visited that IRBM base of ours in England which was nearest to completion.

There was nothing "ready to go."

There was nothing which met operational standards.

There was nothing adequately dispersed.

The entire installation was literally a sitting duck for sabotage.

On April 30, 1959, the New York Times published an article which in part said:

A Defense Department spokesman said today that Pentagon officials had never meant to imply that the entire weapons installation in Britain was combat ready.

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

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

IRBM, NOT BASES, SAID TO BE READY—PENTAGON SPOKESMAN HINTS SYMINGTON WAS CORRECT ON BRITAIN—DENIES DECEIT

WASHINGTON, April 29.—There are probably no complete intermediate-range ballistic missile installations in Britain, with weapons, launching platforms and trained crews ready to fire, it was indicated at the Pentagon today.

The Defense Department refused to comment officially on charges by Senator STUART SYMINGTON, Democrat of Missouri, that the Nation had been misled in believing that the U.S.-equipped IRBM bases in Britain were operationally ready.

The Senator specifically cited testimony by Gen. Nathan F. Twining, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, who told a congressional committee last January that the 1,500-mile weapons delivered to Britain were "ready to go."

A Defense Department spokesman said today that Pentagon officials had never meant to imply that the entire weapons installation in Britain was combat-ready. In promising operational readiness of the missiles in Britain, officials here merely referred to the missile itself, and not to the allied equipment, the spokesman said.

The Defense Department spokesman noted that last September, at least 2 months before the original target date of December 1958, the first Thor IRBM was delivered by airplane to Britain.

It was a fully tested missile, capable of being launched with an atomic warhead. Its delivery, with those of an unspecified number of other missiles in the weeks that followed, fulfilled the implicit promise to the public in official statements, the spokesman declared.

Under the terms of the British-United States agreement, it was emphasized, the

British were responsible for the construction of the bases. Moreover, the terms of the agreement called for the firing by British crews, with the nuclear warheads in the hands of U.S. officials.

The British crews did not arrive for training in this country until March 1958. The first British crew did not successfully fire a test missile until last month at Vandenberg Air Force Base in California.

MAY NOT BE READY TILL 1960

One estimate at the Pentagon was that the IRBM installations in Britain would not be fully operational—in the sense that everything was ready—until perhaps the end of 1960.

The Thors, developed by the Air Force, are the first intercontinental range ballistic missile weapons to be completed and deployed to operating sites by the United States. Another weapon, the Jupiter, developed by the Army, has also been completed. It is slated for deployment to an IRBM base in Italy.

The arrangements for British IRBM bases were initiated at the end of 1956. The final agreement was not signed by the United States and Britain until February 24, 1958. Over the last few years, leading U.S. officials, including President Eisenhower, have referred to the operational readiness of the Thor missile.

Actually, the final test of the missile, declaring it a combat-ready device, was made last June at the testing center in Cape Canaveral, Fla. But most military officials stated simply that the Thors would be operational at the British bases by December 1958.

The prevailing impression here has been that by declaring the Thors operational in Britain, officials have indicated that these weapons were capable of being fired, should war break out suddenly.

The possibility that the deployment of the operational missiles to British sites did not mean that they could be fired at those sites appears not to have been brought out until Senator SYMINGTON's speech yesterday.

The Senator had been a consistent critic of the administration's defense policies.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, on May 1, 1959, the Washington Post published a UPI story quoting Secretary of Defense McElroy to the effect that "none of these missiles is ready for immediate countdown and firing." The article goes on to say that Secretary McElroy "acknowledged that the missiles could be fired only after a number of hours had passed because they were in 'training condition.'"

Also on May 1, 1959, the New York Times published an article written by a Jack Raymond, which quoted Secretary McElroy's admission that the IRBM's were not ready and operational.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that these two articles be printed in full at this point in the RECORD.

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

[From the Washington Post, May 1, 1959]

BRITAIN HAS THORS, CAN'T FIRE THEM

Defense Secretary Neil H. McElroy acknowledged yesterday that U.S. 1,500-mile-range ballistic missiles based in England are not ready for immediate firing.

He said in a statement that the Thor missiles are "in training condition" and "can be fired only after the passage of a number of hours."

"Thus," he added, "none of these missiles is ready for immediate countdown and firing."

McElroy's statement was prompted by a charge made Tuesday by Senator STUART SYMINGTON (Democrat, Missouri), that the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff had misled Congress on whether the British-based missiles were operational.

SYMINGTON told the National Press Club that Gen. Nathan F. Twining testified last January that the missiles were "ready to go." Yet, SYMINGTON said, he personally discovered 10 weeks later by visiting the base most nearly completed that nothing was ready to go.

McElroy's statement said "there has been no problem in delivering the committed numbers of missiles to the British bases."

But he said there has been a "somewhat longer time required to prepare the bases and to install ground equipment than was originally anticipated."

"Moreover, the British Royal Air Force, which is the receiving agency, has determined that the best way to use the first missiles delivered and set up at the British bases is for training purposes."

He then acknowledged that the missiles could be fired only after a number of hours had passed because they were in "training condition." He did not specify how many hours.

[From the New York Times, May 1, 1959]

IRBM'S IN BRITAIN UNREADY FOR WAR—McELROY CONFIRMS CHARGE—SAYS BUILDING OF BASES HAS DELAYED PROGRAM

(By Jack Raymond)

WASHINGTON, April 30.—None of the intermediate range ballistic missiles sent to Britain is ready for immediate combat use, Neil H. McElroy confirmed tonight.

The original target date for operational readiness of the British-based 1,500-mile range ballistic missiles was December 1958. The United States began sending the first of some 60 Thor IRBM's in September.

However, the Secretary of Defense said tonight that there had been somewhat longer time required to prepare the bases and to install ground equipment than was originally anticipated.

Mr. McElroy's statement was issued in response to a question based on a charge by Senator STUART SYMINGTON, Democrat of Missouri, that the U.S. public had been misled into believing that the British bases were operational.

In the last 2 days since the Senator made his charge some Pentagon spokesmen have said that a number of IRBM's in Britain were ready for war use, others said they were not. But no officials would be quoted.

Associates of Mr. McElroy and Gen. Nathan F. Twining, chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, said that they had considered a reply to the accusation but had decided to "clam up" so that the story would quiet down. Murray Snyder, Assistant Secretary of Defense for Public Affairs, is understood to have persuaded Mr. McElroy to issue the statement.

It follows:

"Some questions have been raised as to whether the Thor intermediate range ballistic missiles on English bases are operational."

"There has been no problem in delivering the committed number of missiles to the British bases. There has, however, been somewhat longer time required to prepare the bases and to install ground equipment than was originally anticipated."

"Moreover the British Royal Air Force, which is the receiving agency, has determined that the best way to use the first missiles delivered and set up at the British bases is for training purposes."

"Missiles in training condition can be fired but only after the passage of a number of hours. Thus none of these missiles are ready for immediate countdown and firing."

"It is not intended that we in this country will announce when Thor missiles are operational in England, because the determination of this will naturally be made by the deploying service—the Royal Air Force."

Senator SYMINGTON, who criticized the lack of security and insufficient dispersal of the missile installations he visited at a base in Britain, charged tonight that the bases were so close to public areas that it would be hard to protect them against sabotage.

He said this was true, too, of the United States' own bases and elsewhere that have not been hardened or put underground.

The Senator, a former Secretary of the Air Force, has been a critic of administration defense policies.

This was that statement by General Twining to which Senator SYMINGTON took exception:

"We have Thors up there which are just as effective or more effective than those ICBM's. [A reference to Soviet long-range missiles.] They are located in England. An IRBM will no doubt be more accurate and carries just as big a warhead. We have them sitting there and ready to go."

General Twining said this in response to a question at a hearing January 23 by the House Appropriations Subcommittee on Defense Appropriations.

One of the chief reasons for earlier Pentagon reluctance to comment on Senator SYMINGTON's charges, it was said, was that it might have provided him with political material as a potential presidential candidate.

Mr. McElroy planned originally to wait until called before the Senate Appropriations Subcommittee for Defense on Monday to present his comment on the IRBM charges.

Earlier, the Air Force said that its record indicated it had never declared the Thor operational.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, this is an astonishing situation. It is hard to understand why the top responsible officials of our Defense Department continued to assert that the IRBM's in England were operational, when they were not operational.

Despite this recent admission by the Secretary of Defense, the Washington Post and Times Herald, on May 8, published an Associated Press article bearing the headline, "Thors in Britain Now Ready, Douglas Says."

I ask unanimous consent that the 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:

THORS IN BRITAIN NOW READY, DOUGLAS SAYS

Secretary of the Air Force James H. Douglas told Senators yesterday that Thor intermediate-range missiles—able to drop nuclear warheads on Soviet Russia—are now on launchers in England available for emergency use if needed.

Just back from a flying trip overseas, Douglas told a Senate appropriations subcommittee there had been delays in the original plan to have these 1,500-mile missiles operational last December.

Douglas said the powerful missiles have been delivered to England for use by the Royal Air Force, crews are busy training, and some weapons actually are on the launchers at one site.

The testimony was a follow-up to a recent disagreement between the Pentagon and Senator STUART SYMINGTON, Democrat, of Missouri, a frequent critic of administration defense actions.

Gen. Nathan Twining, chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, said in a January report to Congress that missiles in Britain were "sitting there ready to go."

Ten weeks later SYMINGTON said in a National Press Club Speech that he was just back from a visit to the base most nearly completed and found nothing "ready to go," nothing that met operational standards or was adequately dispersed.

Secretary of Defense Neil McElroy conceded in a statement 2 days later that none of the weapons was ready for immediate firing. He said the British chose to set up the first missiles delivered for training purposes, and in that condition it would take some hours to fire one.

Douglas testified that the longer range intercontinental Atlas ballistic missile will be operational in June at Vandenberg Air Force Base on the Pacific Coast.

"The first Atlas will be deployed at Vandenberg in June of this year," Douglas said as he reported good progress on the Air Force missile and aircraft programs in general.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, the article was based upon the prepared statement which Secretary of the Air Force Douglas presented the Senate Defense Appropriations Subcommittee on May 7.

Under questioning about the language in his statement, however, Secretary Douglas admitted that the Thor missiles were not ready. A part of this testimony is as follows:

Senator SYMINGTON. On page 5 of your prepared statement . . . you say "an emergency capability to launch against targets after a period of preparation has existed and will continue to exist through the projected training phase." Apparently you are referring to the IRBM situation in England. Secretary DOUGLAS. That is right.

Senator SYMINGTON. What do you mean by a "period of preparation"?

Secretary DOUGLAS. I would rather go into that in a security hearing, Senator, if I might. I think I could be quite accurate.

Senator SYMINGTON. You used the phrase. This is a matter I have studied at length. I would not want your opening statement to be misleading.

Secretary DOUGLAS. I certainly don't want my statements to be misleading.

Senator SYMINGTON. I want to know if you will give us a rough idea of the considerable "period of preparation."

Secretary DOUGLAS. Quite a few hours.

Compare this testimony with the fact that the Soviets have hundreds of ballistic missiles capable of hitting the British bases in a matter of a few minutes—in a surprise attack.

To assert or imply that the British-based IRBM's are operational as retaliatory or deterrent strength, when they could not be launched for "quite a few hours" after the surprise attack, is dangerously misleading.

It was for such reasons that the British press was denying assertions by American officials that the Thor missiles on their territory were operational.

In our form of government, public opinion is considered most important in the formulation of national policy.

Therefore the people are entitled to the truth.

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

Mr. SMATHERS. I yield.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I am very grateful to the distinguished Senator from Florida for having seen fit to make his statement concerning these problems which are incident to our national defense. I

know the Senator from Florida will agree with me that regardless of the decisions which may be made by the executive branch with respect to the national defense, it is important that the people be given all truth which will not help a potential enemy.

Mr. SMATHERS. There can be no question about that. It is outrageous and completely unjustified, at any time or upon any occasion, for the people not to have all the truth.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Again I express my gratitude to the distinguished Senator from Florida.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I have many times said in my own State, and I have no hesitation to repeating the statement here, that in my humble judgment the people of the United States owe to the able Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] a great debt of gratitude. I do not know of any other person who has done quite so much to help the United States keep its guard up, and who not only has kept the people of America informed about the state of their preparedness, so far as it has been possible to do so, but at the same time has acted as a sort of needle in keeping the Department of Defense alert and on its toes, so that all of us might be better protected and the country better prepared.

THE VITARELLI CASE

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, during the debate on the confirmation of the nomination of Potter Stewart to be Associate Justice of the Supreme Court, I pointed out the dangers inherent in recent decisions of the Supreme Court concerning Communists and Communist sympathizers. I called attention to the fact that as a result of overzealous and unwarranted concern for the purported rights of those who look with contempt on our republican form of government, a series of recent decisions of the Court has, in effect, written a "Red Bill of Rights" in the United States. As a result of these decisions, I am firmly convinced that this country has immeasurably more to fear from Communist subversion within the United States than it has from armed attack from the Soviet Union. To substantiate this conviction, I shall refer to only a few of the recent pronouncements of the oversolicitous Supreme Court. In the Yates case, the Court said that anyone may advocate the forcible overthrow of our Government with impunity, so long as it is in the abstract and there is no time set for overt acts. In the Cole and Service cases, it was held that Federal employees may freely associate with Communists without fear of discharge if they hold nonsensitive jobs. Over the protests of practically all of the States of the Union, and of the Attorney General of the United States, the Supreme Court held invalid all State laws concerned with sedition in Pennsylvania against Nelson. These are only a few examples of the Court's utter disregard of legislative intention and attendance to judicial "nit-picking."

Mr. President, on Monday of this week the Supreme Court added another amendment to the "Red Bill of Rights"

by ordering the Interior Department to reinstate an employee it had fired twice in the last 5 years on the ground that his continued employment was contrary to the best interests of national security. As a further result of this decision, the Federal Government will be required to pay \$30,000 in back pay to one who has been classified as a "security risk," who has been in sympathetic association with Communists or Communist sympathizers, and who the courts said had lied about such associations before a Federal Loyalty-Security Board inquiry. And thus a department of the executive branch of our Government is ordered by the Supreme Court to reinstate an employee whom it has already determined is in such close association with Communists or Communist sympathizers that his continued employment is inimical to the best interests of our country. Judicial usurpation of power by the present Court is not confined to encroachments on the legislative branch; but, as the Court's decision in the case of Vitarelli against Seaton so well attests, it extends to the executive branch, as well.

Mr. President, Government employees sought to be dismissed should be given the benefit of all procedural protections required by applicable statute and regulation. Persons so situated should be entitled to be free from dismissal on unconstitutional or flagrantly abusive grounds. But no such dismissal occurred in the Vitarelli case. Vitarelli was at no time within the protection of the Civil Service Act, the Veterans' Preference Act, or any other statute relating to employment rights of Government employees. This man, who had been classified as a "security risk," could have been summarily discharged at any time by the Secretary of the Interior. The Lloyd-La Follette Act and the Veterans' Preference Act—the general personnel laws—authorize dismissals for "such cause as will promote the efficiency of the service." Thus, there was no want of substantive authority for the dismissal; and since Vitarelli was not in a sensitive position, he was not entitled to a hearing before a Loyalty-Security Board. The Supreme Court brazenly admitted that Vitarelli could have been summarily discharged had the Secretary of the Interior chosen to do so. It justified the order of reinstatement to the Department of the Interior and the payment of \$30,000 on the ground that because the Interior Secretary informed Vitarelli of the grounds on which he was being discharged—notification of which he was not entitled to in the first instance—the employee was entitled to all of the procedural requirements of someone in a sensitive position. Mr. President, it is an impossibility to deprive a person of procedural due process unless he is entitled to it in the first instance. By its own admission, the Supreme Court recognized that in this case Vitarelli was not entitled to procedural due process. The rationale by which the Court reached the conclusion that this security risk must be afforded all of the procedural requirements of one in a sensitive position is typical of its rationalizations in other cases dealing with

those who would overthrow our form of government.

Let there be any doubt that he was exercising his authority to summarily dismiss a subordinate in the Department of Interior, the Secretary expunged the Department's records of any reference to the Communist activity of Mr. Vitarelli, and notified him of his dismissal in October 1956, and omitted all reference to any statute, order, or regulation relating to security discharges. There is no question whatever, Mr. President, that the Secretary of the Interior had the authority to summarily dismiss this employee, for whatever cause he saw fit, and in a manner that saw him removed at the earliest possible opportunity from the ranks of Government employees. However, the Supreme Court, in a marvelous display of judicial gymnastics, held otherwise. A majority of the Court said that because the 1954 dismissal was abortive, no effect would be given to the 1956 dismissal, notwithstanding the fact that the letter of dismissal was clearly within the exercise of the Department's summary dismissal power. Even if it be conceded that the discharge of 1954 was invalid, the prior action did not deprive the Secretary of the power to discharge Vitarelli prospectively. It was a lawful exercise of the summary dismissal power; but the Supreme Court held that it meant, administratively, nothing. The Court has frustrated every attempt of the Interior Department to rid itself of this undesirable employee. On Monday of this week, the Supreme Court said that not only has Vitarelli not been validly discharged, but he is entitled to back pay of \$30,000.

How is the Federal Government to rid itself of subversive elements within its very ranks, Mr. President?

Typical of its opinions in recent years, Mr. President, the Supreme Court has once again disregarded the actualities of the situation. The power of the Executive to discharge for untrustworthiness or deliberate misrepresentation is beyond dispute. The Secretary of the Interior had unfettered authority to summarily dismiss William Vincent Vitarelli, and did so, only to have this authority frustrated by the Court. In doing so, it gratuitously transformed itself into a factfinding body, criticizing the substance of the charges against Vitarelli and the form of the questions propounded at the security hearing. It is not the function of the Supreme Court to decide whether an employee is or is not untrustworthy or a "security risk." The Court's decision in the case of Vitarelli against Seaton is another example of an unreal interpretation by the Supreme Court resulting in disproportionate concern for Communist sympathizers and the attribution of illegality to a lawful exercise of governmental action.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, so long as I am sitting here as a Member of the Senate, I would be recreant to my sense of duty if I did not rise at this time to make the following very brief comment:

This is not the first time, either during this session or during previous ses-

sions in which I have served in the Senate or, indeed, at other times during the long proud history of the United States, that the highest tribunal in our Nation has been attacked and abused and vilified.

Mr. President, one of the great freedoms the American people enjoy, both in the Senate and outside it, is the freedom to speak freely, regardless of whether one is right or is wrong in what he says. There is this difference, however: Far more freedom of speech is permitted a Senator, under the rules of the Senate, than a citizen enjoys outside this Chamber, under the laws which apply to him there.

In my opinion my colleague was wrong, wrong, wrong—completely wrong—in the accusations he made against the U.S. Supreme Court.

Let the intemperate pour their spleen upon the venerated Supreme Court of our country. It will live in history as the defender of the freedoms guaranteed the American people by their Constitution, for which the 180 million American people will ever be grateful.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, in accordance with the order previously entered, I move that the Senate adjourn until tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 7 o'clock and 10 minutes p.m.), under the order previously entered, the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, June 5, 1959, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate June 4, 1959:

IN THE ARMY

The following-named officers 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 3307:

TO BE MAJOR GENERALS

Maj. Gen. Leander LaChance Doan, O16839, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. John Bruce Medaris, O39554, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Parmer Wiley Edwards, O16775, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Martin Joseph Morin, O16911, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Thomas Fraley Van Natta, O17086, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Webster Anderson, O17101, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. William Henry Hennig, O17122, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Mercer Christie Walter, O17151, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. John Cogswell Oakes, O17160, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Ralph Joseph Butchers, O17242, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Stanhope Brasfield Mason, O17295, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

Lt. Gen. Paul DeWitt Adams, O17306, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Walter King Wilson, Jr., O17512, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Paul Wyatt Caraway, O17659, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Russell Lowell Vittrup, O17681, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Ralph Copeland Cooper, O17741, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Eugene Fodrea Cardwell, O38662, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Briard Poland Johnson, O29393, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Robert Highman Booth, O18093, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

The following-named officer for temporary appointment in the Army of the United States to the grade indicated under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3442 and 3447:

TO BE BRIGADIER GENERAL

Col. Jonathan Owen Seaman, O19385, U.S. Army.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate, June 4, 1959:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Ogden Rogers Reid, of New York, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Israel.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Frederick Henry Mueller, of Michigan, to be Under Secretary of Commerce.

Carl F. Oechsle, of Massachusetts, to be an Assistant Secretary of Commerce.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Thomas Sovereign Gates, Jr., of Pennsylvania, to be Deputy Secretary of Defense.

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY

Fred A. Bantz, of New York, to be Under Secretary of the Navy.

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE

Joseph V. Charyk, of California, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Air Force.

THE COMMISSION ON CIVIL RIGHTS

George M. Johnson, of California, to be a member of the Commission on Civil Rights.

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

Rosel H. Hyde, of Idaho, to be a member of the Federal Communications Commission for a term of 7 years from July 1, 1959.

FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION

Frederick Stueck, of Missouri, to be a member of the Federal Power Commission for the term of 5 years expiring June 22, 1964.

FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION

Earl W. Kintner, of Indiana, to be a Federal Trade Commissioner for the unexpired term of 7 years from September 26, 1953.

U.S. COAST GUARD

The following-named persons to the rank indicated in the U.S. Coast Guard:

TO BE LIEUTENANT COMMANDERS

George W. Hardy, Jr.
Glenn L. Smith

TO BE LIEUTENANTS

Maynard Fontaine
Harold W. Doan

TO BE LIEUTENANTS (JUNIOR GRADE)

Merrill K. Wood John R. Butler
Barry P. Sebralla Gerald C. Hinson
Benjamin A. Ramsey Royce R. Garrett

APPOINTMENTS IN THE NAVY AND IN THE MARINE CORPS

The following-named midshipmen (Naval Academy) to the rank indicated in the restricted line of the Navy, subject to qualifications therefor as provided by law:

TO BE ENSIGNS

James A. Kelly
Peter S. VanNort

The following-named midshipman (Naval Academy) to the rank indicated in the Supply Corps of the Navy, subject to qualifications therefor as provided by law:

TO BE ENSIGN

Daniel E. Ralston

The following-named person (Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps) to the rank indicated in the line of the Navy, subject to qualifications therefor as provided by law:

TO BE ENSIGN

Richard M. Krol

The following-named person (Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps) to the rank indicated in the Supply Corps of the Navy, subject to qualifications therefor as provided by law:

TO BE ENSIGN

Alan G. Brown

The following-named (Naval Academy graduate) for permanent appointment to the rank indicated in the Marine Corps, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

TO BE SECOND LIEUTENANT

Arthur E. Archambault

The following-named (Army Reserve Officers' Training Corps) for permanent appointment to the rank indicated in the Marine Corps, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

TO BE SECOND LIEUTENANT

Robert M. Hall

POSTMASTERS

ALABAMA

George N. Chastang, Citronelle.
John E. Stallings, Cuba.
Talton A. Shaw, Jr., Langdale.
Marvin S. Ward, Pine Apple.
John F. Segrest, Jr., Tuskegee.

ALASKA

Ola M. Cosgrove, Delta Junction.
Martha R. Prater, Glenallen.

ARIZONA

Roberta M. Hill, Sells.
Bessie L. Pierce, Tumacacori.

ARKANSAS

James Overton Thomson, Aubrey.
Edgar L. Fergeson, Havana.
James A. Leighton, Helena.
C. Stewart Landes, Lewisville.
Helen G. Webb, Mountain View.

CALIFORNIA

Richard A. Wallace, Anderson.
Chester B. Schmill, Camarillo.
Norman Warren, Elk Grove.
Leslie B. Hall, Jolon.
Ada W. Stone, Lewiston.
Ralph W. Boyd, Norwalk.
Fred Judson Booth, Stockton.
Ernest G. Kuhn, Sunnymead.

COLORADO

George J. Ware, Aspen.
Robert Hayes Wardwell, Colorado Springs.
John C. Warren, Fruita.

CONNECTICUT

Clarence P. Meier, Cornwall.

FLORIDA

Sara Bryan Rogers, Live Oak.

GEORGIA

Jean H. DeLoach, Claxton.
Joseph H. Summerour, Duluth.
Oneita H. Barrett, McRae.
Edgar P. Faulkner, Tucker.

IDAHO

Leoren D. Anderson, Filer.
Inez A. Seagraves, Kingston.

ILLINOIS

Theron C. Tavenner, Freeport.
Richard D. Michael, Le Roy.
Ralph E. Wright, Rockton.
Herbert W. Danekas, West Brooklyn.

INDIANA

Alexander L. Zivich, East Chicago.
J. Clyde Garretson, Roaknoke.

IOWA

Donald L. Wilson, Colo.
Ewing E. Shiffer, Grimes.
Carl T. Ehen, Harcourt.
William C. Messenger, Menlo.
Phyllis J. Davis, St. Charles.

KANSAS

George E. Cox, Buffalo.
Oswald K. Klassen, Elbing.
George P. Shaw, Kanopolis.
Lee M. Fraker, Winchester.

LOUISIANA

Ruel Gene Roberson, Dubach.
Ora G. Thomas, Mooringsport.
Alice H. McWilliams, Princeton.
Claude T. Cox, Vivian.
Jacqueline F. Dunn, Westlake.

MARYLAND

Agnes L. Matthews, Hughesville.
Lee Munshour, Thurmont.

MICHIGAN

Menzo A. Chapman, Blanchard.
Verla V. Wolfgang, Dansville.
Bonnie L. Smith, St. Helen.

MINNESOTA

Marguerite D. Manders, Big Falls.
Ruth A. Campbell, Ellendale.
Eugene J. Grady, Hoyt Lakes.
Roland S. Sorvig, Winger.

MISSISSIPPI

Arlie A. Ramsey, Clarksdale.
Harry O'Caln, Durant.
Herbert M. Herman, Mayersville.
William R. Basden, Sherman.
Tommy V. Dillard, Stonewall.
Paul L. Parker, Water Valley.

MISSOURI

Warren C. Moser, Auxvasse.
Orpha Mae Bolin, Bois D'Arc.
John R. Allison, Marceline.

MONTANA

James M. Stout, Ballantine.
Donald A. Kleppelid, Circle.
Olaf Pederson, Huntley.

NEBRASKA

James R. Fleming, Cedar Bluffs.
Roy H. Clements, Riverton.

NEW HAMPSHIRE

William J. Driscoll, Plymouth.

NEW JERSEY

Francis A. Riopel, Marlboro.
Daniel Dietz, Stanhope.

NEW MEXICO

Virginia L. Alexander, Farmington.
Sibyl S. Griffin, Reserve.
Julius E. Fitzner, Tucumcari.

NEW YORK

Helen M. Hlavac, Bohemia.
David A. Walt, Burnt Hills.
Walter M. Paul, Clark Mills.
Edna M. Beach, Cottekill.
Edwin Craft, Ellenville.
Edward O. Wood, Iilon.
Betty P. Kanar, Porter Corners.
Gladys Behr, Rocky Point.

NORTH DAKOTA

Melvin L. Tofteland, Antler.
Harold D. Dunahay, Bismarck.
Myron J. Wallin, Crosby.
William T. Fasset, Dunseith.
Simon H. Gimbel, Hazelton.
Leo Ketterling, Lehr.
Arnold F. Fahrer, New Rockford.
John Boyko, Stanton.

OHIO

Lloyd Gardner, Dundee.
William A. Jordan, Fayetteville.
Richard J. Swain, South Zanesville.

OKLAHOMA

Virgil R. Hughes, Blanchard.
Hiram H. Wright, Paden.
Ida M. Doyle, Redrock.
Boyd A. Troop, Tuttle.

OREGON

Roger J. Thompson, Cutler City.
Juanita L. Hagen, Government Camp.
Reese D. Jenkins, Ontario.

PENNSYLVANIA

Harold H. Allshouse, Brookville.
Henry L. Bomberger, Elm.
Norman H. Fulton, Glenolden.
Merl W. Seavers, Hershey.
Vincent B. Segeleon, Leetsdale.
Richard C. Rader, Lititz.
Irvin V. Diffenderfer, New Holland.
Esther M. Moore, Rockhill Furnace.

SOUTH CAROLINA

Ruth L. Lawson, Buffalo.
Carl E. Burkett, Cayce.
Ralph H. Ellis, Little River.

SOUTH DAKOTA

Melvin R. Bollinger, Bowdle.
Dale A. Wiltfang, Mansfield.

TENNESSEE

Charles B. Gray, Afton.
Harold N. Tidwell, Bon Aqua.
Lloyd Dodson, Doyle.
Betty Greer Goddard, Louisville.
Erma J. Hall, Mayland.
William R. Allbritten, Puryear.

TEXAS

Arthur R. Main, Petersburg.
Trinidad Solis, San Diego.

VERMONT

Ernest A. Pike, Craftsbury.

VIRGINIA

George P. Grindstaff, Damascus.
Virginia B. German, Dunn Loring.
Wilmer J. Whitaker, Fries.
James E. Brunner, Riner.
James I. Whitlow, Sandston.
Roy M. Cleek, Warm Springs.

WASHINGTON

Dean M. Corliss, Port Orchard.

WISCONSIN

Clifford John Stuber, Cochrane.
Floyd R. Dixon, Elkhart Lake.
John R. Sargent, Gratiot.
Daniel H. Hutchison, Ontario.

WYOMING

Elizabeth L. Moore, Fort Washakie.
Hazel M. Bennion, Meeteetse.