



Congressional Record

United States
of America

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 86th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

SENATE

FRIDAY, JUNE 5, 1959

Rev. Robert H. Shaw, Ph.D., rector-elect, Trinity Episcopal Church, Fredericksburg, Va., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, Thou high and mighty Ruler of the Universe, look with compassion upon the world which Thou hast made, and which men have disordered. Grant an end to tyranny and enslavement, to anxiety and fear. Show Thy mercy upon men; establish Thy truth among nations.

Bless, O God, this Nation, founded under Thy protection. Preserve it as a living witness to the value of each individual man, as a living influence for Thy will in Thy world.

Send Thy Holy Spirit, we beseech Thee, upon those who govern this Nation, and especially upon these, Thy servants, the Senate of the United States. Grant them love, to desire what is right; grant them wisdom, to know what is right; grant them courage, to do what is right; that in ordering the affairs of this country they may restore Thy order in the affairs of this world.

Through Jesus Christ our Lord, who liveth and reigneth with Thee and the same Holy Spirit, one God, world without end. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, June 4, 1959, was dispensed with.

EXECUTIVE REPORT OF A COMMITTEE SUBMITTED DURING ADJOURNMENT (EX. REPT. NO. 4)

Pursuant to the order of the Senate of June 4, 1959,

Mr. MAGNUSON, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, reported favorably the nomination of Lewis L. Strauss, of New York, to be Secretary of Commerce, and submitted a report thereon, together with minority and individual views, which was printed.

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.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 1094) to amend the Bretton Woods Agreements Act.

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.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its business today, it stand in adjournment until noon on Monday.

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

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the Executive Calendar, as in executive session.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

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.)

STATE DEPARTMENT

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now consider the nomination, on the Executive Calendar, of J. Graham Parsons, of New York, to be an Assistant Secretary of State.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination will be stated.

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of J. Graham Parsons, of New York, to be an Assistant Secretary of State.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, 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 VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

There being no objection, the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO THE BUDGET, FISCAL YEAR 1960 (S. DOC. NO. 28)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the President of the United States, transmitting proposed amendments to the budget for the fiscal year 1960, involving increases in the amount of \$433,365 for the legislative branch, which, with an accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

RESOLUTIONS OF MINNESOTA LEGISLATURE

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I present two resolutions which were recently approved by the Minnesota State Legislature, in support of a bill to establish a Youth Conservation Corps and a bill to equalize the retirement pay of members of the Armed Forces. I ask unanimous consent that the resolutions be printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred to the committees considering these measures.

As the sponsor of the Youth Conservation Act of 1959, S. 812, and a cosponsor of S. 269, which would equalize retirement benefits, I am most pleased to invite the Senate's attention to these two resolutions in support of these bills.

There being no objection, the resolutions were received, appropriately referred, and, under the rule, ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

To the Committee on Armed Services:

"RESOLUTION 7"

"Resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to amend the Military Pay Act of 1958 to equalize the retirement pay of members of the Armed Forces of the United States."

"Whereas there is now pending before the 86th Congress of the United States legislation, including S. 269, S. 541, and H.R. 703,

to equalize the pay of retired members of the uniformed services who receive their retired pay under the provisions of the Career Compensation Act of 1949; and

"Whereas the Military Pay Act of 1958, Public Law 85-422, failed to provide for the computation of the retired pay of such members of the uniformed services, retired prior to June 1, 1958, on the basis of the newly established pay rates provided in said law, at the same time providing that the retired pay of those retired after that date be computed at the newly established higher rates; and

"Whereas there appears to be no basis for this gross discrimination against such retired personnel who, by reason of past meritorious services, should be equally entitled to benefits granted to retired personnel retired after the effective date of the Military Pay Act of 1958, Public Law 85-422; and

"Whereas a failure to maintain the same standard for the computation of retired pay of all members of the uniformed services of the United States, regardless of the date of their retirement, will cause defections from active service of career officers and thus prove detrimental to the national defense and security of the United States; and

"Whereas retired members of the uniformed services of the United States reside in every portion of our country, however, the State of Minnesota is privileged to have great numbers of such retired personnel who have served their country faithfully and with distinction: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Legislature of Minnesota, That the Legislature of Minnesota respectfully memorialize the Congress of the United States to enact appropriate legislation, similar to that proposed in S. 269, S. 541, and H.R. 703 of the 86th Congress, to provide that the retired pay of those retired before June 1, 1958, be computed on the same basis as the computation of the retired pay of such members retired after June 1, 1958; and be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of state is hereby directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President and the Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Senator and Representative from the State of Minnesota in the Congress of the United States.

"KARL ROLVAAG,
"President of the Senate.
"E. J. CHILGREN,

"Speaker of the House of Representatives.
"Approved April 24, 1959.

"ORVILLE L. FREEMAN,
"Governor of the State of Minnesota."

To the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

RESOLUTION 8

"Concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact legislation creating a Youth Conservation Corps to provide healthful outdoor training and employment for young men and to advance the conservation, development, and management of national resources of timber, soil, and water, and of recreational areas

"Whereas an ever-increasing number of young people 16 to 22 years of age in our society are unable to find employment; and

"Whereas unemployed youth under 20 years of age in Minnesota numbered 14,000 in February 1959, according to Federal estimates reported by the Minnesota Department of Employment Security; and

"Whereas such growing unemployment results from the increasing mechanization and automation in agriculture, industry, and clerical and service activities, and is therefore no transitory problem; and

"Whereas many of these young people who are unemployed have special need to learn habits of work, responsibility, skills, and self-confidence; and

"Whereas idleness at this period of their lives will turn many of them into embittered and frustrated citizens, crippled vocationally and emotionally; and

"Whereas the protection of our natural resources in soil, water, forest, and wildlife is essential to the continued economic and spiritual health of our society, at the same time that conservation projects offer unlimited and noncompetitive work opportunities to our young people; and

"Whereas both youth unemployment and conservation needs are nationwide and require Federal attention: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Legislature of the State of Minnesota, That the Congress of the United States be respectfully requested to enact immediately legislation now before it to establish a Youth Conservation Corps; and, be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of state of the State of Minnesota be instructed to transmit copies of the joint resolution to the Presiding Officers of the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States and to each Member of Congress from the State of Minnesota.

"E. J. CHILGREN,
"Speaker of the House of Representatives.

"KARL ROLVAAG,

"President of the Senate.

Approved April 24, 1959.

"ORVILLE L. FREEMAN,
"Governor of the State of Minnesota."

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. BYRD of Virginia, from the Committee on Finance, without amendment:

H.R. 6319. An act to amend chapter 55 of title 38, United States Code, to establish safeguards relative to the accumulation and final disposition of certain benefits in the case of incompetent veterans (Rept. No. 344).

By Mr. HAYDEN, from the Committee on Appropriations, with amendments:

H.R. 5915. An act making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1960, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 345).

By Mr. ELENDER, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, without amendment:

S. 6. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain real property of the United States to Sophronia Smiley Delaney and her sons (Rept. No. 346); and

S. 1941. A bill to extend section 17 of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act for 2 years (Rept. No. 347).

By Mr. ELENDER, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, with amendments:

S. 1521. A bill to provide for the removal of the restriction on use with respect to a certain tract of land in Cumberland County, Tenn., conveyed to the State of Tennessee in 1938 (Rept. No. 348).

By Mr. HOLLAND, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, with amendments:

S. 1512. A bill to amend the Federal Farm Loan Act to transfer responsibility for making appraisals from the Farm Credit Administration to the Federal land banks, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 349); and

S. 1513. A bill to clarify the status of the Federal land banks, the Federal intermediate credit banks, and the banks for cooperatives and their officers and employees with respect to certain laws applicable generally to the United States and its officers and employees, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 350).

By Mr. HUMPHREY, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, with amendments:

S. 864. A bill to provide greater protection against the introduction and dissemination of diseases of livestock and poultry, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 351).

REPORT ON DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, from the Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments, to which was referred for examination and recommendation a list of records transmitted to the Senate by the Archivist of the United States that appeared to have no permanent value or historical interest, submitted a report thereon, pursuant to law.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS 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. SALTONSTALL:

S. 2121. A bill to provide for systematic reduction of the public debt; to the Committee on Finance.

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

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

S. 2122. A bill to require semiannual reports by the Secretary of the Treasury with respect to the financial commitments and contingencies of the Government; to the Committee on Government Operations.

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

By Mr. WILEY:

S. 2123. A bill to amend sections 1461, 1462, 1463, and 1465 of title 18 of the United States Code to provide mandatory prison sentences in certain cases for mailing, importing, or transporting obscene material; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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

By Mr. SYMINGTON:

S. 2124. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. EASTLAND:

S. 2125. A bill to provide that the tax imposed by the Federal Unemployment Tax Act shall not apply with respect to service performed by individuals in connection with certain fishing and related activities; and

S. 2126. A bill to exclude from coverage under the insurance system established by title II of the Social Security Act service performed by individuals in connection with certain fishing and related activities; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

S. 2127. A bill for the relief of Andrzej Szuba; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THURMOND:

S. 2128. A bill for the relief of the West Virginia Pulp and Paper Co.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SALTONSTALL:

S.J. Res. 106. Joint resolution authorizing the Secretary of the Navy to receive for instruction at the U.S. Naval Academy at Annapolis two citizens and subjects of the Kingdom of Belgium; to the Committee on Armed Services.

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

RESOLUTION

Mr. HUMPHREY submitted a resolution (S. Res. 129) favoring continued efforts by all nations to strengthen cooperation in health and research activi-

ties, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

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

THE PUBLIC DEBT REDUCTION ACT OF 1959

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill entitled "The Public Debt Reduction Act of 1959."

This bill is similar to Senate bill 1738, which I introduced in the last Congress. The bill would amend the Second Liberty Bond Act, as amended, which provides for a permanent ceiling on the total national debt of the United States, now established at \$283 billion. The purpose of the bill is to lower, gradually and systematically, the ceiling on the national debt, by providing that at the beginning of each fiscal year it be reduced by a certain percentage of the preceding year's Federal revenue.

The percentages provided in this bill range from 2 to 5 percent. These are modest amounts, and would not disrupt existing Federal programs. However, if the bill were enacted into law, it would bring about a gradual reduction in the public debt of the United States, and would provide in any given year a fixed ceiling for Federal spending.

The percentages would operate on an escalator principle, and not until 1963 would the full impact of the bill be felt. In that and succeeding years the bill would call for a reduction of the debt by 5 percent of the net Federal revenue for the previous fiscal year. The budget for the fiscal year 1963 and thereafter could not exceed 95 percent of the previous year's revenue.

The bill provides two escape clauses when its debt-reducing effect would be suspended—one to be invoked in time of war, and the other to be invoked in a time of economic crisis when it might be considered in the best interests of the Nation to incur a budget deficit. Furthermore, in the event that Congress should pass any tax relief measure, the amount of the scheduled lowering of the public debt could be reduced, under this bill, for 2 fiscal years by the amount of the loss of revenue resulting from such tax relief.

The provisions of this bill are essentially the same as those of the similar bill I introduced in the last Congress. The bill I am introducing today contains two provisions which were not in my previous bill. The first of these would authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to accept, on behalf of the United States, gifts of money or any other intangible personal property and any Government obligations, if made on the condition that such gifts be used to reduce the national debt. Under present law, the Secretary of the Treasury may not accept such conditional gifts. This provision would afford to the people of the United States an opportunity by their own direct action to reduce the national debt.

The second provision which was not in the bill which I introduced in the last Congress would require that the proceeds

received by the Federal Government from the sale of any capital assets be applied to reduction of the national debt.

In order to make these two features effective, the bill requires that, in addition to the scheduled annual percentage reductions in the debt ceiling, such ceiling shall also be reduced by the amount of gifts received by the Secretary of the Treasury and by the amount of proceeds resulting from the sale of capital assets of the United States.

There are three basic goals which I hope this bill will achieve. The first is to reduce the size of the debt of the United States, which would, in turn, reduce the enormous sums of money which must be appropriated each year for payment of interest on the debt. The President's 1960 budget provides for \$8.1 billion for this purpose. This is more than 10 percent of the 1960 budget. Second, I hope the bill will help to keep a control on Federal spending, by establishing a system for limiting the amount of expenditures in times of peace and prosperity. Third, the bill should serve as an effective measure to help combat inflation. President Eisenhower has made it a prime goal of national policy to curb inflation, which has plagued our economy since 1939. His efforts are beginning to show results. Enactment of this bill will help assure that the progress in controlling inflation which has been started under President Eisenhower will continue in the years to come.

It begins to appear that there is real hope for a budget surplus in the fiscal year 1960, for the U.S. economy seems to be booming toward ever-higher levels of prosperity as we draw away from last year's recession. If this session of Congress can produce a budget balanced along the lines recommended by the President, it now begins to appear that revenues will be large enough to produce a surplus. Already there has been some talk of the possibility of tax relief next year. Today I am not prepared to say whether tax relief would be a good idea next year. I know that I shall wish to balance that possibility against the opportunity to reduce the national debt.

If Congress enacts this bill, it will assure the necessity of weighing tax reduction against debt reduction, in the event of budget surpluses. Mr. President, certainly everyone favors reducing the national debt. This bill provides an opportunity for Congress to do something toward achieving that objective. I hope the Senate Finance Committee will give the bill prompt and favorable consideration, together with a number of other interesting proposals which have been made for reduction in the national debt.

Mr. President, this bill spells fiscal responsibility. It is a call for sound fiscal management on the part of both the Congress and the executive branch. It is an invitation to come firmly to grips with a bad habit which has marked most of the last quarter century of Federal Government fiscal behavior—namely, to leave until some undefined tomorrow payment of the cost of many Government services and activities which should be met today. I can think of nothing which would more effectively strengthen

the confidence of the American people in the future fiscal integrity of their Government than for Congress to indicate that it means business on debt reduction. Such action would also assure all our friends in the free world that America means to keep her dollar hard, and thereby safeguard her economy, on which the economies of all other free nations so greatly depend for their strength and stability. It is not hard to remember that we must constantly maintain the military strength necessary in today's world, in order to assure the survival and growth of the United States and the rest of the free world. More effort seems required in order to recall the no less important necessity that we keep our economy strong. Enactment of this bill will guard us from the weakening influence of fiscal irresponsibility.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, at the close of my remarks, three articles which from different points of emphasis illuminate the importance of having Congress adopt an effective mechanism for controlling and reducing the national debt.

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

[From the New York Herald Tribune, May 26, 1959]

TREASURY'S ANDERSON: HIS PRODUCT UNPOPULAR

(By Joseph R. Slevin)

WASHINGTON, May 25.—Secretary of the Treasury Robert B. Anderson is a salesman with an unattractive product and fresh reminders of his market troubles come with disconcerting regularity.

Government securities are the Secretary's stock-in-trade. He wants investors to add larger quantities of governments to their portfolios but they have been taking a dim view of his entreaties.

The only growing market that Mr. Anderson can find is for short-term securities. Corporations have been buying short-term governments to invest their tax reserves and local governments have been buying them to invest their own tax collections.

Other customers are cutting back. That's true of savings bondholders, who consistently have been cashing more bonds than they have been buying. And it's true of the big institutional purchasers who have been searching out more lucrative investments than Government bonds.

It's doubly galling to Mr. Anderson and his Treasury advisers.

Government securities are being cold-shouldered at a time when the public debt—and the Treasury's needs for customers—have been rising. They are being cold-shouldered during a period when the total investments of institutions are growing by leaps and bounds.

The Treasury estimates that institutional investors chopped \$1,500 million of Government securities from their portfolios during the last 6 years. The assets of the institutions climbed an incredible \$100 billion over the same 6 years.

Life insurance companies and mutual savings banks cut their actual holdings of governments by \$5,500 million. The proportion of their assets in governments dropped 50 percent.

Savings and loan associations and State and local government pension funds added to their holdings of governments. But their total assets rose even more quickly with the result that governments represented a

smaller proportion of their assets at the end of the period than at the beginning.

The latest bit of unhappy news concerns corporate pension-fund holdings of governments and it came to Mr. Anderson today from the Securities and Exchange Commission. It had a familiar ring, for it was the same story that a prosperous, profit-hungry economy has been telling the Secretary for a long, long time.

Corporate pension funds boosted their assets to \$22,094 million at the end of 1956 from \$19,319 million a year earlier. The funds simultaneously trimmed their holdings of Government securities to \$1,985 million from a year ago total of \$2,032 million.

Where did the funds put their increased assets? Holdings of corporate bonds rose to \$11,731 million from \$10,392 million. Holdings of common stock jumped to \$6,042 million from \$4,770 million.

The pension funds are buying corporate bonds and common stock because they want a more generous return than they can obtain from Government securities. The corporates pay better. The common stock yields as much or more and provides a hedge against inflation to boot.

Corporate pension funds began to grow rapidly just under 10 years ago after the National Labor Relations Board ruled that pension benefits were a proper subject for collective bargaining. The SEC figures go back to 1951 and the changes since have been dramatic.

The funds have more than trebled in size. The December 31, 1958 total of \$22,094 million compares with a December 31, 1951, volume of only \$6,876 million.

The \$11,731 million corporate-bond total contrasts with 1951 holdings of \$3,125 million and the \$6,042 million common stock portfolio stacks up against a meager 1951 volume of \$812 million.

Government securities not only haven't shared in the expansion but they actually have lost ground. The \$1,985 million of "governments" in pension fund hands last December 31 was \$185 million smaller than the \$2,170 million of "governments" that the funds had 7 years before.

Mr. Anderson is trying to decide whether he should ask Congress to boost the 4 1/4 percent statutory ceiling on Government bonds. The going rate is higher and the Treasury has been priced out of the market.

Paying more than 4 1/4 percent may not arouse additional investor enthusiasm. Corporate bonds and mortgages still will yield more than "governments." But it will allow the Treasury to sell some Government bonds to the segment of the market that likes to put part of its funds in Federal obligations.

Mr. Anderson can sharply increase the Treasury's sales only by raising the Treasury rate to yield that would actively bid money away from other investments.

The maneuver would drain money from home building, local government public works, corporate expansion and other private activities. Much as Mr. Anderson would like to sell more bonds, it's not a step that he's likely to take.

[From the New York Times, May 22, 1959]

THE OMINOUS DISTRUST OF THE DOLLAR

(As reprinted from the Whaley-Eaton American Letter by Reader's Digest)

The flight from Government bonds is more ominous than most Washington officials care to admit publicly. Several recent Treasury financing operations have failed badly. As a result, the Treasury is being forced to run faster and faster merely to keep up with its maturities. The fact is that the richest Nation in the world is now operating on a hand-to-mouth basis.

The effect of all this seems utterly lost on advocates of dynamic new spending pro-

grams to speed business expansion, eliminate unemployment.

The Treasury cannot spend more money than it gets through taxes and Government security issues. Yet professional and naive investors both now distrust the latter. This means recourse to financing through the banks, which increases the money supply and is directly inflationary.

The classic sources of savings upon which the Treasury must draw if it is to manage the public debt in orderly fashion are being diverted. Institutions and individuals alike are investing their funds elsewhere. This clearly reflects basic distrust of the Government's fiscal responsibility. As Federal Reserve Chairman William McC. Martin puts it, "Investors cannot be induced to purchase fixed-income securities if they fear a steady erosion in the purchasing power of the dollar." Yet this is precisely what they do fear.

Official Treasury figures tell the story. During the past 6 years the assets of insurance companies, mutual savings banks, savings and loan associations and pension funds rose by about \$100 billion, but not a penny of this additional money went into Government issues.

During this same period, private citizens had new savings on the order of \$137 billion available for investment either through savings institutions or directly in securities and mortgages. None of this flow of capital went into Government obligations, on balance.

Refusal of the investing public to put new funds into Federal issues forces the Treasury to finance by devious means. For example, it sells tax anticipation notes to corporations at whatever price the market offers. This is, in effect, a method of collecting taxes before they are due. And it sells other short-term issues to banks, which treat them as cash, since they can be turned into dollars by rediscounting—thus creating more money.

Unless hopes for balancing the budget can be revived, the Treasury will have no alternative but to continue this course. That creates still further problems: (1) It will push up its interest cost even higher; (2) it will necessitate new offerings at more frequent intervals.

Restoration of faith in the dollar requires facing up to the Treasury's dilemma. But that is something Congress still seems unprepared to do. The testimony of Treasury officials has brought out clearly the need for fiscal sanity. But such pleas for a balanced budget mean comparatively little to a Congress which is being pressured from all sides to approve vital new Federal spending programs.

These pressures are direct, and every Member of Congress is subject to them. The sad truth is that they do not come solely, or even primarily, from labor-liberal groups. Conservatives are just as active in sponsoring spending programs when their own interests are involved.

Congress lacks any real machinery, moreover, with which to keep the budget under control. Its dual system of appropriating directly for some programs and authorizing agencies to borrow from the Treasury, with no time limit on either type of spending, skirts the whole problem. There is no close tie between the voting of expenditures and the voting of revenues to provide the necessary funds. This makes hold-the-line policy difficult under any conditions.

Spot checks of congressional mail fail to reveal any strong national demand for a balanced budget. Many people are writing, but most also want local needs considered.

Federal debt management problems not only arouse concern on the part of the Treasury officials but also affect the taxpayers' pocketbook. Interest cost on the money the Government has hired now runs to \$8.1 billion yearly. This is second only to defense in the fiscal 1960 budget of \$77 billion, and

represents almost a 30-percent increase within the past 5 years alone.

The continuing shift in Treasury debt to shorter and shorter issues is creating other worries. With buyers backing away from issues having a longer term than a year, refunding operations become larger and more frequent. Financing exclusively in the 1-year area means that within 4 years 75 percent of the total debt would have to be refunded each year.

The upward trend of interest rates has, moreover, still some way to go. Not only does the Treasury face further maturities this half year which must be refunded; it will also have to raise some \$6 billion to \$7 billion of new money in the second half. If business recovery continues as expected, the Treasury will be competing with heavy business loan requirements.

Eisenhower's impossible position on spending versus economy is illustrated in his effort to boost rural electrical cooperative interest rates. He wants co-ops to pay the same rate (about 4 percent) that the Treasury must bear when it borrows in the open market—just enough to cover basic costs. Yet the President is stymied by the congressional farm bloc. Democratic leaders assured the cooperatives that the 2-percent rate will go untouched.

At the heart of the Treasury's problem is a simple fact, easily grasped by anyone. This is that governments, like individuals, cannot spend more than they take in without being hurt. In the case of governments, continuing deficit spending debases the currency. This is the essence of today's distrust of the dollar.

[From U.S. News & World Report, May 11, 1959]

INFLATION, DEBT, RED INK: HERE IS THE OFFICIAL VIEW

(Interview with Robert B. Anderson, Secretary of the Treasury)

Question. Mr. Secretary, is the decline in the Government-bond market the result of a fear that inflation will further cheapen the value of the dollar?

Answer. I think you have to take into consideration a number of factors. In a period of strong business recovery, there are many opportunities for people to invest. A great many people are attracted to common stocks. Some see better business opportunities and put their money to work directly in a business operation. Businesses, seeking to expand and modernize, compete with the Treasury in borrowing savings with which to expand.

Greater difficulty in managing the Federal debt is simply one of the inevitable side effects of a rapidly expanding level of business activity.

Question. It has been said recently that the Treasury, in financing debt in a period of inflation, faces an almost impossible situation. What would you say to that?

Answer. It certainly is not an "impossible" situation. I would call it a rather difficult one. We have had similar difficulties in earlier periods of rising business activity. I think it's important to realize that we are making substantial progress in debt management in spite of the effect of a \$13 billion budget deficit this year.

At the present time the amount of the public debt maturing in less than 1 year is \$10 billion less than it was at the end of 1953. It's \$2 billion less than in December 1957, before the present substantial budget deficit arose. The average length of the marketable debt is slightly greater than it was in December 1957.

And then we've taken several steps during the past year to restructure our short-term debt so that it creates much less market disturbance. This is being done through the staggering of maturities and through selling more of our securities at auction. In

this way, competitive market forces determine the price of the new issues which are sold.

Question. You have said that, when the Government borrows from banks, the effect is to increase the country's money supply. Why be concerned about that?

Answer. I think in answering this kind of question one has to speak in the context of the time in which one is living. Let us simply say that more money usually means more spending.

There are times in which more spending is just what the economy needs.

A year ago we were in a recession; more spending was desirable. But, when business is expanding rapidly, we tend to use more and more fully our productive resources—our manpower, materials, our machines, and equipment. And after a certain point we take up most of the slack in the economy.

Then, if spending increases when there is little or no slack in the economy, prices would rise. We might then be confronted with the immediate danger of restraining an inflationary spiral.

I believe it is important for us to say that we have not, in my judgment, reached that point; nevertheless it does not minimize our obligation to do the right things now, while reasonable price stability prevails.

We still have too much idle manpower but, as the economy grows and the level of business activity rises, this manpower will be more fully utilized. We still have some idle equipment and machinery but, here again, with rising levels of business, the slack will be taken up. Last month, for example, industrial output moved to an all-time peak; individuals' income rose sharply to a new record; unemployment declined sharply.

The hard, basic fact is that, if we are to be a responsible nation, we must constantly plan for the future. Winning a battle against inflation is much like winning a battle in a war—it requires the utmost in determination and in advance planning. And we must respond to the challenge of what may be the dangers in the future, so that we can maintain confidence.

Question. Would you say that inflation has now become so much of a danger that it is vital to balance the Government's budget and stop borrowing new money?

Answer. If, in a period when we are setting new highs in production, in earnings, in corporate profits, in the level of business activity that is measured by gross national product—if, under those circumstances, we cannot live within our means—then I think people can rightfully ask, "When can you do so?"

There are a number of things which should put us on guard. For one thing, we are rapidly taking up the slack in the economy. Moreover, even though consumer and average wholesale prices have been more or less stable for a year, the stability has reflected increasing industrial prices and the prices of various other things, offset essentially by declines in prices of food and farm products.

The important thing to remember is that, in combatting future inflation, the seeds of inflation can be sown in periods just like the present.

To sit placidly by as long as price indexes are reasonably stable, without preparing properly for the pressures which may be building up toward future inflation—without restraining those pressures that may later show up in increased prices—is in effect to close the barn door after the horse has gotten at least part of the way out.

Question. Is the alternative to a balanced budget more bank-created money?

Answer. The extent to which we do not have a balanced budget would, of course, require us to do increased borrowing. The extent to which we do increased borrowing would probably result in some expansion of bank deposits.

Question. Is growth in the money supply the real danger of deficit financing in the period ahead?

Answer. It is certainly one of the dangers.

I should like to say on this subject of balancing the budget, or living within our means, that we must never forget that we already have a debt of very great magnitude. Surely in a period of high and rising business activity we should have as a goal, as an aim of our country, not only to achieve a mere balance in the budget, but something of a surplus that can be used for debt retirement. For if this is not done, the alternative may well turn out to be greater reliance on money creation.

Question. Suppose business begins to expand more rapidly, and businesses become not buyers but sellers of Treasury securities. What will your situation be then, with money tightening?

Answer. The extent to which securities are not bought and held by individuals, corporate holders and other nonbank investors puts an additional pressure upon the Treasury to finance in the commercial banking system. To that extent, of course, there is the danger of increasing the money supply.

However, as long as corporate profits and tax liabilities continue to rise, their holdings of governments should remain high. With business activity expanding, the outlook for continuation of corporate demand for our securities is favorable.

Question. Now, Mr. Secretary, what can we do in this country to avoid resorting to excessive creation of money to finance the Government?

Answer. One of the things that we can do during periods of high levels of business activity is to not only live within our means, but actually to make some reduction of the national debt. This means that the Government should do all of those things that are required and as many of those things as prudent people would judge should be provided within the limits of our fiscal condition at any given time.

We can try to increase our productivity by carefully studying our productive capacities and by eliminating impediments to rising productivity.

We can and should give support and encouragement to sound monetary policies such as will prevent credit excesses from adding unduly to spending during a period of business expansion.

The role of Government in all of these areas is, of course, vital. In this connection, it should be noted that outstanding leaders of both parties in the Congress have an awareness of, and are working toward, sound policies. But more than sound policies in Government are required.

Sometimes it seems to be old fashioned, or a cliché, to say that business and labor—indeed, every single citizen of this country—must use restraint, judgment, and responsibility in his activities; but this is one of the burdens of democracy. And when you weigh the advantages of democracy and freedom, the ability to use man's full incentives and the genius of his productive capacity, against a totalitarian system of direct controls, it's a very small burden that we're asked to assume—simply to be responsible.

Question. Is the outflow of gold a complicating factor in your problem? Are you concerned about that outflow?

Answer. I do not believe that the outflow of gold has been a significant complicating factor in our efforts to finance the deficit.

The outflow of gold is related to our international payments position and also reflects the fact that some foreign countries which were building up their international reserves last year had increased earning in their balance of payments and chose to hold some of their reserves in gold. Gold serves its age-old functions—as a means of interna-

tional settlement, and a national monetary reserve. To do this, it moves from country to country in accordance with the payments balance and the monetary policies of the major trading countries in the world.

I should point out that, during the time that gold was being added to the reserves of other countries, foreign holdings of bank deposits and short-term investment in this country—including short-term securities of the United States—increased.

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

The bill (S. 2121) to provide for systematic reduction of the public debt, introduced by Mr. SALTONSTALL, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

FEDERAL OBLIGATIONS REPORT-ING ACT OF 1959

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to make regular reports of the financial obligations of the United States, including direct and guaranteed debt, indirect and contingent debt, contractual commitments, and authorized but uncommitted appropriations.

The direct and guaranteed debt of the United States, most of which is subject to the public-debt ceiling, is already now regularly reported at various times and in various forms by the Treasury Department. It appears in the Monthly Bulletin, in the monthly statement of receipts and expenditures, and in other ways.

However, there is no comprehensive, regular reporting of the Government's indirect and contingent debt, its forward contractual commitments, or its backlog of uncommitted appropriations. These categories of Federal obligations and spending have grown substantially over recent years. We need a convenient, regular, and comprehensive means of keeping informed about them. Such information is increasingly essential to sound fiscal management in the Federal Government.

Federal agencies and corporations have been authorized to issue their own obligations. Some are guaranteed by the U.S. Government, and others are not; but purchasers see both types as backed by the Government. For example, a variety of guarantees have been made on housing and other mortgages; the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation insures the bank deposits of our people; GI life insurance insures the lives of our soldiers and veterans. Each of these programs and many others are reported to the Congress from time to time, but are never reported all at once, so that the Congress and the people may be fully aware of the impact they may have on our debt structure.

This bill calls for the reporting by the Secretary of the Treasury of the payments which the United States may be legally or morally obligated to make under all such programs. It calls for the reporting of the unused authority to make commitments under such programs. It calls for an estimate by the

Secretary of the Treasury of the financial risks inherent in such programs. The bill does not attempt a single definition of such risks, because there is so much variety among the programs. However, I would suggest that it might be reported in the form of estimated actuarial reserves. Any existing reserves would, of course, be reported, so that comparison would show the net risk.

There is another area in which recent growth has added to the obligations of the Government. The making of long-term contracts, when the United States has agreed to pay for goods or services over a period of up to 20 or more years, has increased sharply. Examples of this are the long-term leases whereby new post office or Federal office building construction is financed. In most cases these programs are an effort to avoid increasing the direct public debt of the United States, by encouraging private bodies to underwrite what the Government does not wish to pay for all at once. They are, perhaps, excellent programs; but since they replace the public debt, I believe they should be considered in the same context as the public debt. A third area in which the Congress is inadequately informed is the field of authorized and appropriated but uncommitted Government spending programs. From time to time, there is substantial delay in the actual commitment by the Executive of appropriated funds, thereby accumulating within the executive branch a volume of potential spending which could substantially affect the economy, as well as have a significant effect on the Federal balance sheet. It is my belief that this condition should be reported to the Congress at regular intervals at the same time as the direct debt, the indirect debt, and long-term contracts are reported, so that Congress and the taxpayers may see the full picture all at once.

The bill calls upon the Secretary of the Treasury to make such reports semi-annually—at the end of the fiscal and calendar years. It provides that they be broken down by department and agency, so we may see the programs individually and as parts of a whole.

Such reports would provide Congress and the taxpayers with information which is vitally needed in convenient form. A part of it is now readily available in existing reports, but most of it can be obtained only by special request. Such requests have been made from time to time in the past by the chairman of the Finance Committee, the senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] who joins me in sponsoring this bill, and by other Members of Congress. The Treasury Department has been accommodating in fulfilling these requests. However, I do not believe it should be necessary that this information be specially requested from the Treasury Department.

Under present laws, we have easier access to information about the obligations of many private corporations than we have about the obligations of the Federal Government.

Corporations which want to raise money from the public must publicly dis-

close to the Securities and Exchange Commission all their contingent liabilities and future spending programs. The purpose of such disclosures is to inform investors of the risks they face, and to give them an informed and reliable basis for the decisions they must make in their private investments. Since all of us are necessarily investors in the Federal Government, we should be as readily informed about its obligations and future spending programs.

The reports called for by my bill will provide Congress with information which would be very helpful in providing for sound fiscal management of the Federal Government.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the full text of the bill which I am introducing printed in the RECORD, and also a short study entitled "Providing the Congress with More Information on Authorizations and Commitments to Spend Beyond the Budget Year," which has been prepared at my request and direction by John C. Jackson, specialist in fiscal and financial economics in the Legislative Reference Service.

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

The bill (S. 2122) to require semi-annual reports by the Secretary of the Treasury with respect to the financial commitments and contingencies of the Government, introduced by Mr. SALTONSTALL (for himself and Mr. BYRD of Virginia), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Government Operations, 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 this Act may be cited as the "Federal Obligations Reporting Act of 1959."

SEC. 2. Section 114 of the Budget and Accounting Procedures Act of 1950 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"(d) The reports required by this section to be prepared by the Secretary of the Treasury shall include semiannual reports setting forth—

"(1) a summary statement of the outstanding public debt and guaranteed obligations of the United States showing the amount thereof which is subject to statutory limitation;

"(2) the aggregate amount of the contingent liabilities of the Government together with a statement showing the collateral pledged or other assets available (or to be realized) as security therefor, and an analysis of their significance in terms of past experience and probable risk;

"(3) the total amount of the Government's obligation under outstanding contracts for the purchase of property, goods, or services to be realized or delivered over a period of three or more years; and

"(4) the total amount of the outstanding contract authorization which has been granted to, but not committed by, the executive agencies.

"Such reports shall set forth the financial data required by clauses (2), (3), and (4) of this subsection in a concise form, with such explanatory material as the Secretary may determine to be necessary or desirable, and shall include total amounts for each category according to the executive agency involved and for all such agencies."

The study presented by Mr. SALTONSTALL is as follows:

PROVIDING THE CONGRESS WITH MORE INFORMATION ON AUTHORIZATIONS AND COMMITMENTS TO SPEND BEYOND THE BUDGET YEAR
(By John C. Jackson, specialist in fiscal and financial economics, Economics Division, Library of Congress)

Most of the Federal Government's expenditures pay for programs that continue beyond one budget year. Many of the programs and their component activities are of indefinite duration, others require varying numbers of years for completion. The manner in which the Congress has authorized expenditures often reflects the nature and duration of the program, and affects the ability of Congress to control expenditures in any fiscal year. A few examples will illustrate differences in the way expenditures are authorized. The interest on the public debt is paid under authority of a permanent appropriation. Major portions of the public roads program expenditures are from a trust fund to which gasoline and other taxes are contributed. Aircraft, missiles, and ships are paid for under authority of appropriations which contain no limitation as to the period of years over which the funds are to be available. The Export-Import Bank lends funds which it has obtained from Treasury investment in its capital stock, funds obtained by borrowing from the Treasury, and also lends the repayments and earnings from earlier loans. The Federal Housing Administration insures mortgages and meets claims by issuing debentures which are subsequently redeemed out of insurance revenue and the proceeds of the sale of the properties and mortgages. The appropriation for salaries and expenses of the Bureau of the Census is an annual appropriation, to be obligated during the fiscal year for which it is provided.

These activities or programs, like others undertaken by the Government, involve moral or statutory commitments of the Government to spend money in later fiscal years. The commitment to maintain a Bureau of the Census may be no less binding because it is financed on an annual basis than is the commitment to a missile program which will not require annual congressional action because one appropriation has authorized the full amount of money required for a program extending over several years.

The annual expenditures to meet commitments are difficult to control through present methods of authorizing obligations when a project requires more than 1 fiscal year to complete, or is financed through a revolving fund, or when insurance or guarantees are written. The Congress does not have complete control over the rate of progress on missile contracts or construction contracts, nor over the prices of farm produce subject to price support, nor over delinquency and default rates on insured mortgages.

The means of obtaining the money to make the authorized expenditures are prescribed by legislation, but the adequacy of the funds is not wholly within the control of the Congress. Income tax revenues, for example, vary with changes in economic conditions. Receipts of Government corporations from loan repayments and from sales of commodities, receipts that will be applicable to the corporation's uses and avoid budgetary expenditures, also fluctuate with economic conditions.

One of the results of imprecise control over expenditures and revenues is insecure control over the size of the public debt. If the Congress wishes to reduce the public debt in an orderly fashion, by definite amounts, it may consider methods of controlling expenditures more precisely.

A first step toward closer annual control over expenditures is to ascertain not only

the plans for expenditures during succeeding years but to ascertain how much the Government can spend on the basis of present authorizations, and how much it could be required to spend, willingly or unwillingly, because of present commitments for which appropriations have not been provided.

Information on these matters is presented in the text of the budget document, and in summary tables, for programs resulted in budgetary expenditures. (Some data also are presented for trust funds in the budget, and additional information appears in trustees' reports.) Some of the information is kept up to date through periodical publication; additional information is reported to the Treasury Department and the Bureau of the Budget, but is not published.

The total of authority to spend which can be used in the future is reported monthly in the Treasury Bulletin. The existence of this authority indicates only the current authorized upper limit on future expenditures. The upper limit can be changed, and its existence does not indicate either the amount that will be spent in a particular fiscal year, or eventually. In addition to the unspent balances, expenditures may be made from authorized programs for which no limit has been established, including some insurance and guarantee programs; or expenditures in excess of authorized limit may be required by commitments to guarantee and insure.

Unexpended balances of appropriations, of authorizations to expend from debt receipts, and of contract authorizations, are reported monthly in the Treasury Bulletin. One table shows for each of the departments, and for independent offices as a group, the development of the balances from the beginning of the fiscal year. Another table reports expenditures over a 6-year period according to a functional classification, and indicates the balances at the end of the most recent month. This table does not separate the forms of authorization which remain unexpended.

The tables referred to do not indicate how much of the authorizations have been obligated, whether spent or subsequently to be spent. Unobligated balances perhaps could be reported in these tables on the basis of information about obligations which is supplied monthly to the Bureau of the Budget on standard form 133, for its use in apportionment of authorized funds. (The Budget indicates that the unobligated balances at the end of this fiscal year will total about \$27.5 billion, outside of the proposed authorization for the international financial agencies. Less than \$8 billion of appropriations is expected to remain unobligated; nearly \$16 billion will remain unobligated authorizations to expend from debt receipts, and \$4 billion of that will be the FDIC and FSLIC authorizations which have not been touched in the past.)

In addition to information about unexpended balances, the Treasury Bulletin publishes for a number of governmental offices quarterly or semiannual statements of financial condition, income and expense, and source and application of funds and resulting budgetary expenditures. The offices include public enterprise revolving funds such as the Export-Import Bank and the Small Business Administration, and the Federal Housing Administration; intragovernmental revolving funds such as the GSA building management fund, other activities such as the Farmers Home Administration, Rural Electrification Administration, Commerce Department maritime activities, Bonneville Power Administration; and some deposit funds and trust revolving funds. The regulation (Department Circular No. 966, Treasury) reads:

"3. This regulation requires the submission of financial statements by corporate

and noncorporate Government agencies of the following character:

"(a) All wholly owned and mixed ownership Government corporations specifically included in the Government Corporation Control Act and amendments thereto, or subsequently brought under the provisions of that act.

"(b) All other activities of the Government operating as revolving funds * * * for which business-type public enterprise or intragovernmental fund budgets are required by the Bureau of the Budget.

"(c) Other activities or agencies (1) which are of a business-type nature; or (2) whose operations, services, or functions are largely self-liquidating or primarily of a revenue producing nature; (3) or whose operations result in the accumulation of substantial inventories, investments or other recoverable assets. Agencies and other activities to report under this category will be designated by the Fiscal Assistant Secretary of the Treasury."

The tables which the Treasury Department prepares from these reports for publication in the Treasury Bulletin, do not include memorandum entries which would indicate the maximum spending or lending authority of the offices, nor how near the maximum has been approached. The tables include a great number of offices, but not all of the Government, and do not combine into aggregates that could be compared with the current monthly data on expenditures and unexpended balances. Perhaps a feasible addition to the tables would be a memorandum, prepared from information now reported to the Treasury and the Bureau of the Budget, of the remaining unused authority of the offices included in the present tabulations.

The regulation which requires the reports referred to above also requires a semiannual report, information from which is now summarized in a mimeographed statement of long-range commitments and contingencies of the U.S. Government. The nature of the information required is best described in the language of the regulation, and of the standard form (223, Treasury Department).

The statement includes explanatory pages in which the Treasury insists that the commitments and contingent liabilities are not public debt. When or if they become obligations that are not met in full by the applicable receipts of the corporation, revolving fund, or other agency, they will become budgetary expenditures and then affect the public debt.

The commitments and contingencies are classified in the statement as loans guaranteed or insured; insurance in force; undisbursed commitments to make future loans, to purchase mortgages, to guarantee and insure loans; unpaid subscriptions; obligations on the credit of the United States; and Federal Reserve notes.

A number of programs are reported in part under more than one of these headings. For example, the urban renewal fund for loans and planning advances includes in its obligated balance (as reported in the Budget document), federally guaranteed private loans, and other undisbursed loan commitments. The first appears in one classification of the statement of long-range commitments, under loans guaranteed or insured by Government agencies; the second appears in another classification, undisbursed commitments to make future loans.

Possibly the statement could be arranged with agencies listed vertically in an item space, and the kind of commitment under headings spread horizontally, so that both the nature of current commitments and contingencies and the commitments and contingencies facing each fund or agency could be compiled readily.

The statement compares gross amount of contingency with public debt securities held

against them. One purpose of the comparison is to discourage duplicate counting of obligations. The statement does not include information requested on the standard form about other collateral or realizable assets. Nor does it include estimated losses, also specified in the form.

Understanding of the nature of the commitments or contingencies might be advanced if the relation of each to the obligations and the unobligated balance of the spending or borrowing authority of the agency were shown in the tabulation. Some of the commitments are charged as obligations against the borrowing authority of the agency, some are not; and whether or not they are obligations now is ascertainable only by examining the financial statements which appear in the budget document. Charges against borrowing authority, reducing unobligated balances, are made for the loan guarantees reported in the statement for CCC, public housing, informational media guarantees, Farmers Home Administration undisbursed loan commitments, college housing undisbursed loan obligations, public facility undisbursed loans, urban renewal undisbursed loan commitments and urban renewal federally guaranteed private loans. Not included in statements of financial condition nor in obligated balances of funds are farm tenant mortgage loans insured, FHA insured mortgages, maritime activities insured mortgages, Federal crop insurance, VA national service life insurance, and U.S. Government life insurance.

PENALTIES FOR MAILING, IMPORTING, OR TRANSPORTING OBSCENE MATERIAL

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I introduce a bill providing stiffer penalties for willful and continuing violations of the Federal antiobscenity laws.

Unscrupulous racketeers are now doing a half-billion-dollar-a-year business in sending obscene magazines, books, records, and films to grownups and youth alike, all over the country. Our mails are used for this direct attack on the American family and American morals. In fact, our postal rates at times inadvertently serve to subsidize these filth dealers. The Post Office Department estimates that up to 1 million children will receive unsolicited pornographic literature this year. Youngsters need not have indicated any interest in this type of material to receive it in the mail. The racketeers plainly solicit any young person whose name they can obtain from any generally available mailing lists. At times it is sufficient for a young man to answer an advertisement for such an innocent item as a baseball bat, and he finds himself flooded with uninvited and obscene so-called literature.

The penalties under present laws, providing for fines up to \$5,000 are inadequate. These illicit dealers, making thousands of dollars a year, regard fines as a mere cost of doing business. The bill I am introducing requires mandatory prison sentences for second and succeeding violators who transmit obscene matter through the mails, by express or truck, or who themselves take obscene matter interstate.

I desire to stress, however, that strengthening the Federal laws must be only one part of a broader program. The major portion of the battle against

this type of material must be carried out by State and local authorities, who must stamp out the base of operations of these dealers in filth. Furthermore, the attention of parents and the public at large must be drawn to this danger. Community support must be mobilized behind law enforcement, to help apprehend mailers of and dealers in pornography. But at the same time we must make certain that one of our most important public institutions, and a major means for national communications, is not misused by those who threaten the moral and social well-being of our youth.

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

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. 2123) to amend sections 1461, 1462, 1463, and 1465 of title 18 of the United States Code to provide mandatory prison sentences in certain cases for mailing, importing, or transporting obscene material, introduced by Mr. WILEY, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 1461 of title 18 of the United States Code (relating to mailing obscene matter) is amended—

(1) by inserting "(except any obscene, lewd, lascivious, indecent, filthy, or vile article, matter, thing, device, or substance)" immediately following "anything declared by this section to be nonmailable" in the eighth paragraph thereof; and

(2) by inserting immediately following such eighth paragraph the following new paragraph:

"Who knowingly uses the mails for the mailing, carriage in the mails, or delivery of any obscene, lewd, lascivious, indecent, filthy, or vile article, matter, thing, device, or substance, or knowingly causes to be delivered by mail according to the direction thereon, or at the place at which it is directed thereon, or at the place at which it is directed to be delivered by the person to whom it is addressed, or knowingly takes any such thing from the mails for the purpose of circulating or disposing thereof, or of aiding in the circulation or the disposition thereof, shall be fined not more than \$5,000 or imprisoned not more than five years, or both, for the first such offense, and shall be imprisoned not less than one year nor more than ten years for each such offense thereafter."

Sec. 2. Section 1462 of title 18 of the United States Code (relating to importation or transportation of obscene matter) is amended—

(1) by inserting "(except any matter, article, or thing covered by paragraph (a) or (b) of this section)" immediately following "any matter or thing" in the penultimate paragraph of such section; and

(2) by adding at the end of such section the following:

"Whoever knowingly takes from such express company or other common carrier any matter, article, or thing covered by paragraph (a) or (b) of this section—

"Shall be fined not more than \$5,000 or imprisoned not more than five years, or both, for the first such offense, and shall be imprisoned not less than one year nor more than ten years for each such offense thereafter."

Sec. 3. The second paragraph of section 1463 of title 18 of the United States Code (relating to mailing indecent matter on wrappers and envelopes) is amended to read as follows:

"Whoever knowingly deposits for mailing or delivery, anything declared by this section to be nonmailable matter, or knowingly takes the same from the mails for the purpose of circulating or disposing of or aiding in the circulation or disposition of the same, shall be fined not more than \$5,000 or imprisoned not more than five years, or both, for the first such offense, and shall be imprisoned not less than one year nor more than ten years for each such offense thereafter."

Sec. 4. The first paragraph of section 1465 of title 18 of the United States Code (relating to transportation of obscene matter for sale or distribution) is amended to read as follows:

"Whoever knowingly transports in interstate or foreign commerce for the purpose of sale or distribution any obscene, lewd, lascivious, or filthy book, pamphlet, picture, film, paper, letter, writing, print, silhouette, drawing, figure, image, cast, phonograph recording, electrical transcription or other article capable of producing sound or any other matter of indecent or immoral character, shall be fined not more than \$5,000 or imprisoned not more than five years, or both, for the first such offense, and shall be imprisoned not less than one year nor more than ten years for each such offense thereafter."

INSTRUCTION AT U.S. NAVAL ACADEMY OF TWO CITIZENS OF KINGDOM OF BELGIUM

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a joint resolution to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to receive for instruction at the U.S. Naval Academy two citizens and subjects of the Kingdom of Belgium. This week two fine young Belgians were graduated from the Naval Academy. These young men were admitted to the Academy under the authority of Public Law 318, of the 83d Congress. The same law authorized the admission of two Thai cadets to the U.S. Military Academy at West Point. The Thai cadets have also completed their full course of study. A new measure, Senate Joint Resolution 24, which was introduced by the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN] earlier this session, will permit the replacement of two Thai students at West Point. The joint resolution which I am introducing makes provision for Belgium to have two more midshipmen at Annapolis. Belgium has a fine, budding, young Navy, but no naval academy.

I understand that King Baudouin of Belgium, who made such a fine impression on all of us by his address before the joint meeting of Congress last May 12, is very anxious to be able to replace at Annapolis the two outstanding young men from his country who have recently graduated.

I understand that both the State Department and the Defense Department are in favor of this proposal.

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

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 106) authorizing the Secretary of the Navy to receive instruction at the U.S.

Naval Academy at Annapolis two citizens and subjects of the Kingdom of Belgium, introduced by Mr. SALTONSTALL, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

MUTUAL SECURITY ACT OF 1959—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF AMENDMENT

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, on May 28, 1959, I submitted an amendment to the Mutual Security Act of 1959. I did so on behalf of myself and the distinguished Senators from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD], from Nevada [Mr. CANNON], from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], from Utah [Mr. MOSS], from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER], from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXIMIRE], from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH], from Georgia [Mr. TALMADGE], and from Ohio [Mr. YOUNG].

Subsequently while the amendment was on the table, and under the authority of the order of the Senate of May 28, 1959, there were added as additional cosponsors the names of the distinguished Senators from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT], from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], and from Wyoming [Mr. McGEE].

I now ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that there be added as cosponsors the names of the distinguished Senators from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT] and from Maine [Mr. MUSKIE].

I am most pleased, Mr. President, to be joined by such able and distinguished Members of this body in the cosponsorship of this amendment.

It is a simple amendment. It seeks only to bring the foreign aid programs under the same budgetary and accounting controls to which the domestic programs are subjected.

It is most difficult for me to understand the resistance on the part of the executive branch to such a proposal. The delegation by the Congress to an executive agency of its constitutional right to appropriate funds should not be permitted to continue.

It is highly significant that 20 Senators, more than 20 percent of the Members of this body, have joined in expressing their desire that appropriations for foreign aid be returned to the control of the Congress.

Is it not enough that so much of this program is presented yearly to the Congress under the cloak of secrecy? Must those who present the program also be vague and indefinite about the purposes for which the funds appropriated are to be used?

Is it not past time that the Congress recapture complete fiscal control of this program, on which over \$70 billion have already been spent, and for which additional billions are being asked and will continue to be asked?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the names of the additional cosponsors of the amendment will be added, as requested by the Senator from Alaska.

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. HART:

Statement by Senator HART, presented to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry on June 4, 1959.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF JOHN F. KILKENNY TO BE U.S. DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE DISTRICT OF OREGON

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for 2:30 p.m., Monday, June 15, 1959, in Room 2228, New Senate Office Building, on the nomination of John F. Kilkenny, of Oregon, to be U.S. district judge for the district of Oregon, vice Claude McColloch, retired.

At the indicated time and place all persons interested in the above nomination may make such representations as may be pertinent. The subcommittee consists of the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA], and myself, as chairman.

THE STRAUSS NOMINATION—
MR. ERPF

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, on Wednesday, June 3, an editorial entitled "Now It's Mr. Erpf" was published in the Washington Evening Star. Inasmuch as other related material, from another newspaper in the city of Washington, has gone into the RECORD, I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be printed in the body of the RECORD, in connection with the Strauss nomination.

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

Now It's Mr. ERPF

The extent to which some people will go in their efforts to destroy a man is truly remarkable.

For months, Adm. Lewis Strauss, named by the President to be Secretary of Commerce, has been smeared up one side and down the other by his senatorial and journalistic enemies. When the committee hearings on his nomination ended, it looked as though the sniping was over—at least until the opening of Senate debate on the nomination. But not at all. Suddenly, out of the blue, there emerges the strange and supposedly sinister case of Armand G. Erpf. And the case of Mr. Erpf, we are told, proves once again that Mr. Strauss is devious, intellectually dishonest and unfit to be Secretary of Commerce.

This is vicious nonsense. On May 28, the Department of Commerce, undoubtedly with Mr. Strauss' approval, issued a press release which denied that Mr. Erpf, a New York financier, had been appointed to head up a Commerce Department transportation study. This release said Mr. Erpf "has not been selected, appointed, or otherwise chosen for any position in the Commerce Department and no arrangement with him has been made." This was the precise, literal truth.

But suddenly it becomes devious and sinister. Why? Because Mr. Strauss hoped that Mr. Erpf would take on the assignment and, several months ago, sounded him out on the project. Was the May 28 press release an attempt by Mr. Strauss to cover his tracks in the Erpf matter? Of course not. And the record is the best proof.

On May 11, Mr. Strauss was before the Senate Commerce Committee in public session. Chairman MAGNUSON asked him whether he had selected the man who would head up the transportation study. Mr. Strauss replied that he had asked two or three men to help him last February or March, but that they shied away pending Senate action on his confirmation. Senator MAGNUSON again asked: But are we to understand that as of now you have not selected a person to head it? Then came the following exchange:

"Mr. STRAUSS. Yes; I have a man in mind I would like to head it. I don't know if he would."

"The CHAIRMAN. Is that Mr. Erpf?"

"Mr. STRAUSS. Yes. E-r-p-f. And I haven't spoken with him in nearly 3 months."

This, then, is the record in the Erpf case—the case which now emerges as a sinister disclosure some 3 weeks after Mr. Strauss testified publicly about it.

Mr. Erpf, although an expert in the field, has withdrawn because he rightly feels that the adverse publicity has impaired his usefulness in any transportation study. Perhaps, because he has railroad interests, he should not have served in any event, although it should be noted that representatives of all segments of the transportation industry would have been represented on the study committee. Perhaps the critics would have been happier with a study headed up by some amiable nobody endowed with blissful ignorance of our transportation problems. But this now is beside the point.

The important thing is that the Senate is scheduled to begin debate on the Strauss nomination tomorrow, and we hope that Mr. Strauss, in line with the President's strong stand, will stay in there and fight this thing out to the end.

Of course, each Member of the Senate is entirely free to vote for or against confirmation. In our opinion, there is nothing in the record which justifies an adverse vote. But this is for the Senate to decide. All that an outsider can ask is that a record vote be taken—a vote in which each Senator will have to answer to his own conscience and to those people who expect the Senate to act with a sense of responsibility in a matter of this importance.

THREE HUNDRED AND FIFTIETH ANNIVERSARY OF DISCOVERY OF LAKE CHAMPLAIN—TRIBUTE TO BRIG. GEN. JAMES M. WARNER

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, this year many towns in the State of Vermont are commemorating the 350th anniversary of the discovery of Lake Champlain by the French explorer, Samuel de Champlain.

Local festivities highlighting important historical events are being reenacted or otherwise memorialized all during the summer and autumn.

However, these activities are, by no means, limited merely to the Vermont of earliest colonial times.

For example, in Morristown, Vt., there was a Memorial Day exhibition in tribute to Brig. Gen. James M. Warner, the first colonel of the 11th Vermont Volunteers in which many Morristown men served during the Civil War.

General Warner was the first mounted man to break through breastworks at the Battle of Petersburg, Va., on April 2, 1865, in the assault which broke the Confederate line and turned the tide of the war.

There is also the story of his plea to the adjutant following his nearly fatal wound at Spottsylvania, to hold fast the regimental colors on May 18, 1864.

These are the same colors which are now on display at the State House in Montpelier.

Memorabilia closely associated with General Warner's wartime activities form a basic part of the exhibition which was on display in the local Peck's Pharmacy store window.

Some 12 years ago the Morristown Historical Society was formed. Since then, it has established a local historical museum in a fine old brick homestead which was built in the early 1800's by Jedediah Safford, the son of John Safford, who came to Morristown soon after its founding in 1790.

Of interest to visitors will be the original wallpaper designs reproduced by the silk screen process; original fireplaces, one with the bake-oven, crane and early fittings; a well-known collection of over 2,000 pitchers and Toby mugs; mementos of the first white settlers of the town; and relics from the revolution.

It is good to know that the example of the Morristown Historical Society is by no means exceptional. Instead, it is typical of the interest and devotion of American citizens in communities all over the land.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD in connection with these remarks a news report from the Burlington (Vt.) Free Press of May 26, 1959, relating to the same subject.

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

MORRISTOWN HISTORICAL GROUP HONORS LEADER OF VERMONT CIVIL WAR REGIMENT

MORRISVILLE.—The Memorial Day exhibit of the Morristown Historical Society this year, appearing in the Main Street window of Peck's Pharmacy, is in tribute to Brig. Gen. James M. Warner, first colonel of the 11th Vermont Volunteers, in which many Morristown men served during the Civil War. Morristown's GAR post, formed in 1868 as the fourth in Vermont, is named for him.

General Warner, a native of Middlebury, was 25 years old and a 1st lieutenant in the U.S. Infantry at Fort Wyse, Colo., when Gov. Holbrook asked him to lead the new Vermont Volunteer Regiment.

His 1861 lieutenant's commission in the Army, issued following his graduation from the U.S. Military Academy at West Point, and signed in a firm hand with full signature, "Abraham Lincoln," is among the items in the exhibit.

Another memento is a scabbard of a gold-mounted dress sword presented to General Warner by officers of the Vermont Regiment. These and other items are loaned by his grandson, Paris Fletcher, of Worcester, Mass., an interested friend of the local historical society.

The exhibit includes a large portrait presented by General Warner to the GAR post here in 1869 and a copy of the resolution of thanks adopted by the post and signed "A. A. Niles, D. J. Safford, E. D. Darling, and Frank Kenfield, committee."

The James M. Warner Women's Relief Corps loans its charter. A group photograph of GAR members, a steel engraving portrait of General Warner in uniform as it appears in the book, "Vermont in the Civil War," a summary of his military career and other documents make up the memorial.

"General Warner is described in "Vermont in the Civil War" as "brave, modest, soldierly in the Civil War" as "brave, modest, soldierly, and equal to every position in which he was placed."

He wounded while directing an assault at the Battle of Spottsylvania on May 18, 1864.

Settling at Albany, N.Y., after the war, with his wife, the former Matilda Allen, he established a successful commercial house and served as U.S. postmaster for 4 years. His death occurred suddenly in 1897 at the age of 61.

FIFTEENTH ANNIVERSARY OF D-DAY

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, tomorrow will be June 6, 1959—the 15th anniversary of D-day.

Fifteen years ago tomorrow, on a sulky, stormy day, just at the break of dawn, allied paratroops dropped on Contentin peninsula, Normandy, France. Ninety minutes later the first assault troops—made up of American, British, Canadian, French, and Polish soldiers—began to crack the Normandy beaches named Sword, Juno, Gold, Utah, and Omaha.

The Normandy invasion was one of the greatest military achievements of all time, Mr. President. There, on that day, the battle of Europe against Adolf Hitler and Nazi Germany essentially was won. Five thousand ships, 9,000 planes, and Allied troops numbering 150,000 men, including 24 U.S. divisions, did battle during D-day. There were more than 10,000 Allied casualties and more than 2,000 men killed.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that two articles commemorating D-day, one from the June 8 issue of Time magazine and one from the May 31 issue of This Week magazine, be included in the RECORD at the close of my remarks.

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

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I feel that it is appropriate for us, and rewarding to us to commemorate this attack, this victory, this performance, this day, Mr. President, for two paramount reasons.

First of all, we commend to our memory the courage and the capability displayed on the 6th of June because that day rises high in our spirits as a great moment of American and free world history, and because of the dignity and generosity of the men and boys who died there serving the cause of a better, happier, more peaceful world for all of us.

Secondly, I am proud in the remembrance of D-day to honor the service of one individual who led our cause then, and who leads it now in the all-compelling issues of war and peace. Dwight D. Eisenhower, Mr. President, who had commanded the Allied forces against the Axis in North Africa, and who was to become NATO leader, Army Chief of

Staff, and finally Commander in Chief, was in charge of the entire D-day operation. As Supreme Commander of the Allied Expeditionary Forces, he was the final strategist, he calculated the precarious chances, he equated the factors of danger and triumph, he made the momentous decision to "go ahead."

In a sense, D-day was the beginning of the painful reconstruction, regrouping, and rededication of the years of the postwar period. In a sense, Mr. President, the Normandy invasion marked the start of a NATO which now guards Europe. Here, on June 6, 1944, in the first success of the continental victory over fascism, were the first beginnings of the new struggle against communism. Then and now, Mr. President, Dwight D. Eisenhower leads us.

On that victorious day in France in 1944 were sown the seeds of confidence in the judgment and leadership of General Eisenhower which so emphatically bloomed in the 1952 and 1956 U.S. elections. And today, President Eisenhower continues to hold the overwhelming support and trust of the American people as he works, for the future, with the intricate factors of power and principle. We offer our prayers and support to him, Mr. President, as he leads America and the free world in our shared efforts to meet the complex and delicate challenges of waging the peace.

EXHIBIT 1

[From Time magazine, June 8, 1959]

D-DAY IN EUROPE: THE FORGE OF VICTORY

June 6, 1944 was a dour, windswept day on the English Channel—and the decisive moment of World War II was hard at hand. The combined Chiefs of Staff of the United States and Britain had issued a directive to Supreme Commander Dwight D. Eisenhower: "You will enter the continent of Europe and * * * undertake operations aimed at the heart of Germany and the destruction of her armed forces." Eisenhower looked at the lowering sky and made his fateful decision to go ahead. Now to the captive peoples of Western Europe came his voice of hope: "The hour of your liberation is approaching." This, 15 years ago this week, was D-day. The results of that day's work are known wherever man draws breath. Almost forgotten is how precariously the power and the glory hung in the balance.

To undertake history's greatest amphibious invasion, the Allied Powers had assembled 150,000 men, 1,500 tanks, 5,000 ships, and 9,000 planes. The German enemy was reeling: his cities had been bombed, he had lost North Africa and been thrown back to the seven hills of Rome. Wounded he was—but still deadly dangerous, with 60 divisions, including his crack Panzers, to defend Western Europe. Adolf Hitler correctly divined Normandy as the probable Allied Schwerpunkt, concentrated his armored reserves behind seven infantry divisions in the target area and, closer to Germany, maintained strength in the Pas de Calais area. Hitler's most mobile general, Field Marshal Erwin Rommel, well knew that Allied air superiority (5,000 fighters on the channel front to a mere 119 for the battered Luftwaffe) would rule out any battle of maneuver, Rommel strengthened the coast defenses and prepared to fight it out on that line. Said he: "The war will be won or lost on the beaches. The first 24 hours will be decisive."

The Allies therefore faced a momentous strategic equation. Once the beachhead into Europe was established, they could land

100 divisions and pound on to Germany with almost 2-1 superiority. But on D-day itself the Allies would have to land nine divisions to fight 10 German divisions in bristling, fixed positions—and the Allied spearheads would be even more heavily outnumbered. "We shall have to send the soldiers into this party seeing red," said the Allied ground forces commander, Bernard Law Montgomery. "Nothing must stop them. Nothing."

Nothing did stop them—in places. In the battle's first hours, between 0015 and 0900, the Allies won three quick successes. On the left flank the British 6th Airborne Division achieved complete tactical surprise, wiped out German positions east of the Orne River. On the right flank the U.S. 82d and 101st Airborne Divisions, although badly scattered in the airdrop, outfought 3 German divisions, suffering 2,500 casualties. Shielded by this U.S. airborne success, the U.S. 4th Infantry Division swept ashore soon after the first light on Utah Beach, swamped the defenses at a cost of only 197 casualties. It was D-day's first major breakthrough.

INCH BY INCH

But it was on the four beaches between the Orne and the Vire that the man-to-man battle was fought in most savage fury. On Sword, Juno, and Gold Beaches, British and Canadian troops hurled in an astonishing force of specialized armor—mine-clearing tanks, pillbox-blasting tanks, ditch-filling tanks, flamethrowing tanks—but the German 716th Infantry Division in fortified seaside hotels and summer villas, fought back viciously, inflicting 4,000 casualties.

Onto the U.S. forces' Omaha Beach, a concave sweep of sand 300 yards deep beneath fortified bluffs, the U.S. 1st and 29th Divisions sent in a spearhead of 1,450 men. They ran head on into most of the German 352d Division—undamaged by the inaccurate air bombardment—and were soon shelled, mortared, mined, machinegunned. But even as the German commander at Omaha announced victory and began diverting his reserves against the British, U.S. Col. George A. Taylor ordered an advance: "Now let's get the hell out of here." Inch by inch, behind accurate naval gunfire, backed up by waves of reinforcement, the U.S. infantrymen pushed back the German defenders.

MILE BY MILE

All day and night the Allies poured reinforcements onto the hard-won strips of Europe—36,250 in the Utah sector, 34,250 at Omaha, 83,115 on the British-Canadian beaches and airborne area. The German infantry began to crumble. Still desperately fighting, the British punched out gains of 6 miles, the Canadians 8. The U.S. 1st and 29th Divisions battled into fortified villages behind Omaha, dug in. In the Utah sector the seaborne forces linked up with the airborne, pressed inland. The battle neared its moment of truth—the expected counterattack of Rommel's blazing Panzers. But that moment never came.

What happened was a breakdown in the German command. Rommel, believing the weather too foul for an invasion, was away in Germany on D-day. The 21st Panzer Division, instead of counterattacking, was fed into a piecemeal defense of Caen. The 12th SS Panzer and the Panzer Lehr Divisions were held in the rear from 0400 to 1600 by command from Hitler himself. Smothered by Allied air attack, they did not get into action until D-plus-one, D-plus-two, and D-plus-three.

THE BREAKTHROUGH

By that time, the battle was won. Along a 30-mile front, the forces of freedom had secured their beachhead on Hitler's Festung Europa. The price was dear: 10,724 casualties, including 2,132 dead.

There was deadly fighting yet to come and stirring history yet to be made. Montgomery drew the German armored strength onto the Second British Army and First Canadian Army at Caen, while the First U.S. Army broke out at St. Lô. Hitler and Rommel held back the German Fifteenth Army near Calais, waiting for a second invasion that never came. George Patton, with his ivory-handled pistols, led the Third U.S. Army from Avranches to Le Mans to Orléans to Verdun to Metz in the most spectacular armored advance of the war. There was the unforgettable moment when Paris was liberated. But those moments essentially had been made possible by the United States, British, and Canadian troops who, on that single day 15 years ago, stormed the beaches named Sword, Juno, Gold, Utah, and Omaha.

[From This Week magazine, May 31, 1959]

EISENHOWER'S TOUGHEST DECISION

(By Stewart Beach)

Do you remember D-day? Even if you weren't one of the thousands of soldiers who crossed the channel that unforgettable day, you may have been there in spirit, turning on a radio early the morning of June 6, 1944, hearing the terse message: "Under the command of General Eisenhower, Allied naval forces, supported by strong air forces, began landing Allied armies this morning on the coast of France."

That was all. But for the moment, it was enough. The invasion had begun. But why was it timed for June 6? Why that day rather than another? Few remember, if they ever knew, the factors which dictated the choice of D-day, or the precarious chance on which its success hung. I was in the fortunate position of knowing some of the chief actors in the drama, and I have gotten the story of what happened from them. It began this way:

Fifteen years ago this week events were moving rapidly toward the flaming climax of the greatest suspense story of modern times. The Germans knew, as everyone knew, that the Allies were about to launch a vast assault against the coast of France. But where the forces would storm ashore and the date of D-day—these were the two great secrets of that spring of 1944.

In May endless convoys of trucks loaded with men in battle dress began moving down the English roads to the channel coast. The men could guess that this was the invasion—but they didn't know. Only when they were penned into barbed-wire enclosures near the ports would they be told. They would wait there, for no one came out once he knew the secret. The entire south coast of England was an enormous military camp, off-limits to the public.

THE SECOND ENEMY

Now the ships began marshaling—more than 5,000 of them. Many anchored in the harbors; the landing ships nosed up against the macadamized "hards," surfaced strips along the water's edge, where their bows opened wide and their ramps went down to receive the troops and tanks that would rush to the beaches.

But the supreme commander and the other officers who shared the secret knew there was one enemy that could wreck their plan—the weather. And the plan itself was based on three phases of the weather which relentlessly governed the timing of D-day. An invasion across the treacherous English Channel was hazardous enough in itself. But unless they had fair weather on the days when three factors coincided, the commanders agreed that the enterprise would have to be postponed. Here is what they wanted:

1. Tide low but rising. Out near the low water mark on the Normandy coast the Germans had strung mined defenses. Lanes would have to be blown, and this could be

done only when the tide was out. But they wanted it rising so landing craft could get well inshore after obstacles were cleared.

2. Approach at dawn. Navy and Air Force wanted an hour of daylight to saturate the shore defenses. Therefore, the tide should be right an hour after dawn.

3. Light for airborne troops. Three divisions of airborne troops were to be dropped behind the beaches at 2 a.m. They needed darkness for the flight, but a late-rising moon to light the Normandy objectives.

By May 17, when he could be sure that all the pieces of the elaborate invasion machinery would fall into place, Eisenhower could pick a date. The three great essentials would coincide, according to the almanac, in early June—June 5, 6, and 7.

Now the state of the weather—fair or foul—was the big question mark which would face General Eisenhower when the time came for him to make his decision. Weekly practice sessions had been started in April when the meteorologists predicted the weather 24 hours ahead. Questions were asked, as they would be on the fateful morning. Then General Eisenhower would announce his practice decision.

As May wore on the weather was beautiful.

The generals—Eisenhower, Montgomery, and Bradley—visited the troops in the invasion force, making pep talks, as Montgomery called them. Confidence was high throughout that magnificent spring.

Then it happened. As May turned into June, the weather began to worsen. The commanders' meetings with the meteorologists were now held twice daily at Southwick House, the Portsmouth HQ, at 9:30 in the evening and 4 in the morning. And now the 4 o'clock meeting on June 4 was the crucial one.

At the meeting the meteorologists' predictions held no hope. Heavy clouds, gales, and high seas were ruling the channel. Naval gunfire would be ineffective, the dawn aerial bombardment of the Normandy defenses almost impossible. Smaller craft might capsize in the turbulent surf. The supreme commander made his decision: D-day was postponed, until June 6.

Twenty-four hours later, in the early hours of Monday, June 5, a wind of almost hurricane proportions was blowing in General Eisenhower's camp when he left for the 4 o'clock meeting. It was a formidable and complicated decision he must make. Many of the ships based in northern ports had already been at sea 2 days. To postpone for another day would cause almost insurmountable problems of refueling. To delay for another 2 weeks, when dawn and tide would be right again, would raise the agonizing problem of what to do with the troops in the meantime. Secrecy would almost certainly be lost if they were let out of the barbed-wire enclosures.

WARMTH INSIDE, CHILL WITHOUT

At Southwick House, he went into the comfortable library where a fire glowed on the hearth and there was coffee to take off the chill, tea for the British. There were some 15 or 20 officers assembled there—the commanders with their chiefs of staff, Air Chief Marshal Tedder, the deputy supreme commander; Lt. Gen. Walter Bedell Smith, General Eisenhower's chief of staff; Maj. Gen. Harold R. Bull, SHAEF G-3. There were also those most important men, the meteorologists, headed by Group Capt. J. M. Stagg and his deputy, Col. Donald Norton Yates, today a major general commanding the Atlantic missile range at Cape Canaveral.

The weather was dreadful outside Southwick House, and the meteorologists confirmed that the storms they had predicted were lashing the Normandy coast, with high waves thrown up on the beaches.

But, they said, reports from Iceland, Greenland, and ships at sea indicated that on the morning of June 6 a relatively good

period of weather would begin; it might last as long as 36 hours. Then bad weather would set in again.

IT WAS HIS CHOICE, ALONE

So there it was, a hope followed by the threat of disaster. General Eisenhower was faced with a choice and a chance. If he got a force on shore, could it be maintained in the face of bad weather ahead? Without the rigidly planned buildup of men and equipment on the beaches, the Germans might push the entire enterprise into the sea. On the other hand, the problems of postponement were agonizing.

As Supreme Commander, the decision was his alone. It was a moment when history was made. A wrong decision could wreck the greatest amphibious force ever assembled anywhere; a right one would carry it to decisive victory. His opponent was not Hitler now. It was the enemy he had always known he might have to face—the weather.

The room was still, with an almost unbearable tension. Then General Eisenhower rose to his feet.

He said, "We'll go."

That was Eisenhower's toughest decision. It was one that couldn't be put aside, and that had to be made by Eisenhower alone. That it was the right decision was brilliantly proved by the Allied sweep through France. That's something we can all still be thankful for this D-day.

MR. JOHNSON OF TEXAS

Mr. President, I commend the very able minority leader on the very fine and beautiful statement he has just made with regard to the coming anniversary of D-day and with regard to those who contributed so much in order that so many could continue to enjoy freedom in the world.

Very shortly I shall address myself to an anniversary involving one of the great statesmen of this Nation who was one of the real architects of the victory which was ours.

I should like to suggest the absence of a quorum, so that Members may be notified; and I suggest the absence of a quorum, Mr. President.

THE VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

MR. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

UNDERSTANDING: THE ONE SURE ROAD TO PEACE

MR. MUNDT. Mr. President, my home State of South Dakota was privileged earlier this week to hear an outstanding address by Mr. George V. Allen, Director of the U.S. Information Agency.

Mr. Allen's excellent speech is a valuable contribution in not only explaining the role of the USIA in promoting cultural exchange, but in telling how important and vital it is to world peace that we make every effort to achieve understanding of each other among the peoples of the world. Mr. George Allen was awarded an honorary degree by Huron College of Huron, S. Dak., on June 1.

As coauthor of the Smith-Mundt Act, I am deeply appreciative of the kind

comments Mr. Allen has made with respect to the accomplishments which have been made through programs resulting from this legislation.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have Mr. Allen's address made a part of the RECORD at this point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MANSFIELD in the chair). Is there objection to the request of the Senator from South Dakota?

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

UNDERSTANDING: THE ONE SURE ROAD TO PEACE

(Address by George V. Allen, Director, U.S. Information Agency)

It is not by chance that graduating exercises are commonly called commencement. The traditional sheepskin is, indeed, your introduction to a new life, to be lived in stirring times.

Personally, I am optimistic about the future, but not so blind as to deny that today the future presents many serious problems. Certainly the most serious of these is how to achieve peace with justice.

During the past 30 years I have lived in a number of countries and visited and traveled in many more. The most interesting, and often the most valuable, part of living or traveling in different countries is to talk to people, to find out what they are thinking, what they want. And I have always found that their first thought, their deepest desire, was for peace—for a real and lasting peace, not just another uneasy interlude between wars. People want a chance to develop their lives, to give their children an education, and to look to a future free from the constant anxiety and dread of international conflict.

Since this desire is so deep and wide, I have asked myself, I have asked others, why, then, do we not have permanent peace? Why is war still the nightmare that haunts the world's dreams? Why must we, even during periods between hot wars, constantly be faced with a cold war conflict?

One of the chief reasons, it seems to me, lies in the almost universal failure of different national groups to understand each other. Xenophobia, the fear and distrust of strangers, one of man's strongest emotions since the dawn of time, still control men's thinking. We not only dislike, we even hate people whose eyes are strangely made, as the song writer put it. We have a tendency, perhaps an instinctive one, to distrust people whose skin is a different shade or whose language or religion or customs are different from our own.

And yet time and again we have seen it demonstrated that once this tendency is overcome, men are able to recognize their common humanity. The first step is for people of different nationalities to learn more about each other. I do not contend that all people will automatically like each other better merely because they know each other better. A newspaper columnist, during a recent political campaign, described one of the candidates as a man you have to know well to dislike thoroughly. But knowledge is the first step toward understanding. If you understand a foreigner's motives, you are likely to be tolerant of his way of life even when you do not agree with it.

In the past, the chief barrier to international understanding has been the problem of communications. During recent years, however, tremendous strides have been made toward solving that problem, at least in the technical field. Today, one man standing before a microphone can communicate simultaneously with every nation of the entire

world. Last summer the USIA broadcast the proceedings of a special session of the United Nations, live, from the floor of the U.N. Assembly room in New York to every corner of the globe, in the five official languages of the U.N. We concentrated all of our 76 transmitters in the United States and overseas for this purpose, during the crucial 3 days of the session. This was undoubtedly the largest concentration of international broadcasting attempted up to the present time.

Last Christmas, a short 6 months ago, a human voice came down to earth from outer space for the first time in man's history. President Eisenhower's message of peace and good will toward all men was broadcast from an earth satellite which orbited the globe every 90 minutes.

The transmission lasted only a few days, and the message was brief, but it was eminently appropriate, for it ushered in a great new era of communications with a plea for peace and good will. Within a few years, both television and radio networks will use orbiting satellites regularly to relay messages to all the world. Two of these such satellites, orbiting in cadence with the daily revolution of the earth, but at different places in outer space, will relay broadcasts to every spot on the surface of the earth simultaneously.

These new tools of communication make it possible for us, if we use them wisely—if we use them to build friendship rather than hatred—to make great progress toward international understanding.

The barrier of language will still exist, and will be more difficult one to overcome than the scientific problem of transmitting sounds. A universal language is still far off. Even here, however, progress is being made. The eagerness of people throughout the world to learn English is astonishing. And we Americans are at last waking up to the need at least for our people who work overseas to speak the language of the people with whom we live.

International understanding may be no longer merely a dream. It could become a reality, at least to a sufficient degree to enable the governments of the world to form an international organization strong enough to keep the peace. I am convinced that this will come about, and that conviction is the basis of my optimism for the future.

It seems to me that the United States has a distinct and special contribution to make toward the progressive advance of such understanding. It could be our most important single contribution toward human welfare.

This young Nation has demonstrated that the people of many faiths, of many races, can learn to live in peace with each other. To be sure, we have not resolved all our internal differences completely, but we have made extraordinary progress. We can serve as a model, not of perfection, but of determination to do the job. I think we have a responsibility to do just this.

In the Smith-Mundt Act of 1948, of which my good friend and your senior Senator, KARL MUNDT, was one of the sponsors, the U.S. Government recognized this responsibility. The act itself states that its purpose is to promote "a better understanding of the United States in other countries and to increase mutual understanding between the people of the United States and the people of other countries." To the wisdom and statesmanship of those words I think the future will bear witness.

Your Senator, then Representative MUNDT, and Senator Alexander Smith, of New Jersey, were sent to Europe in the summer of 1947 on an investigation. They learned that a very incorrect image of the United States was in the minds of most people abroad, and that Americans did not always have a true picture of the aims and aspirations of foreigners. They came home resolved to take the action

that resulted in the legislation just mentioned.

Then, as now, the need was to give other people as true a picture of America as we possibly could. It was not proposed that we try to picture the United States as having achieved perfection, but Congress made it clear that those of us engaged in this field should try to give people everywhere a sense of what we Americans know we are—a strong and alert democratic nation dedicated to man's best capabilities.

Fortunately for the United States, a large proportion of mankind today shares our aspirations for peace and a better world. Interest in America, too, is almost universal. People everywhere want to know what we are and what we do. They want to come and see us, and if they can't do that, they want to read, hear, and talk about our country.

All this, of course, gives your Government's oversea information program a strong foundation on which to work. With books, magazines, releases for the local press, films, radio and TV programs, our officers overseas try to supply the information these people want. Using all the tools of communication available, we try to keep the channels open for a flow of information and ideas in both directions.

Cultural exchange with foreign peoples is proving one of our most effective approaches. As a high ranking Indian Government official remarked at the opening of an American water-color exhibit in New Delhi, "Politics divide, slogans irritate, but art unites."

The heart of our operation overseas is, in fact, our U.S. cultural centers, 158 of them in 80 countries. In addition, the USIA cooperates in the operation of 93 binational centers, the majority in Latin America but an increasing number in Europe and Asia. These centers range in size from modest little units managed part time by one American with the aid of a local staff to such great establishments as Amerika Haus in West Berlin, which is visited daily by some 5,000 persons, a fourth or more from East Germany. We are told that the Soviet determination to get the Western Powers out of Berlin is chiefly directed at the USIA Amerika Haus and RIAS, our radio station in that city. The Soviets call them festering sores. We call them havens of democracy and freedom.

A newspaperman from Calcutta had a rather pertinent comment recently on the U.S. Government's oversea informational and cultural programs. C. K. Bhattacharyya told us that our materials help build "relationships which endure although political relationships may deteriorate."

I am particularly proud of this positive and constructive side of the USIA program. Unfortunately, we are forced at present to carry on concurrently certain quarrelsome activities—to correct misstatements about the United States and to combat misrepresentation by international communism. We would have enough to do merely to overcome simple ignorance about the United States, but when we must strive to offset willful falsehoods, our task is compounded. The Communist bloc is waging the greatest international propaganda campaign in history, to propagandize the non-Communist world and to degrade the United States. In addition, they spend a great deal of time and effort, through jamming operations and otherwise, to prevent their own people from learning about the outside world.

We try not to be propagandists in the bad sense of the word, but the Communist campaign of misrepresentation has to be countered, and we are doing it, with lashing attacks where needed. However, it isn't the most appealing part of our effort. To build a true structure, not destroy false images, is more in keeping with the American character.

Our cultural exchanges with foreign countries is positive, and of growing importance. The USIA, I should hasten to add, is not the only U.S. Government effort in the cultural exchange field. Fifteen Government departments and agencies were represented at a recent State Department meeting to discuss the coordination of the various official international cultural and educational programs of the United States. This may sound like duplication, but I do not believe the danger of duplication is very great. The Department of Agriculture, or Labor, or Commerce, or the Library of Congress, or the Smithsonian Institution, is each interested in developing cultural contacts with foreign officials or groups in its particular field. In my view, the more groups working at the problem, the better.

There are also very many and important private programs which are doing outstanding work. Some of these programs are entirely nongovernmental. In others, the Government either cooperates or stands by to assist when asked. We do both, cooperate and assist, in such programs as the affiliations between American colleges and similar institutions abroad. These colleges exchange books, magazines, records, films and even students. Some 38 American colleges and universities are at present affiliated with institutions overseas.

American cities and towns affiliate with cities and towns abroad. I should like to see both types of affiliations vastly expanded.

I was pleased to note in some of the literature which your President sent me that Huron College frequently has welcomed foreign students. Perhaps you may have felt that the number of such students was too small to be of significance. I think even a small number is significant. The importance of the individual is a tenet of the democratic faith, and one foreigner who returns from Huron College to his homeland to tell about America is very important. If he leaves with you a wider understanding of his country and his people, that, too, is equally important. It is mutual understanding which the world needs.

I am deeply honored that Huron College has seen fit to confer on me the honorary degree of doctor of social science. Since international relations is one of the social sciences, I accept your distinction not only on my own behalf but also on behalf of my associates at USIA. That it was bestowed by Huron College makes it even more important since, as I have told you, the program with which I am now connected is, in considerable part, the brain child of Senator KARL MUNDT.

The legislation that bears his name launched the United States on one of the noblest ventures of its history—a venture based on the concept that honest and straightforward presentation of facts is the best basis for international understanding. It is a venture with which I am proud to be connected.

DANISH AND SWEDISH CONSTITUTION DAYS

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, it is appropriate today for the Senate and for Americans to recognize the Constitution Days of two of the great democracies of the world, which are being observed this weekend.

Today marks the anniversary of the adoption of the Danish constitution on June 5, 1849. Under this document, Denmark became a constitutional monarchy, ruled by the Rigstags, or parliament. The constitution was drawn up in 1848 under King Frederick VII, and later revised in 1915.

Sunday will be the anniversary of the adoption of Sweden's liberal constitution on June 6, 1809. This constitution came as the result of a reform movement which overthrew a despotic ruler and placed King Charles XIII on the throne. Since that time, Sweden has enjoyed an era of progressive liberalization in government and industrial development.

Both Denmark and Sweden today are model democracies which enjoy advanced standards of living and high levels of education. These two constitutional monarchies offer fine examples for all the world of the fruits which progressive democratic government and liberal public welfare standards can produce for a nation. I might add, Mr. President, that our own country can benefit greatly from the experience of these two countries in developing and enacting the liberal welfare programs which have so greatly enriched the lives of their citizens.

In the free world's struggle against Communist imperialism, there is no better example to show to now uncommitted and underdeveloped nations than the economic, social, and political progress that these two nations have produced under liberal democratic government. America salutes Denmark and Sweden on their Constitution Days.

THE "VOICE OF FIRESTONE"

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I am quite certain that the television and radio listeners of the Nation were hit with a rather heavy impact on June 1 when they learned that the "Voice of Firestone" would no longer be seen over the television or heard over the radio. I have received a number of letters on this subject from citizens of Ohio expressing their regret that the Firestone hour of music will no longer be their entertainment.

The Firestone Co. wanted very much to continue to sponsor this top-quality program, but regrettably it was refused prime evening time by the three television networks because the "Voice of Firestone" supposedly did not have a satisfactory audience rating, as measured by present Madison Avenue advertising standards.

I have written a letter to the Federal Communications Commission expressing my disappointment about the action which has been taken by the three principal television networks. I should like to state to my colleagues today that it is rather regrettable that in the programming of entertainment on the television networks their prime objective seems to be satisfactory financial results to the various companies.

I believe a grave mistake was made. My hope is that something will be done to prevent its recurrence in the future. I think there may come a time when possibly legislation will be enacted declaring that the airways belong to the public, and that the gigantic national television networks will have imposed upon them a civic responsibility greater than they are now willing voluntarily to carry.

Huge are the profits they make in the sale of their stations. Huge are the

profits which are being made through the operations of their stations. Yet when the public is to be considered on the one hand, and fiscal profits on the other, the recognition is of the fiscal profits, and not the public.

I call this subject to the attention of my colleagues especially because the sponsor principally involved is the Firestone Co. of Ohio.

Mr. President, I now wish to discuss another subject.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio has the floor.

THE EIGHTH WINTER OLYMPICS

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, it was with great distress that I observed that the Olympics committee recently decided not to recommend that Nationalist China be invited to participate in the Olympics. I think a tragic mistake was made. The promoters of the International Olympics extended an invitation to Red China, and recognized it as the government of the Chinese people. At the same time, they requested that Taiwan enter as Taiwan and not as Nationalist China. I bring this subject to the floor today because in February 1960, at Squaw Valley, there will be held the eighth winter Olympics. The organizing committee for the eighth winter Olympics has already extended invitations to various prospective participating nations. Its invitation went to Nationalist China. It did not go to Red China.

I understand that discussions of the subject are now under way, but that the organizing committee for the eighth winter Olympics has decided to continue the extension of its invitation to Nationalist China on Formosa, and not to Red China.

It is my sincere hope that the organizing committee will stand fast. I understand that through the Congress we have provided \$4 million to sponsor the Squaw Valley Winter Olympics, and it would be a tragedy if we should decide to invite Red China to the winter Olympics and to require Nationalist China to apply under the national designation of Taiwan.

I call upon the organizing committee for the eighth winter Olympics, and especially the American representatives, to stand fast and continue their invitation to Nationalist China, and not Red China.

IMPROVEMENT IN THE EMPLOYMENT PICTURE—INFLATION

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, we have all noted with gratification the improvement in the employment picture during the spring months and we all hope for continued improvement until the recession is laid completely to rest.

However, we must never overlook the fact that severe local unemployment existed before the recession began and will exist indefinitely into the future unless action is taken. Those of us who supported the area redevelopment bill, which the Senate passed earlier this year, sought to provide such help.

In order that Members of Congress may be reminded of the continuing labor

surplus problem and of the large number of communities still suffering from substantial unemployment, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks a tabulation showing major and smaller areas of substantial labor surplus, as of May 1959. This tabulation is taken from the May 1959 publication *Area Labor Market Trends*, of the Bureau of Employment Security.

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

**AREAS OF SUBSTANTIAL LABOR SURPLUS,
MAY 1959**

MAJOR AREAS

Alabama: Birmingham, Mobile.
Connecticut: Bridgeport, New Britain, Waterbury.

Illinois: Joliet.

Indiana: Evansville, Fort Wayne, South Bend, Terre Haute.

Kentucky: Louisville.

Maine: Portland.

Maryland: Baltimore.
Massachusetts: Brockton, Fall River, Lawrence, Lowell, New Bedford, Springfield-Holyoke, Worcester.

Michigan: Detroit, Flint, Grand Rapids, Muskegon-Muskegon Heights.

Minnesota: Duluth-Superior.

New Jersey: Atlantic City, Newark, Paterson, Perth Amboy, Trenton.

New York: Albany-Schenectady-Troy, Buffalo, New York, Utica-Rome.

North Carolina: Asheville, Durham.

Ohio: Toledo.

Pennsylvania: Allentown-Bethlehem-Easton, Altoona, Erie, Johnstown, Philadelphia, Pittsburgh, Scranton, Wilkes-Barre-Hazleton, York.

Puerto Rico: Mayaguez, Ponce, San Juan.

Rhode Island: Providence.

Tennessee: Chattanooga, Knoxville.

Texas: Beaumont-Port Arthur, Corpus Christi.

Virginia: Roanoke.

Washington: Spokane, Tacoma.

West Virginia: Charleston, Huntington-Ashland, Wheeling-Steubenville.

SMALLER AREAS¹

Alabama: Alexander City, Anniston, Florence-Sheffield, Gadsden, Jasper, Talladega.

Alaska: Anchorage.

Arkansas: Fort Smith.

Connecticut: Ansonia, Bristol, Danbury, Danielson, Meriden, Middletown, Norwalk, Thompsonville, Torrington, Willimantic.

Illinois: Canton, Centralia, Harrisburg, Herrin-Murphysboro-West Frankfort, Litchfield, Mount Carmel-Olney, Mount Vernon.

Indiana: Anderson, Columbus, Connersville, Michigan City-La Porte, Muncie, New Castle, Vincennes.

Iowa: Ottumwa.

Kansas: Coffeyville-Independence-Parsons, Pittsburg.

Kentucky: Corbin, Hazard, Hopkinsville, Madisonville, Middlesboro-Harlan, Morehead-Grayson, Owensboro, Paducah, Paintsville-Prestonsburg, Pikeville-Williamson.

Louisiana: Alexandria, Opelousas.

Maine: Biddeford-Sanford, Lewiston.

Maryland: Cumberland, Frederick, Hagerstown, Westminster.

Massachusetts: Greenfield, Haverhill, Milford, Newburyport, North Adams, Pittsfield, Southbridge-Webster, Ware.

Michigan: Adrian, Allegan, Bay City, Escanaba, Iron Mountain, Jackson, Marquette, Monroe, Owosso, Port Huron, Sturgis.

Mississippi: Biloxi-Gulfport, Greenville.
Missouri: Cape Girardeau, Flat River, Joplin, Washington.

Montana: Butte, Kalispell.

New Jersey: Bridgeton, Long Branch, Morristown-Dover.

New York: Amsterdam, Auburn, Batavia, Corning-Hornell, Elmira, Glens Falls-Hudson Falls, Gloversville, Jamestown-Dunkirk, Kingston, Newburgh-Middletown-Beacon, Olean-Salamanca, Oneida, Plattsburgh, Wellsville.

North Carolina: Fayetteville, Henderson, Kinston, Lumberton, Mount Airy, Rockingham-Hamlet, Rocky Mount, Rutherfordton-Forest City, Shelby-Kings Mountain, Waynesville, Wilson.

Ohio: Ashtabula-Conneaut, Athens-Logan-Nelsonville, Batavia-Georgetown-West Union, Cambridge, East Liverpool-Salem, Findlay-Tiffin-Fostoria, Marietta, Portsmouth-Chillicothe, Springfield, Zanesville.

Oklahoma: Ardmore, McAlester, Okmulgee-Henryetta.

Pennsylvania: Berwick-Bloomsburg, Bradford, Butler, Chambersburg-Waynesboro, Clearfield-DuBois, Indiana, Kittanning-Ford City, Lewistown, Lock Haven, Meadville, New Castle, Oil City-Franklin-Titusville, Pottsville, St. Marys, Sayre-Athens-Towanda, Sunbury-Shamokin-Mt. Carmel, Uniontown-Connellsville, Williamsport.

Rhode Island: Newport.

Tennessee: Bristol-Johnson City-Kingsport, Columbia, La Follette-Jellico-Tazewell.

Texas: Laredo, Texarkana.

Vermont: Burlington, Springfield.

Virginia: Big Stone Gap-Appalachia, Radford-Pulaski, Richlands-Bluefield.

Washington: Aberdeen, Anacortes, Bellingham, Bremerton, Everett, Olympia, Port Angeles.

West Virginia: Beckley, Bluefield, Clarksburg, Fairmount, Logan, Martinsburg, Morgantown, Parkersburg, Point Pleasant-Gallipolis, Ronceverte-White Sulphur Springs, Welch.

Wisconsin: Beloit, Eau Claire-Chippewa Falls, La Crosse, Oshkosh.

Mr. CLARK. Not all of these communities would be eligible for assistance under the area redevelopment bill because they have not been labor surplus areas for the length of time required for eligibility. However, some of the cities on this list have been in the substantial unemployment category almost continuously since the end of World War II. It is for areas of chronic unemployment such as these that the area redevelopment bill is designed. Not only the States affected, but the whole Nation, has a stake in the restoration of a healthy economy in these communities.

I point out that my own State of Pennsylvania unhappily has the largest number of surplus areas, and I believe it now has the greatest amount of chronic, consistent unemployment of any State in the Union. This causes me to advert to a recent editorial entitled "Ingredients of Inflation," published in the New York Times, which took the Joint Economic Committee to task for its prognosis of several months ago. I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

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

INGREDIENTS OF INFLATION

An increasing number of developments on the economic front of late have combined to suggest that, while it is only about 2 months since the report of the Joint Congressional

Committee on the President's Economic Report appeared, its central conclusion, if not perhaps completely refuted, has at least been brought into serious question.

This conclusion was that for 1959, since there was obviously no evidence of inflation on the horizon, we should pursue public policies such as a budget deficit and cheap money until we have achieved full recovery from the recession. In other words, we should forget about a balanced budget and give highest priorities to the attainment of maximum employment and production.

When the congressional committee was preparing its report the most recent available figure on unemployment was that of January, which placed it at 4,724,000. Reflecting the recovery to new alltime highs in industrial production and the gross national product, this figure had been slashed by April to 3,627,000. Since the average number of unemployed in the boom years 1955-57 was 2,900,000, this means the total of the recession-induced jobless had already fallen to 727,000, and this at a time when we have put behind us the worst 4 months of the year in terms of unemployment expectancy.

If we look for evidence that the danger of inflation is not to be dismissed as lightly as the committee dismissed it, our first thought, of course, would be the stock market, which has soared so high and so fast that officials and members of the exchange have expressed their apprehensions concerning its speculative temper.

But the desire to turn a quick profit is equally evident in such seemingly unrelated news stories as that of the Florida land boom and the spectacular prices recently bid for paintings by established artists in the leading art auctions. In another, but equally obvious, form, we see it in the unwillingness of investors holding maturing Government obligations to accept in exchange a new short-term security that in anything like a normal atmosphere could be regarded as exceptionally attractive.

Again, the committee observed that the country's money supply had increased by an average of only 1 1/2 percent since the end of 1954. By the generally accepted definition of the money supply—currency, plus demand deposits adjusted—the latter has risen during the past 12 months from \$135 billion to \$140.4 billion, an increase of \$5.4 billion, or 4 percent. This reflects an increasingly vigorous demand for business credit, which on being used is likely to put to a very practical test the committee's thesis that the possibility of a reemergence of prime inflation this year can safely be ruled out.

In short, the person who is genuinely on the alert for possible signals of inflation doesn't wait until it shows up in that laggard series, the Consumer Price Index. And not even the legislator dedicated to the concept of inflation as a way of life, perhaps, would deny that such news items as these are strangely reminiscent of some of the more infallible symptoms of inflation in the making that he vaguely recalls from the past.

Mr. CLARK. In my judgment, this editorial is entirely wrong, both in its emphasis on inflation as being our primary national problem, and also in its criticism of the Joint Economic Committee. The New York Times and the financial journals of Wall Street have become so obsessed with the problems of inflation that they are unable to view in perspective the somewhat more important problem of continued national economic growth, in order to put an end to unemployment and to realize for our children a first-class America.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks an

¹ These areas are not part of the regular area labor market reporting and area classification program of the Bureau of Employment Security and its affiliated State employment security agencies.

able article by Richard L. Strout, staff correspondent of the Christian Science Monitor, published in the May 13, 1959, edition of that newspaper. The article is entitled "Inflation's Mist Fogs Boom."

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

INFLATION'S MIST FOGS BOOM

(By Richard L. Strout)

WASHINGTON.—American business is good and getting better: the big concern is inflation.

The paradox of this situation is that nearly all business indices are heading up except the cost of living—this index that measures inflation has remained nearly stationary for almost a year, the longest period of price equilibrium in recent statistical history.

There is every prospect that the United States is in, or is about to enter, a boom, and that this will last a year or so.

It is hard to see what can stop it. Following a 2-year recession there is now an enormous backlog of consumer and capital goods demand. It is true that unemployment is still abnormal, but this is rapidly dropping.

NINETEEN HUNDRED SIXTY VOTE FACTOR

The boom should ease many domestic problems. It should also aid the Republicans in the 1960 Presidential campaign. They can take credit for expected prosperity.

Through all this rosy prospect there remains, however, the fear of inflation. Advertisements warn against it daily. Apparently the apprehension is not based on any current runaway prices because actually the sensitive cost of living index is standing still.

(This index is the average of conflicting forces: the cost of many things is rising, particularly of services, but for the present this is balanced off by the decline of consumer food prices. Stability is being purchased at the expense of the farmers.)

Is the current fear of inflation due to a bad American record in holding the price line as compared to other countries? The answer here has to be no.

The United States by this criterion has a record to be proud of. Every American knows that prices have gone up. But competent economists show that relatively the American price rise is less—and in most cases far less—than in most other Western nations.

RATE OF RISE LOW

Britain, for example, does not seem worried about inflation. Yet the 10-year rise of British wholesale prices, 1948-57, was 55 percent, that in the United States only 18 percent. The same thing is true of consumer prices. The 10-year American rise of 17 percent is visible to everybody, but compared to other countries it is close to the bottom of the list.

Well then, the observer asks, how does the present movement of U.S. prices compare with those in the past?

What the public rarely understands is that inflation has been operating a long time. One analysis shows that over the period (1897-1958) the compound rate of price increase in the United States has averaged 2½ percent a year. Some years it was less, some (usually war years) more.

So-called creeping inflation has existed for a long time. In the United States, at least, it has never become galloping inflation. If the average rise is 2½ percent a year then the current period of almost a year with no rise at all is amazing.

DEFICIT AT PEAK

There are several new factors in the current situation which help account for the national sensitivity over inflation—a sensitivity hardly found today in any other big country.

1. The power of labor and management to maintain wages and prices appears to be

at an alltime high. In the 1957-58 recession old-fashioned economic precepts indicated a drop in wages (from unemployment) and of prices (from reduced consumption). On the contrary, both went up. This implies a power to control the economy which society must view with concern.

2. Budget deficits: The United States is operating at a deficit, the biggest in peacetime history. President Eisenhower has balanced his budget only twice in 6 years. Red ink in the budget tends to be inflationary. But why is there this enormous current deficit?—primarily because of a slowing down of national economic growth. This results in a fall off of Federal revenues. The budget goes into the red.

Many observers would be happier if the Nation showed as much concern over the alarming decline in the rate of increase in gross national product, a disaster which has really occurred, as it does over the fear of inflation, a mere possibility of the future.

SCARE TECHNIQUE?

3. Politics: The political factor cannot be ignored. Nobody can deny that fuel for inflation now lies around. But it is easy to use the scare to cry inflation against almost any bills—some of them worthy, such as defense, foreign aid, and education. There are signs that some interested parties are promoting an inflation scare for their own ends.

Where a proper concern over inflation becomes hysteria it becomes dangerous. Some observers ask if that point has been reached.

The Government is finding it hard to market its long-term bonds in large part because of nationwide inflation fears. Simultaneously the huge stock market boom threatens to get out of hand (also stoked, in part, by investors seeking a hedge against inflation).

Again, one reason for gold going abroad may be exaggerated foreign fears of inflation.

Finally, exaggerated emphasis on inflation distracts attention from the problem of retarded U.S. economic growth.

Soviet output recently has been at three or four times the rate of the United States; a situation not necessarily serious at the moment but which Allen W. Dulles, Chief of the Central Intelligence Agency, says would spell economic suicide if indefinitely continued.

Mr. CLARK. Our friends of doom and gloom on the other side of the aisle point constantly to the dangers of inflation, but hardly ever do they say anything about the necessity for continued economic growth. I point out again that twice as many babies were born in the United States in 1956 as in 1936. I point out that the national per capita income has grown hardly at all during the Eisenhower administration, in fact by less than one-half of 1 percent. I point out that the primary economic problem is economic growth, not the combating of inflation. Of course, we must combat inflation, too, but I point out that the cries of doom and gloom which arise from our friends on the other side of the aisle are doing positive harm in our efforts to stabilize our price system. One of the features of these cries is the stressing of the fact that we are losing gold in this country.

In that connection, I ask unanimous consent to have an article published in the May 31, 1959, issue of the New York Times printed at this point in my remarks. It is entitled "Exports Gloom Held Too Thick."

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

EXPORTS GLOOM HELD TOO THICK—BALANCING FACTORS INDICATE THE U.S. PICTURE ISN'T AS DARK AS IT'S PAINTED

(By Brendan M. Jones)

Continuing business concern with the decline in U.S. exports suggests the need for a corresponding emphasis on factors tending to put the issue in more rational perspective.

The decline began about 2 years ago. After reaching an exceptionally high level of \$19,455 million in 1957, commercial exports dropped last year to \$16,315 million. This decrease of more than \$3 billion still was not as large as, or very different from, three previous year-to-year declines that occurred in relatively recent times.

The record set in 1957 climaxed 2 successive years of exceptional export gains, above \$2 billion that year and \$3 billion the year before. A good part of this exceptional rise was due to boom conditions in Europe and some other areas.

DECLINE BEGAN IN 1957

The decline of export trade, which showed up most markedly in last year's total, actually began in the latter half of 1957. Although this was the year in which exports soared to a new peak, most of the increase was concentrated in the first half. It was produced primarily by the unusual demands for fuel and other commodities caused by the Suez Canal stoppage.

A particularly worrisome aspect of the export trend is the fact that the decline has persisted into 1959. While last year there had been no real expectation that volume would come anywhere near the high level of 1957, more optimistic traders had looked for an upturn by the spring of this year. So far there has been no sign of such an upturn, but figures for April reported last week show a comparatively small decline.

While it now seems likely that the looked-for upturn will be later than expected, there are these factors serving to give perspective to the overall export picture:

The decrease in exports has not been peculiar to the United States. Beginning in 1957 and continuing last year, most large trading nations experienced a downward trend.

For the United States, the 1957 boom and subsequent decline of exports has been concentrated in mineral and agricultural products. Products mainly affected in these two categories include petroleum, coal, fertilizers, cotton, grains, and various other agricultural items such as soybeans, peanuts, and citrus.

A main influence on the general world decline of export trade was a sharp drop in commodity prices, which only lately have begun to recover. The effect on primary materials-producing countries has been the drastic curtailment of their buying power. This development was similar to the commodity slump following the Korean war, which had a like effect on United States trade.

The recent commodity-price drop exerted a contracting effect on exports of most large trading nations through part of 1957 and nearly all of 1958. While many other nations have already begun to experience an upturn in their exports, the full impact of the commodity slump has only just hit United States exports.

This is indicated by the fact that in the first quarter of this year the dip in United States exports came mainly from a decline of 19 percent in sales to Latin America.

In sum, the decline of exports for this country has been from a peak reached through unusual circumstances, followed by severe curtailment of buying power in major markets. Added to this is the fact

that through 1957 and 1958 this country's exports of agricultural produce, much of it surplus, ran at exceptionally high rates that could not be expected to continue indefinitely.

Concern over the export situation has been heightened by the heavy outflow of gold from this country. This movement has caused much questioning concerning whether inflation has priced American products out of the market. It also has raised the general question of decreased value of the dollar in world markets.

While the effects of inflation and the heavy outward movement of gold are not to be shrugged off lightly, the fact is that foreign countries jointly now hold more dollars than a year ago. In addition, it must be recognized that a large part of the outflow of gold, especially last year, was a reversal of a heavy inward flow of the preceding year.

Because of the exceptional requirements in fuel and other materials caused by the Suez situation, West European nations particularly drew heavily on gold reserves for financing. Practically all of these expenditures added to the United States reserves and about half of the heavy outflow last year represented a rebuilding of other nations' diminished reserves.

Through this recent period West European nations showed remarkable recovery from the effects of the Suez crisis and were able last December to underwrite a freer convertibility of their currencies. That this also is a token of their stronger competitive capacity in world export markets is obvious.

While most of these nations have made exceptional progress economically in recent years, they have had to apply greater discipline in checking inflation. Their dependence on world trade is such that protecting the value of their currencies has been paramount. Success of their efforts has now brought a basis for revival of freer competition in world markets and removal of import restrictions as was demonstrated by Britain last week.

Anxiety over the decline of American exports and diminished value of the dollar seems to have been stimulated partly by the recent recession and wage-cost pressures. A furor over decreased value of the dollar has a certain propaganda effectiveness not only domestically but also in other countries where there is interest in seeing gold prices increased.

From a different perspective it is possibly helpful to recall that United States exports slumped \$4 billion in the 1944-45 period; and by nearly \$2 billion in 1947-48 and 1951-53. They later recovered to go on to new records.

Mr. CLARK. I hope very much that the country at large will soon recover its senses and, despite the propaganda from the White House and Wall Street come to the conclusion that we must have prices stable and constant economic growth, as well as and that we are not going to get that economic growth unless the policies of the Eisenhower administration and of the Federal Reserve Board are changed.

AMENDMENT OF BRETON WOODS AGREEMENT ACT—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 1094) to amend the Bretton Woods Agreement Act. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BARTLETT in the chair). The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The Legislative Clerk read the report. (For conference report, see House proceedings of June 5, 1959, p. 10013, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I should like to address one inquiry to the Chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations. The conference report adopts the date of June 30, 1960, instead of the date in the bill as passed by the Senate. Is that correct?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. No; it removes the date which was inserted and adopts the House version, and also the so-called Aiken amendment which the Senate added, which specifies the amount.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is correct. I thank the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, we have just completed action on the conference report on S. 1094, the Bretton Woods Agreement Act. I wish to command the Committee on Foreign Relations. This is very important legislation. I trust that it will be at the White House shortly. It involves \$1,375 million. It is generally in keeping with the recommendations of the President. I am pleased that we were able to dispose of it this morning, rather than have it wait until we had acted on some of the pending business.

Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas has the floor.

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT LIMITING DEBATE ON CONSIDERATION OF INTERIOR DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATION BILL ON MONDAY

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I am informed by the Committee on Appropriations that the Committee has completed action and filed a report on the Interior Department Appropriation bill, H.R. 5915. I hold in my hand the report by the Committee on Appropriations. There are some differences between the bill as reported by the committee and the bill as passed by the House. I am informed that the report states that the bill reported is under the budget estimates and that there is no serious controversy involved.

Therefore, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, at the conclusion of the morning hour on Monday, it be in order to proceed to the consideration of H.R. 5915, under a unanimous-consent agreement limiting debate to 30 minutes on amendments and 2 hours on the bill, to be equally divided.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report has not actually been submitted.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I hold in my hand a copy of the report. May the Chair submit my proposed unanimous-consent agreement?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Texas?

Mr. DIRKSEN. If the majority leader will yield, I should like to address one comment to him. Last week I expressed the hope that there would be continuous consideration of the nomination which will be before us. I am fully sensible of the fact that the business of Government must go on. Certainly I would never have any objection to a reasonable request. Appropriation bills must be processed before June 30th. The request of the majority leader in relation to the appropriation bill is an entirely reasonable one, and therefore I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair hears no objection, and it is so ordered.

The unanimous-consent agreement, as subsequently reduced to writing is as follows:

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Ordered, That, effective on Monday, June 8, 1959, at the conclusion of routine morning business, the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill (H.R. 5915) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1960, and for other purposes, and debate on any amendment, motion, or appeal, except a motion to lay on the table, shall be limited to 30 minutes, to be equally divided and controlled by the mover of any such amendment or motion and the majority leader: *Provided*, That in the event the majority leader is in favor of any such amendment or motion, the time in opposition thereto shall be controlled by the minority leader or some Senator designated by him.

Ordered further, That on the question of the final passage of the said bill debate shall be limited to 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled, respectively, by the majority and minority leaders: *Provided*, That the said leaders, or either of them, may, from the time under their control on the passage of the said bill, allot additional time to any Senator during the consideration of any amendment, motion, or appeal.

GEN. GEORGE CATLETT MARSHALL

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, one of our most distinguished American statesmen once said to me that in a long life he had met only three great men. They were Mr. Justice Holmes and Mr. Justice Brandeis of the Supreme Court of the United States and Gen. George Catlett Marshall—and he said also that General Marshall was not the least of the three.

Since this appraisal was made by a public servant who has also been a lawyer of national distinction, it is not altogether surprising that two of his three great men were these two most famous Justices of the Supreme Court. It was the inclusion of Marshall under whom this civilian had once served that is intriguing.

The titles which he held and the positions he occupied were alone enough to make General Marshall a famous man, even had he been a man of mediocrity.

In themselves, his war service as the great general of the American and allied victory, and his peacetime service as Secretary of Defense and Secretary of State, give him high rank in the 20th century.

But clearly it is the quality of the service and the character of the man himself for which the American people are, in their hearts, grateful.

The phrase "Architect of Victory" is one often bestowed upon him for his performance in World War II. It is a glittering phrase, a happy generality, until we remember and examine once again the mammoth organization which General Marshall built to crush the most professional armies which ever inhabited this earth.

Even the inexperienced amateur was aware of the awesome size of the man who relentlessly, quietly, and selflessly created the armies, the navies, and the air forces in so brief a span of time—and then supplied them with the ever-mounting tools of victory.

This deed was enough to enshrine the name of Marshall forever.

Life offers too few men, if any, the opportunity to serve their nation as brilliantly in peace as they did in war. The only immediate parallels which come to my mind are those two immortals, George Washington and Winston Churchill.

Twelve years ago, General Marshall stood in the open air of Harvard Square and, in a brief speech, offered a concept which was to change the face of the world. Enough has been said here today of the successes of the Marshall plan that I need not once more detail its accomplishments.

In simple sum, one can well say and prove that the Western World is still the free world because of those words uttered in Cambridge, Mass., only these few short years ago.

And this was because the man who uttered those words was fully capable of transforming an idea of peace, just as he had transformed the theory of logistics in war, into action.

It is rare when nature combines in one human being the man of ideas and the man of action.

This is George Marshall. All Americans, everywhere, of the old generation and the new, owe this greatest living American a debt which even the best informed of us are only dimly beginning to understand.

This soldier would not cherish or appreciate such praise as this. I feel sure he would be more than content if someone said in the simplest of words, "He served his country well." To General Marshall there is not, there never has been, any other form of praise.

Even he in the simplicity of his greatness must know how well he deserves such praise, and how grateful the informed people of the free world are that George Marshall has come this way.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, I am glad to be in the Senate Chamber when words of appraisal of George Marshall

are voiced and are to be voiced by the majority leader, by the Senator from Oklahoma, and by other Senators.

Surely General Marshall is more than one of the great Americans of the 20th century. He ranks with that small and noble group of men who have preserved this Nation in its times of crises. He is truly a soldier-statesman. No man since our Nation was founded has been more dedicated to its welfare and its principles. High as is the regard and appreciation of the American people now for this great man, I venture to predict that history will fix for him even a higher place than that we now might believe possible. The grateful thanks of a people sensible of his massive contribution to the United States of America flow to General Marshall. We hope and pray that his health will be restored and that his years on this earth will yet be many.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I thank the Senator from Alaska.

Mr. President, I shall yield the floor, so that the very able and thoughtful Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] may occupy it. I have conferred with him about the statements to be made today, as a result of the inspiration which came from the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma, and which permitted me to make my statement when I did.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I consider it a real privilege to be in the Chamber at this time to hear the remarks of the majority leader in praise and in proper evaluation of a truly great patriot. I am certain that the name of George Marshall will be an inspiration to generations yet unborn.

Not only was this man a great leader in his own right; but he also served with great leaders. What a unique period it was in American history when a man like Franklin Roosevelt could be President and a man like George Marshall could be Chief of Staff; and later, as in time of war, George Marshall was in a position to serve his country with such great distinction, honor, and brilliance. We are really a fortunate people. The majority leader has again reminded us publicly, as he has reminded so many of us privately, of the great privilege it is to be an American and to have leadership of this quality.

I know the Senator from Oklahoma is about to pay his respects to the distinguished citizen, George Marshall, and to the Marshall plan. I shall stay to hear his remarks, because this is, indeed, a historic day for our Nation.

I thank the majority leader for yielding to me.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I thank the Senator from Minnesota for his observations.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, today and tomorrow, June 5 and 6, are anniversary dates of great significance to America and to the world.

One, the June 6 date, marks the 15th anniversary of the American D-day landing on the Normandy beaches. It

was the successful planning and superb execution of this mightiest of all amphibious efforts which led the free world to victory in World War II.

The other, far less dramatic, but of transcendent historic importance, June 5, marks the 12th anniversary of the birth of the Marshall plan for the economic reconstruction of a war-torn Europe.

Who can say, in the short years that have passed, which step—the step which led to the winning of the war, or the step which contributed so much toward winning of the peace—achieved the most for America and for the free world? Our view of history is of too short range today to evaluate these great contributions in their true perspective.

Yet on these two great anniversaries all America can take pride in the modest genius who was the architect of both.

Today, at Walter Reed Hospital, General of the Armies George Catlett Marshall, Jr., lies ill; but the strength and vigor and character that he has given to American leadership in world affairs stand as the great hope for freedom-loving peoples everywhere.

In war and in peace, he proved his genius in planning, and in selecting men who could be trusted loyally to carry out to the limit the strategy and the program he had designed. This was especially true in the execution of his task as Chief of Staff of the U.S. Armies and in the selection of the able generals he chose for command. Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower, Supreme Commander in Europe, was one of those selected. It was true of his planning, training, and equipping of the mighty Army that he expanded from 200,000 men in 1939 to over 8 million men on D-day.

It was true in the strategy of global warfare. Against all kinds of pressures, General Marshall always insisted that Germany first had to be knocked out of the war. Allied pressures, especially from Russia, for premature invasion of the European mainland, found General Marshall insistent first on perfection in training, on coordination of land, sea, and air forces, and on complete readiness for this greatest of all military operations.

He had learned his lessons well. In 1901, he graduated from Virginia Military Institute. He entered the Regular Army during the period of reorganization following the chaotic operations of the Spanish-American War. That was at the beginning of the reforms instituted by Secretary of War Elihu Root, who finally had succeeded in getting the necessary legislation authorizing the creation of a general staff.

In 1907, General Marshall was graduated with high honors from the Infantry-Cavalry school, and later from the Army Staff College, at Fort Leavenworth. There, because of his brilliant record, he was retained as an instructor, although still only a first lieutenant.

In World War I, General Marshall pleaded for command, but was selected by General Pershing to be Chief of Operations for the First Army in France. He was disappointed at not having command, but his greatness in France was

recognized by Pershing and all who worked with him. He returned to the United States as aide to General Pershing.

After many assignments, including China, operation of the famous Fort Benning Infantry School, and other commands, he returned to Washington, in the late 1930's, as Chief of the War Plans Division, and later as Deputy Chief of Staff.

His appointment as Chief of Staff of the then tiny Army of less than 200,000 men occurred on September 1, 1939. That was the day when the Nazi armies invaded Poland—and the testing by fire of General Marshall had begun.

With V-E and V-J Days behind him, General Marshall retired as Chief of Staff, hoping to retire to his Leesburg, Va., home with a full career of outstanding service and devotion to his Nation completed.

Scarcely had his retirement begun before President Truman, faced with the crisis in China, recalled him to active duty—as I recall, it was almost on Christmas Eve—to serve at his special envoy to try to reconcile the warring factions and to end the civil war that was then exploding in China.

In 1947, General Marshall began his second great career of service and achievement for the United States. It was in January 1947 that President Truman appointed him Secretary of State.

The victory in Europe that had been welcomed with fanfare and shouting on V-E Day was fast disintegrating under the hammer blows of poverty, unemployment, hunger, and economic stagnation. The problems of reconstruction of their war-torn cities and towns, and of their bombed-out transportation systems and rubble-filled factories were more than the war-fatigued populations of free Europe could surmount alone.

In General Marshall's brilliant and clear speech at the Harvard University commencement exercises 12 years ago today, he launched the United States into a new and constructive role in the world. He called on the nations of Europe to join with the United States in a vast, cooperative effort to repair their shattered economies. General Marshall well knew that without a speedy rehabilitation of Western Europe there could be no lasting freedom for its people, no stability to its democratic governments, no future for employment and production.

Should this war-ravaged condition have continued, the spirit of the peoples of Western Europe, under threat of hunger and despair, could have faltered, under the constant encroachment of Russia, from infiltration and subversion from within, and from military threats from without.

As the fruits of his plan unfolded into action, thanks to such bipartisan leaders of the then Republican Congress as Senator Vandenberg and then Congressman Chris Herter, now Secretary of State, hopes melded into action, and recovery began.

Never before in history has such an economic turn-around occurred in so short a time. The 4-year plan, which was to cost \$17½ billion, was completed

for a total cost of \$13 billion. It brought about production, both agricultural and industrial, in unbelievable abundance. It provided high employment and commercial stability, and it rescued the governments of many nations from the imminent threat of Communist domination.

It paved the way for the creation of the NATO alliance. Perhaps one of its greatest fruits was to set the pattern for European cooperation, instead of conflict. The Coal and Steel Community, Euratom, and the Common Market are byproducts of this plan launched by General Marshall, and so ably administered by Paul Hoffman, the first administrator of the program.

Recently Paul Hoffman told me some of the results of this greatest of humanitarian efforts in the history of the world. The \$13 billion cost has already seen recoveries in hard currency repayments to the United States of approximately \$254 million. This next fiscal year these payments will total about \$62 million more.

Freely-elected governments today are strong, and free Europe is more vigorous, militarily and economically, than in the immediate prewar years. Instead of communities that are festering liabilities, teetering before the probing of communism, they offer markets for us and suppliers for us in an ever-increasing world trade. Their military divisions in growing strength bolster the free world's shield against the totalitarian threat of the East.

Each year the Marshall plan nations combine to spend more on the mutual security of the West than the entire 4-year cost of the Marshall program.

It would be impossible to calculate the additional military costs to the United States if this great European community had fallen victim to stagnation, exhaustion, and collapse. Certainly the entire Marshall plan cost of \$13 billion for 4 years would have been required—along with additional billions in U.S. military expenditures—to compensate for the loss of this vital part of the world to communism. Even with this extraordinary expense, there would have been no real security for the Western World.

General Marshall resigned because of ill health in 1949. But when the Nation faced another crisis in the Korean war he was recalled to active duty to again serve his Nation. This time he filled the position of Secretary of Defense during the first year of the Korean war. It was in this period that he carried forward the creation of the NATO forces.

In 1951 General Marshall retired, this time for the third and last time. Virginia Military Academy dedicated its third arch to him as one of its most distinguished graduates. It is interesting to note that the first arch honors George Washington, the second Stonewall Jackson, and the third George C. Marshall.

Bernard Baruch, in dedicating this arch to General Marshall, paid tribute to him as a great citizen-soldier in the tradition of George Washington. But he emphasized that the new arch also looked to the future—to the concept of global defense and to George Marshall as the first global strategist.

Many other honors, too numerous to mention here, have come to General Marshall. The highest and best deserved was the Nobel Peace Prize of 1953—the first time it was ever awarded to a soldier.

Time will not permit repeating all of the great tributes paid to General Marshall by those who knew him and who worked with him. President Truman, in his memoirs, writes:

General Marshall is one of the most astute and profound men I have ever known. Whenever any problem was brought before him, he seemed able to put his finger at once on the very basic approach that later would usually be proposed by the staff as the best solution. He talked very little but listened carefully to everything that was said. Sometimes he would sit for an hour with little or no expression on his face, but when he had heard enough, he would come up with a statement of his own that invariably cut to the very bone of the matter under discussion.

General Marshall has refrained from publishing his memoirs, although fabulous offers have been made to him for their publication rights. Since his retirement, he has remained aloof from all controversies.

The George Marshall Research Foundation at Virginia Military Institute has been established to honor him. He has deeded to it his personal papers. Presidents Truman and Eisenhower have cooperated fully in directing the Departments of Defense and State and the National Archives to make Government documents available.

Shortly before he left office, President Harry S. Truman directed the Secretaries of State and Defense and the General Services Administrator to cooperate with Virginia Military Institute and the George C. Marshall Research Foundation in procuring the documentary material relating to the activities of General George Catlett Marshall as a soldier, as Secretary of State, and as Secretary of Defense.

President Truman asked each of the officials to bring his memorandum on the subject to the attention of his successor "as a matter of urgency." "I feel confident that they will wish to support the efforts that have been commenced to provide suitable recognition to one of the greatest Americans of our age," President Truman concluded.

President Truman revealed then, in January 1953, that he had consulted with VMI officials about the Foundation for more than a year. A committee of representatives of the White House, the Departments of State and Defense, and the National Archives had given considerable study to the procedures by which the Government could assist the George C. Marshall Research Foundation. He expressed the hope that eventually a George C. Marshall Research Center would be open to the public on land provided by VMI on the perimeter of its parade ground, under authorization which had been given by the General Assembly of Virginia.

President Eisenhower, on April 1, 1955, wrote Mr. John C. Hagan, Jr., of Richmond, Va., president of the Marshall Foundation, that arrangements were

being made by the Department of State, the Department of Defense, and the National Archives to cooperate fully with VMI and the Foundation "subject to applicable provisions of law."

I am delighted to report that a great deal of progress has been made. Mr. Hagen states that more than 37,000 documents have been microfilmed of the 200,000 already processed.

Since General Marshall is one of the few major authorities on this Nation's recent activities in peace and war who has not written his memoirs, I am happy that the research foundation has made 41 hours of tape recordings in General Marshall's own voice and words to shed new light upon events of current history. Fifty records have been made with such contemporaries of the general as Bernard Baruch, Mrs. Franklin D. Roosevelt, and many of the top military and naval leaders who served with him.

Five researchers now are at work in various departments of government under the supervision of Dr. Forrest Pogue, director of research for the foundation, who once served as chief archivist of the Defense Department. One of the problems, of course, is that there are an estimated 3 million papers relating to the general's career and that many of them are classified.

I am grateful to Mr. Hagan for a chance to see the documents from President Truman, President Eisenhower, and Sir Winston Churchill. I ask unanimous consent that these letters be included in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, the great ability of Sir Winston to express in words the true meaning of General Marshall's contribution to the freedom of the world eloquently portrays the gratitude of one of his associates throughout the crises of war and the crises of peace.

Here for the first time, I think, is presented Sir Winston's letter to Colonel Hagan:

DEAR COLONEL HAGAN: I welcome the decision to commemorate at the Virginia Military Institute the eminent services of Gen. George C. Marshall to the United States, to Europe, and to humanity. I have no doubt that this initiative will be widely acclaimed and supported.

During my long and close association with successive U.S. administrations, there are few men whose qualities of mind and character have impressed me so deeply as those of General Marshall. He is a great American, but he is far more than that. In war he was as wise and understanding in counsel as he was resolute in action. In peace he was the architect who planned the restoration of our battered European economy and, at the same time, labored tirelessly to establish a system of Western defense. He has always fought vigorously against defeatism, discouragement, and disillusion. Succeeding generations must not be allowed to forget his achievements and his example.

It is appropriate to assemble in a place so nearly connected with him documents and mementos relating to this great man. I am glad to think such a notable step is being taken in General Marshall's lifetime.

Yours sincerely,

WINSTON S. CHURCHILL.

I humbly associate myself with these words of Sir Winston. History will record General Marshall's selfless service, his dedication to the cause of world freedom—the story of a modest man ready always to answer the call to duty.

EXHIBIT 1

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, January 19, 1953.
Mr. JOHN C. HAGAN, Jr.,
Richmond, Va.

DEAR MR. HAGAN: I am enclosing a copy of a White House news release which quotes the memorandum I sent last week to the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Defense, and the Administrator of General Services, asking them to cooperate with Virginia Military Institute and the proposed George C. Marshall Research Foundation in procuring documentary material relating to the activities of General Marshall as a soldier, as Secretary of State, and as Secretary of Defense.

I am glad that there is wide interest in providing such a center and that the VMI board of visitors is taking the necessary steps to make it a reality.

I have asked each Department head to bring my memorandum to the attention of his successor in office as a matter of urgency. I am sure that the research center will afford a fine opportunity for scholars, and I am glad to see proper recognition of this great American.

Sincerely yours,

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

THE WHITE HOUSE,
January 17, 1953.

The President (President Truman) has sent the following memorandum to the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Defense, and the Administrator of General Services: "Memorandum for the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Defense, the Administrator of General Services:

"The board of visitors of the Virginia Military Institute has arranged for the organization of the George C. Marshall Research Foundation, Inc., as a nonprofit Virginia corporation. The purpose of the foundation will be to collect and receive papers and records relating to the life and public service of General Marshall, together with other historical objects and documents, and to provide a suitable building to house them at VMI. To assist in effectuating this, the General Assembly of Virginia has enacted legislation authorizing VMI to deed land to the foundation as a site for the building to be known as the George C. Marshall Research Center. This building will be a library and museum and will be open to the public. The foundation project is to be financed by funds raised from private sources.

"The establishment of the foundation has been a matter of great interest to me, and I have consulted with VMI officials about it over a period of more than a year. In connection with these conferences, I agreed that the U.S. Government would insofar as practicable make available to the foundation documentary material relating to the activities of General Marshall as a soldier, as Secretary of State, and as Secretary of Defense. A committee composed of representatives of the White House, the Departments of State and Defense, and the National Archives, has given considerable study to the procedures by which the Government can assist the foundation in obtaining the documentary material that it will want.

"I am now advised that VMI officials are ready to complete the actual incorporation of the foundation, and that they are also prepared to employ the necessary staff to begin the handling and processing of documentary material relating to the career of General Marshall. The VMI library is

equipped to receive and maintain such material on a temporary basis pending construction of the research center building.

"Subject to any applicable provisions of law, I therefore direct the Department of State, the Department of Defense, and the National Archives to cooperate with VMI and the foundation in procuring this documentary material, and to provide them with access to such records as they wish which can properly be made available to public inspection.

"Under the supervision of the Archivist of the United States, I am hopeful that reproductions of official records relating to the career of General Marshall can be provided the foundation.

"Many of the pertinent Government records will remain classified or will be withheld from the public for a number of years. As rapidly as they can be made public, however, I hope they will be made available to the foundation.

"I am requesting each of you to bring this memorandum to the attention of your successors in office as a matter of urgency. I feel confident that they will wish to support the efforts that have been commenced to provide suitable recognition to one of the greatest Americans of our age."

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, April 1, 1955.

Mr. JOHN C. HAGAN, Jr.,
President, George C. Marshall Research Foundation, Inc., Richmond, Va.

DEAR MR. HAGAN: I was very glad to learn from you and General Milton that the George C. Marshall Research Foundation will soon begin to collect and receive papers and records relating to the life and public service of General Marshall, and that the material will be maintained in the library of the Virginia Military Institute pending construction of the research center building.

Arrangements are being made by the Department of State, the Department of Defense, and the National Archives to cooperate fully with VMI and the foundation subject to applicable provisions of law. It is the policy of this administration to remove security classification from Government documents of historical importance at the earliest possible time consistent with the national interest. I am confident that a continuing flow of documents pertinent to General Marshall's career can thus be made available to the foundation for reproduction.

Through the establishment of this center for study of the career of a distinguished soldier and statesman, the George C. Marshall Research Foundation is making a large contribution to public understanding of national affairs. I wish you every success.

Sincerely,

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I congratulate the Senator from Oklahoma for his very truthful and stirring words in praise of Gen. George Marshall. I regard General Marshall as one of the great Americans of all time.

There are a number of features about his public career which I think need to be noted. In the first place, it was a great act of faith on the part of President Roosevelt to designate him as Chief of Staff. As I remember, there were 33 on the list of generals at that time. Furthermore, General Marshall was not a graduate of West Point. A differing faction inside the Army, the so-called MacArthur faction, was very bitterly opposed to General Marshall. Nevertheless, the President passed over 32 generals and

chose General Marshall as Chief of Staff. He did it upon the advice, it is understood, of General Pershing; but it was a great act of faith. If the President's choice had turned out badly, it would have been a serious reflection on President Roosevelt. It turned out extremely well, of course.

General Marshall proved himself to be not only a great organizer of armies, but a profound strategist. Within the space of a few years, he had 12 million men within the Army itself, and they were well equipped, well trained, and the generalship was extremely good. I think later history will show that, although General Marshall did not command the armies in the field, he did lay down the major lines of strategy.

I was particularly interested to hear the tribute of praise from Winston Churchill. I have read most of the books which have been published about the inner strategy of the war, and it is perfectly evident that Churchill was the opponent of General Marshall on the grand plan of strategy. Churchill wanted to have the armies make an attack through the back door. Churchill wanted them to go up through Salonika, on through Yugoslavia, and up through the plains of Hungary, to come in through the back door. He was very bitterly opposed to a cross-channel attack, which General Marshall advocated. A reading of Churchill's memoirs, makes it perfectly clear that Churchill put off the actual carrying out of the decision for a cross-channel attack from month to month, and indeed, from year to year. Now to have him pay tribute to General Marshall is, I am sure, very sweet music to all friends of General Marshall.

General Marshall, of course, also wanted to command the troops in the field, but I believe British opposition prevented him from doing so. Instead, General Marshall found a very good substitute in the person of General Eisenhower. In his choice of field commanders—notably, General Bradley and General Eisenhower—General Marshall showed as good sense in his selections as President Roosevelt had shown in his selection. General Eisenhower, as I remember, was jumped from the rank of lieutenant colonel to lieutenant general in the space of a few days, and was given command of the armies in Europe. This, again, was done with the consent of President Roosevelt. Had that experiment turned out badly, I suppose neither General Marshall nor President Roosevelt would ever have been able to live down the mistake, but it turned out, so far as the war was concerned, extremely well.

I am very glad that the Senator has spoken today on the floor of the Senate in praise of General Marshall. General Marshall remained quiet and preserved aloof dignity under all the attacks which were made upon him, although those attacks must have grieved him. He remained quiet when old friends he favored were silent when he was under attack. He acted like a thoroughbred throughout his whole career.

I think the entire Nation joins the Senator from Oklahoma in praise of this great man and in gratitude for his services both in war and in peace.

Mr. MONRONEY. I thank my distinguished colleague from Illinois for his perception and for the addition of many facts which are vital in regard to the career of General Marshall.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield to the distinguished Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator from Oklahoma.

I earlier made comments with reference to the remarks of the majority leader concerning the illustrious life of this great American, General Marshall.

I should like to say to the Senator from Oklahoma that his comments today relating to General Marshall are not only excellent and inspiring, but also have a direct and current meaning in reference to American investments overseas in what we call foreign aid. The greatest program of American investment in freedom, in democracy, and in reconstruction was the Marshall plan.

The Marshall plan was a success, first of all, because there was candor and frankness on the part of the executive branch of the Government with the Congress as to what was required. The sum of money originally estimated was between \$15 billion and \$17 billion. I remind my colleagues that was a sum of money talked about in 1949, or 1948, and was a substantial sum of money. The timetable required from 4 to 5 years. It was said openly to the American people that this was what the cost would be.

Furthermore, this was not only an American program; it was a program worked out in cooperation with the nations of Western Europe. We insisted on the establishment of the Office of European Economic Cooperation, so that the various nations would help themselves and help each other as we helped them. This is a basic lesson in regard to foreign aid, and I am sure the Senator from Oklahoma would agree with me that in order for a foreign aid program to be really productive it must encompass more than simply the generosity of a country which makes the grants or offers the loans; it must encompass more than even the ability or the capacity of the recipient country; it must include other countries helping each other, within a region or within an area, working together in concert, along with the country or the nation which supplies capital and technical assistance.

I am delighted that the Senator has made these references to the Marshall plan at the time the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations is marking up and finally putting the finishing touches to the foreign aid or the mutual security program, because we have proved that foreign aid can be effective. We have proved that foreign aid can be a valuable investment.

The Senator from Oklahoma has cited for the Record the fact that the investment in foreign aid in Western Europe under the terms of the Marshall plan may have saved the American taxpayers

billions of dollars in terms of our own defense costs, and surely it saved Western Europe from falling either into Communist hands or into complete anarchy.

We owe a debt of gratitude, indeed, to George Marshall for the thought and for the idea. We owe a debt of gratitude, I will say, to the leaders in Congress at the time, on both sides of the aisle, such as the late Senator Vandenberg, the present Secretary of State Mr. Christian Herter, and Members who were on this side of the aisle. We owe a debt of gratitude, I will say, for the persistence of and the decision-making capacity of the President of the United States at that time, President Harry Truman.

It has often been said that democracy is characterized by three "d's"—the right to dissent, the right to debate, and the obligation to make decision. In the instance of the Marshall plan, we had debate and dissent, but finally decision. Best of all, we had a great idea.

I thank the Senator from Oklahoma for this most timely message as a tribute to a great American, which is more than deserved. I am delighted I am alive at the time and in the Senate to join in the tribute.

I am extremely pleased that the Senator from Oklahoma has reminded us again of the basic principles of effective foreign aid, effective investment in freedom and in democracy. Every Member of this body would be well advised to read carefully the message delivered today by the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. MONRONEY. I thank my distinguished colleague for his very flattering remarks.

I wish to add that the Marshall plan would not have succeeded, in spite of the plans or the money, had it not been for the inspirational leadership which was given to this program by General Marshall.

Programs for foreign aid cannot be carried out with a half-hearted, embarrassed, weak-kneed attitude, for they will lack inspiration, which cannot be given by the mere expenditure of money as if it were only a routine operation. It was General Marshall's vision and the circumstances accompanying his administration—the work of Paul Hoffman and the great men associated with him in the early Marshall plan days—which made the plan truly a crusade for rehabilitation, reconstruction, and revitalization of Western Europe. It stopped the march of communism, which would have wound up on the Atlantic seaboard.

This program would not have succeeded had it not been accompanied by inspiration, as well as the dollars for aid.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I am happy to yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY. As the Senator said, this was an exciting and inspiring idea. It became an exhilarating experience. Qualities of leadership were manifested. This is what is lacking today. Today's program seems like tepid tea. What we do, we do because it seems to be necessary. What we do, we do because it seems the established routine.

What we do, we do because we are supposed to be, and are, a big country. There is a lack of drama and inspiration in what we do today. It is for that reason that I think we have faltered. Because of this fact we find ourselves on the defensive. The Marshall plan was an offensive measure, not a defensive measure. The Marshall plan was constructive. It went beyond the mere chance to contain and to hold. It was something which was projected for the future.

I thank the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. MONRONEY. I thank my colleague. I agree with him.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. I should like to add my commendation to that of Senators who have preceded me for the most timely address delivered by the Senator from Oklahoma with respect to the career of that great American, George Catlett Marshall, a dedicated man, a selfless man, a man entirely without personal ambition, a man who placed his country above everything else in life, and a man of exceedingly great ability and great capacity for leadership, and for influencing and retaining the loyalty of others.

He was always loyal to his friends. I saw General Marshall only once in my life. It was in the days shortly before Pearl Harbor. I was then a young captain in what was then the U.S. Army Air Force, serving on the newly created Air Staff. We were not then even in uniform. I remember that one day I was given the great privilege of going with my colleagues on the newly formed Air Staff to hear the Chief of Staff, George Catlett Marshall, tell us a little about the peril in which he found our country at that time, and the efforts he was making, as Chief of Staff, to mobilize America's armed might. He also emphasized the very great role which he was confident the young and budding Air Force would play in the years of decision ahead.

I came away from that meeting with the conviction that George Marshall was a truly great leader, a man with the capacity to inspire loyalty, a man who understood the problems with which we were confronted. I have never had occasion to change my mind since then. The amazing administrative task General Marshall performed in mobilizing the armed strength of the United States, in directing the major strategy of the war, and coordinating that strategy with our allies, was probably among the greatest military feats in the history of our country.

The dedication with which he determined to stick with the job, instead of taking the more glamorous position of field commander, is something for which all Americans must always be in his debt. Not only was he first in war in our time, but I suspect that when the history of this trying period through which we have all lived is written, he will go down in the annals of our country as also the first in peace.

I think I am correct in saying that this marks the 12th anniversary of the un-

veiling of the Marshall plan at Harvard University, on June 5, 1947. That dramatic gesture saved Europe from chaos and communism. It was a stroke of genius which dictated it. It was administrative genius which carried it out.

I hope that General Marshall will be able to read, if not hear, some of the things which are said about him on the floor of the Senate today. I, for one, am confident in my belief that when we sum up and evaluate events at the end of the era, it will be found that, in the list of great Americans in the first half as well as the second half of the 20th century, General Marshall's name will stand among the few great leaders of our country.

I thank the Senator.

Mr. MONRONEY. I thank the distinguished senior Senator from Pennsylvania for his tribute.

Let me say to him and to the Senate that I discussed General Marshall's condition with the Superintendent of Walter Reed Hospital only an hour or so ago. While General Marshall has been the victim of several strokes, and while it appears that he will have to remain in the hospital for an indefinite period, he still is able to read, understand, and, above all, to appreciate the things he knows have come about as a result of his efforts, which were so great. He, himself, always has treated his achievements with the extreme modesty which is the true mark of a distinguished and great man.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I am happy to hear that cheering news, and to know that what the Senator has said is true. What a wonderful thing it would be if, while the general is alive, some tribute of a national character could be paid to him—perhaps the naming of the new national metropolitan airport, or some other recognition to signify the affection and respect in which he is held by the entire body of the American people.

Mr. MONRONEY. I thank my colleague. It is an honor well merited.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, on this anniversary of the Marshall plan, I wish to join in bringing to the attention of the Senate the fact that General Marshall proposed the famed program at commencement exercises at Harvard University. Later, it was called the Marshall plan; and it has had a very great deal to do with bettering the economic conditions in Europe and in the rest of the world. We believe it had much to do with keeping the peace after World War II.

As a member of the Committee on Armed Services, I came in contact with General Marshall when he was Chief of Staff, and later when he was Secretary of Defense. I grew to respect and to admire him, and, I hope, to have a mutual personal friendship with him.

Today, unfortunately, General Marshall is in a hospital; but I hope that he is thinking happily of the glorious part he played in furthering peace in the world following World War II.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I desire to be associated with the remarks which have been made by the distin-

guished majority leader [Mr. JOHNSON], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], and other Senators in the compliments and commendations they have paid to the retired General of the Armies, George C. Marshall.

I have known General Marshall for approximately 20 years. To my way of thinking, he is one of our Nation's great men. His contributions have not only been many, but they have been worthwhile, as well. He was the directing genius behind the plans which brought our country and our allies victory in the Second World War. He was unassuming, but he had deep and firm convictions. One could always rest assured that what he was saying and what he was doing were always in the best interests of our country, and that at all times he placed the interests of the United States ahead of everything else.

I think our Nation has been extremely fortunate in having had at the time it did a man of the caliber of Gen. George C. Marshall. I know that the contributions he has made to our welfare will never be forgotten, and that General Marshall himself, because of his activities in the military field and because of his genius in devising the Marshall plan, will live in our memories and will be revered by our children for many decades to come.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield to me?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I am delighted to yield.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I concur in the statements the able junior Senator from Montana has made with respect to General Marshall.

General Marshall's service to the country is a unique one—a service which transcends, in fact, the citizenship and the boundaries of the United States and of the Western Hemisphere, and encompasses the entire free world. It is particularly pointed to the preservation of freedom in Western Europe.

The Marshall plan was bold and imaginative. It was also successful and effective.

As a military leader, General Marshall excelled. As Secretary of State, his record is indeed outstanding.

Mr. President, it is with pleasure that I join in the other tributes which have been paid to General Marshall; and it is an honor to do so.

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield to me?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I am delighted to yield.

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, I should like to join in the testimonials to a really great man in America, Gen. George Marshall.

For a good share of my life I have been interested in the writing of history. Historians are already beginning to record that one of the most unselfish, statesmanlike contributions of a free society emanated from the program which bears the name of Gen. George Marshall. At a time in our history when freedom and democracy were on the firing line, at the conclusion of a war in

which deep bitterness had been engendered, there was real reason to fear that we might lose the war in the peace. It was at that moment, when the temptations of revenge and selfishness were about to take over, that, under the leadership of General Marshall, the United States held out an unselfish hand of opportunity to the vast areas which had been devastated by the war itself.

In Europe, in particular, there were many persons who felt that America, although she had contributed greatly to the winning of the war, might well forget what was at stake in that war and might return home because, again, they were reading in their own history books, and they could remember our great contributions in 1917 and 1918; but they also remembered that, once the shooting stopped, so did our determination to win freedom; and, as a consequence, in 1918 the war to make the world safe for democracy was followed by a peace which made the world only safe for dictatorship. Therefore, America was being tested, once again, at the end of the Second World War in a generation.

What America did was brought to a head and was well epitomized in the program headed by General Marshall; and affixed to that program, rightfully, is his name—a program by which a victorious nation, for the first time in human history, agreed to share its abundant wealth, its great opportunities, and the blessings of having escaped the immediate ravages of war with the sections of the world—regardless of which side they had been on during that war—which had suffered such grievous devastation because of the war. As well they know, the Communists intended to feed on the unrest and the devastation in Europe; and, indeed, they had every chance of doing so. It was the Communists' intent to do nothing in Europe, but to let starvation and suffering breed a demand for communism. It was at that moment that America, through General Marshall, rushed into the vacuum and met the challenge in the only humane and constructive way that could be effective. Because of America's record on this front, all Americans can hold their heads high. We shall stand before the bar of history acquitted of any selfishness or any vindictiveness or any sense of revenge, which so often follow in the wake of great war.

To that end, we in America pay tribute, on this commemorative date, to Gen. George Marshall, one of the greatest Americans of them all.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I am delighted to yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, I welcome this opportunity to join in the remarks which already have been made on this anniversary date with respect to a very great American.

I think many persons believe that this Chamber is filled with those who are concerned with history's verdict regarding them. Consciously or unconsciously, I think all men and women are concerned with history's verdict with respect to them.

General Marshall, happily and deservedly, knows history's verdict, and he knows the gratitude of men and women across the world for him. Mr. President, nothing that could be said here could add to that story, but I think one should note on this anniversary date that the plan which bears his name points clearly to the road which America must follow if we are responsibly to discharge our obligation to civilization. It is not an easy road. It is definitely uphill. But free people, if they are given to understand the necessity, willingly will assume heavy burdens. It is leadership such as General Marshall has given which makes clear to free people the necessity for assuming burdens, and they find it a joy to assume such burdens.

Mr. President, I welcome this opportunity to speak on behalf of a very great American.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article published in the New York Times of December 25, 1955, entitled "Marshall at 75: The General Revisited"; extracts appearing on pages 245 to 248 from the book entitled "Incredible Tale," written by Gerald W. Johnson; and extracts, as marked, from the book entitled "Peace Can Be Won," written by Paul G. Hoffman.

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

[From the New York Times, Dec. 25, 1955]

MARSHALL AT 75: THE GENERAL REVISITED

(By William S. White)

PINEHURST, N.C.—The cottage stands among the estates of the quietly and elderly rich who mainly inhabit this place. It is rather small, with a faint touch of pleasant shabbiness, and it looks rather huddled upon itself against the far grander homes across the shaded road. Here, on a winter's day, when a visitor calls upon the master of the cottage, the pines do not so much shelter as command; they are quite green, quite overpowering, and quite cold. The sheen of the sun is cold.

Here lives a great man, now venerable in retirement, an unconscious portrait of the general as an old man. (Whatever else he may be, however right or wrong his high policies in the immense years that he served, the host here is indisputably great, in the personal, human sense certainly; no sharper contrast to the small and the petty could readily be found.)

With him here is his wife, a lady of subdued, relaxed gaiety, whereas the general remains rather like a finely coiled spring. The steel has bent a bit, become a bit less supple with the passing of the years. Still, it remains. Here, too, is the general's orderly, an unobtrusive sergeant in uniform moving about deftly, much as a mobile background shadow alternately comes into focus and fades and dissolves in the eye of the camera.

Among the many, many obvious questions that the interviewer does not ask, is the name of the sergeant. The general would be perfectly polite, perfectly responsive, to such an inquiry. But he would be perfectly astonished, too. There is not the slightest doubt of his fondness, almost his paternal fondness, for this sergeant, who comes along with the other perquisites given by a more or less grateful Republic to a General of the Army.

All the same, the host here spent some 40 years in the professional Army, a good many of them with one or more stars on the shoul-

der, and even now he has no taste or gift for small talk or small facts. Unquestionably, he would unhesitatingly ford an icy river in winter to pull this sergeant out of a hapless fall. Unquestionably, too, however, a sergeant is a sergeant, a far more interesting being than, say, a second lieutenant, but still not a subject for general conversation.

Indeed, this small facet of character expresses one of the outstanding impressions left in a revisit, after some years, to George C. Marshall, General of the Army, former Secretary of State, former Secretary of Defense, former Chief of Staff, and holder of the Nobel Peace Prize.

That impression, stronger than ever now, is (however wretched the pun) of the profound generalness of the General's mind and point of view. An eminent soldier, credited by many with having held intellectual headship among all the military in prosecuting and winning the Second World War, he discusses, if left to himself, no particular battle and no particular crisis of that war.

This is by no means a vague or fuzzy period in his life, for, as he says with a small, bleakly appealing smile, he is "absolutely all right—from the neck up," although his 75th birthday is coming on December 31. Rather, it is a period, as he sees it in retrospect, and as no doubt he saw it even at the time, of vast, complicated shifting and interrelated designs of effort, of setback, of triumph, of transitory confusion succeeded in due course by firm and fixed consensus of purpose—a deep forest and not a series of trees.

The same is true of his later and purely political life. As Secretary of State he engaged himself primarily on putting over the Marshall plan for European recovery, but to this day nothing sharp, dramatic and alone, of that policy, stands out in his mind.

Instead, he simply remembers the general scene that lay before him: There was the devastation in Europe and the accompanying dangerous state of enfeeblement against the approach of communism. There was the political situation in the United States, specifically the task of persuading Congress to hand over the money for this enterprise. Finally, and at least as high in General Marshall's consciousness as these two other infinitely more interesting circumstances, was—what? "The shortage of a good many of the strategic materials that we were to need in this affair."

Again, as Secretary of Defense, Marshall's memories of his tour are more general and institutional than specific, personal, and intimate. His pride in that particular task lies most of all, as he casually remembers it, in what he did to halt the tremendous strife, as he puts it, that had been going on between the military services and between his predecessor as Secretary, Louis Johnson, and others in the Truman administration.

"I managed to change that," says the general, with quiet satisfaction, "and most of it, I believe, in about 2 weeks." How was it changed? The general spreads his hands, speaks noncommittally for a moment, and changes the subject.

There is no suggestion that he is avoiding the question; he has simply dealt with its important and general aspects and is now eager to pass on to something else.

It is clear that he dislikes Washington very much—his late years, in fact, have involved a series of retreats southward, first to Leesburg, Va., and now down here, so very far, indeed, from all official life. This dislike, it seems, actually proceeds, however, not so much from what others have so often denounced in Washington life—the backstabbing and climbing, and so on—as from General Marshall's intellectual revulsion to what he considers simply the damn nonsense of the place and the drabness of what he calls "Potomac social fever."

This, and any other kind of personalization of his position in Washington, was always a great, boring nuisance to him, and his juniors were given an incredibly free hand in dealing as they saw fit with this sort of thing. Mrs. Marshall recalls with a smile, for an example, that once when the general was guest at a notable affair the band leader felt it obligatory to ask for his favorite song. "The general," said one of the general's aides with a straight face, "prefers either 'Nearer, My God, to Thee' or 'Buttons and Bows'." Marshall himself did not know at the time of this extraordinarily catholic description of his musical interests. He smiles briefly now at the anecdote.

While the years have made their unavoidable mark upon him, the harsh denunciations of him that came late in his career, from the Republican right wing, have made no visible imprint at all. Five years ago, when the general's appointment to be Secretary of Defense was up for Senate confirmation, Senator WILLIAM JENNER of Indiana called him "a front man for traitors * * * a living lie."

Just after the incident this correspondent happened to speak to the general over the telephone on another matter. At the end, I said to him: "General, by the way, some very harsh things have been said about you in the Senate today."

"Oh?" said Marshall. "What were they?" He was told. There was the faintest pause and then he said: "Who? Jenner? Don't know him. Goodby."

The situation is about the same today. The general, having made, years ago, a firm decision never to write or publish a memoir or any other sort of apologia for his career, the question arose as to how and whether he would reply at all to his detractors.

"Don't intend to," he says in the sitting room here in Pinehurst. "I think the record [not "my" record, note] is sufficient. That was rather an emotional period, you know."

What was his hardest job in public life? "The hardest thing I ever did was to keep my temper. I had to work with those people, and that was that." To the question, "What are the indispensables for disinterested public service?" the general frowns a bit, drawing back from the brink of what might seem to be mere hackneyed sentiment, but at length bravely takes the plunge.

"Courage. Wisdom. Tolerance. An understanding of the democratic procedures. Tolerance. You can't operate the democratic system without tolerance." All this he bites off embarrassedly, like a man asked to read his prayerbook aloud.

Many things are part of Marshall. But this, it seems on reflection, is at the very core of it all: Here is a man of the military, a man with a good deal of what sometimes is slightly called the military mind, an aloof, aristocratic, indrawn man who nevertheless in his life expresses the truly democratic spirit as well as any person this political writer has ever known.

He sometimes expresses it, it is true, with a kind of exasperated resignation; a man still incredulous at memory of the incoherent shouts of the crowd, poked by the small darts of political enemies, but faithful still to the great plan that makes any public servant, however elevated, the servant at last of them all. To Marshall, for example, any defiance of Congress or President, particularly for a soldier, would be an inconceivable act.

He has wry memories of some of the things Congress did, not to him but to his beloved budgets, especially the most beloved of all, the Army's budgets. It is clear that he has many reservations today about many things in high policy, foreign and domestic. Still, he is adamantly unwilling to discuss any of these things. Proper authority has made these policies and he, moreover, is, as he says, quite out of it now, knowing a great

deal of background perhaps, but not at all abreast of current intelligence.

His connection now with the Pentagon is tenuous and largely formal. As a General of the Army he is a member of a very small club that has much in the way of honor but little in the way of explicit duty. He does not often see many members of the club, though one of them, General of the Army Omar N. Bradley, was down here in Pinehurst not many months ago to play golf. (Of Bradley, of whom he is very fond, Marshall says in passing: "Bradley's a very junior member of our club, you know.")

Marshall's present relationship with the Pentagon, in fact, is largely nostalgic; he gets a great many letters from among the 10 million or more ex-servicemen with whom, as he says, he is "involved." They ask all sorts of things—one man in fact has entreated the general to do something to preserve the American bald eagle—and the general, with a great show of grumpy complaint that is not very convincing, does the best he can for them. His affection is for the American soldier; even here his concern is general and not particularized.

What he does most of all these days is to sit quietly, reading, contemplating the matters of life and watching television. He is quite pleased with that mechanism; when I called on him a newspaper clipping listing the evening's program was across the arm of his chair.

Nearby was a new and formidable book, "The Lessons of History," by William Smyth, in which was the card of an old Marshall friend, Bernard Baruch. Across the room were many more used books. Along about 5 o'clock in the afternoon the general went out to the kitchen for highballs, not sending the sergeant on this errand for the reason that any gentleman would have no difficulty in understanding: This was a man's home and this was the act of a host.

This he shows with restrained pride, pointing out in a flat, unemphatic voice several rich oriental tapestries and paintings that hang on the walls. "Gifts to Mrs. Marshall," he says, "from Madame Chiang." He does not elaborate, or even recognize, the irony—for few will fail to recall that General Marshall's mission to China soon after the end of the war was alleged by some of his critics to involve a sellout of the Nationalist Government of Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek. He simply repeats "Madame Chiang" and with an expressionless face he lets it go at that.

Then there is a stroll in the garden with Mrs. Marshall and the visitors, the general very straight in a thin tweed jacket and carefully oblivious of the now chill and sharpening wind whistling around the gleaming pine trees.

He has not, as he phrases it, been too well of late; the effects of a bout of virus flu are still upon him, and he finds it physically difficult to do a good deal of the writing—letters and so on—that he feels he ought to do. He could have in a secretary, of course, but this would not really do at all. "Mrs. Marshall and I so value our privacy," he explains.

Later, as his visitors rise to leave, the general goes to the door with them and beyond, leaning over the automobile door as he gives directions on how to get back to the main road. His face is thin, but still powerful in the twilight, and he stands watching in the driveway as the car pulls away toward the Durham-Raleigh Highway.

It is impossible not to look back upon the tall still figure under the now darkening pines. It is impossible to put down the melancholy thought that the truly great ones—not necessarily the right ones or the wrong ones on policy and all that, for all that is not the point—are falling back now into irretrievable time.

Thus, George Catlett Marshall, Esq., of whose like there indeed are not many.

EXCERPT FROM BOOK ENTITLED "INCREDIBLE TALE"

(By Gerald W. Johnson)

And yet—on June 7, 1947, we sounded a blast that echoed around the world. George Catlett Marshall was the trumpeter, but that is a detail, for he was sounding in behalf of the average man; all that the identity of the individual did was give a name to the call. It carried the defiance of the commoner, whose heart and hand must make it good; and the great herald was, after all, merely a herald. Every American who has assented and who has supported the Marshall plan is entitled to say, "the slughorn to my lips I set," for at Harvard University that day the Secretary of State was speaking for us all.

It is certainly true that our motives were not unmixed. The Marshall plan would never have gone through Congress so quickly, and it might not have gone through at all, had not some Members been spurred by fear of communism. Its supposed efficacy as a stopper of communism gave the plan the last group of votes necessary to a majority, and to that extent it is correct to say that terror, not boldness, was the deciding factor.

But it is equally correct to point out that there was a heavy vote in Congress, and a strong sentiment among the people in favor of the Marshall plan before terror was introduced as an additional argument. Fear gave it the final shove, but it was already close to success. Fear is nothing new. Fear has been dictating action since history began. Fear will always be a factor in the decisions that any nation makes. The presence of the oldest of human motives in this decision signifies nothing as regards the political education of the American people. The appearance of a new motive does. Realization that the restoration of Europe is a part of our task was such a motive; and it was powerful, if not controlling.

It is appropriate to the moment that the poem ends with the trumpet call. What happened after that, Browning does not say. What is to happen after our bugle blast we do not know as yet. But the fact that we had the spirit to sound it is one of the great incidents in the tale of our times.

For it was not a defiance of any specific man or of any specific society. It was a challenge offered to certain ancient ideas, stronger than any man, a defiance of traditions older than history. What will come swarming out of the Dark Tower we know no better than the knight errant did, but it will be trouble in multitudinous forms. Perhaps one of those forms will be war, but perhaps not. We got through the first 2 years and well into the third without war, but it may well be upon us before these lines are in print; or it may not come at all. But we have already precipitated plenty of trouble by our defiance and there is more to come.

Why not? No one has attacked an ancient evil yet without starting trouble, and the evil we attacked is one of the oldest in the world. It is the belief, rooted in the human mind before history began to be written, that *Vae victis* is the supreme law of nations and that diplomacy is simply war in another form. This belief had been challenged before, but never as flatly, never as uncompromisingly as in the Marshall plan. Here for the first time a conqueror assumed that in destroying any part of the world, even that part held by an enemy in arms, he was destroying values in which he had a share, and that the woe that ensued should in justice be shared by him also.

The Marshall plan on its face is a financial measure, by which the American people—not the President and the Secretary of State, but you and I and the man next door—undertake to contribute sums of the order of \$5 billion a year for at least 4 years to a pool from which stricken nations may draw to

restore their shattered economic life. But its financial aspect is its superficial aspect. That is proved by the fact that some nations, including some of the worst devastated, refused the offer.

In view of the fact that the money does not have to be returned, except in certain restricted cases, and in view of the fact that the offer was made to all alike, it must have been a powerful motive indeed that induced any nation to refuse an offer so much to its advantage. It is evident that the Marshall plan, in the estimation of these nations, includes much that does not appear on the face of the financial transactions.

It does, indeed. It includes a tacit agreement on the part of beneficiary nations that they will make every effort to restore, not only their domestic productive power, but also that free and friendly commercial exchange necessary to support the economy of the world. This economy is not sustained but damaged by a policy of aggression on the part of any nation or group of nations; hence the Marshall plan by its very nature requires abandonment of the idea of aggression.

In theory a strong nation—Russia, for example—might have accepted the Marshall plan with no intention whatever of living up to this responsibility; but in practice it would not work. The leaders of the Communist state were well aware that if they accepted the benefits of the Marshall plan, intending all along to follow a policy of aggression, they would be left in a position so indefensible morally that they could not make even their own people regard it as justifiable. The Soviet system is powerful; but even so, it is not powerful enough to accept a man's money and then stab him in the back without incurring the condemnation of its own supporters.

But Russia, debarred from accepting the plan, must inevitably regard its success elsewhere with great apprehension, and was compelled, by her own stern logic, to employ every resource to prevent its success. Those resources have been employed, with considerable effect. The blockade of Berlin, for instance, compelled us to resort to the airlift, costing us hundreds of millions and many lives; and that was but one item in a long list. Oh, yes, when we put the slug-horn to our lips we started something that will be difficult to carry through.

The worst of it, though, is not Russian obduracy and ingenuity, but our own fatigue. The moral endurance of the American people has astonished the world, but it is not unlimited. The antagonist who rose before us after 1945 is well aware of the fact and has employed it with great shrewdness. His game has been to facilitate a psychological collapse by every means in his power, and to play for time until it comes about. It is a style of warfare to which Americans have never been subjected before, and the manner in which the average American will sustain it has yet to be determined.

EXCERPTS FROM BOOK ENTITLED "PEACE CAN BE WON"

(By Paul G. Hoffman)

The Kremlin's intent, even before the Marshall plan got under way, became abundantly clear as early as July 1947 in Paris. General Marshall had but recently delivered his great speech at Harvard, calling upon the nations of Europe, upon all of them, to join together in a vast cooperative effort to repair their shattered economies. "It is logical," he had declared, "that the United States should do whatever it is able to do to assist in the return of normal economic health in the world, without which there can be no political stability and no assured peace. Our policy is directed not against any country or doctrine, but against hunger, poverty, desperation, and chaos." There were no ideological strings attached to that offer beyond

the commonsense warning that "governments, political parties, or groups which seek to perpetuate human misery in order to profit therefrom politically or otherwise will encounter the opposition of the United States." This was an offer made in good faith and backed by good will. Its sole object was to lay the groundwork for a more prosperous world in which peace and freedom would be secure.

I can understand why many people feel this way. Much as I believe in peace, I am not for peace at any price. I go along completely with Senator Vandenberg, who, with his customary insight, said at Dartmouth College in 1949: "Appeasement is surrender on the installment plan." And General Marshall, in his eloquent 1950 Memorial Day address, endorsed this view when he declared that "there is nothing to be said in favor of war except that it is the lesser of two evils. For it is better than appeasement of aggression because appeasement encourages the very aggression it seeks to prevent."

On both scores there is hopeful news. Nothing finer could have occurred to persuade Europeans that we are in earnest about building up our defenses, and using them to avert war, than the appointment of George Marshall as Secretary of Defense. They vividly remember his leadership in World War II. They look upon him, and rightly, as a military genius who can construct and conduct a great common defense. At the same time they have an immense regard for him as the author of the Marshall plan as a program for peace. In the same way that he conceived of economic strength as a means of thwarting internal Communist aggression he will conceive of military strength as a means of thwarting external Communist aggression.

If this sounds like fiscal fantasy, let's look at the process in action. The French had made a valiant comeback in their cotton industry, restoring some 80 percent of prewar capacity. Raw materials ran out. Prior to the Marshall plan, French millowners faced the threat of having to shut up shop for lack of raw cotton. Unfortunately, France is not a cotton-growing nation and no cotton was available there. The millowners had plenty of francs, but the American cotton grower couldn't use them. Then the Marshall plan came along. The millowners took their francs to the French exchange control, traded them for dollars (after their requests were approved by French officials and ECA), bought the needed cotton with the dollars and kept their mills going. What about the millowners' francs? They went into the recovery fund and became counterpart—to be used for some such worthwhile project as building a highway or creating new farmland by draining a swamp.

What has happened? The dollars kept the French mills active and thousands of French workers at their jobs. They have provided the French Government with a sackful of francs for recovery projects. They have robbed the French Communists of an excellent opportunity to exploit the discontent of idle workers. More importantly, because the French millowners paid for their cotton—and thus ordered only what they needed—the program avoided the waste that is normal in most "giveaway" plans.

We must use guided dollars. As most Americans know, we have been extending to Europe a vast amount of aid ever since World War I.

In 1947, Congress was facing the task of further aid to Europe. But it wanted to put it on a sounder, more solid basis than ever before. Hence Congress made this the central aim of Marshall plan legislation. In my opinion, its efforts were notably success-

ful, with good reason; the problem in Europe had been thoroughly studied by congressional investigators (such as the traveling committee headed by the brilliant Christian A. Herter, of Massachusetts). The ECA legislation itself was based upon some of the most protracted hearings in congressional history—the testimony filled five volumes and contained 6,584 pages. When the law finally emerged from these hundreds of necessary but wearisome hearings and conferences, it included among its provisions a directive that the European nations: (1) Submit a detailed program of their needs, (2) discuss with the ECA administration the trade and fiscal policies they would follow, and (3) allow ECA to make end-use checks to determine that American aid was spent as agreed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I wish to thank all Senators who have associated themselves with the majority leader and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONROEY] in expressing their thoughts on General Marshall today. He is a great man—great in the annals of war, great in the annals of peace, and great in the affection of his countrymen.

Mr. NEUBERGER subsequently said: Mr. President, I was on the floor earlier today when the able Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONROEY] paid tribute to the illustrious career of Gen. George C. Marshall. I realize there is nothing I can say which would add to the encomiums paid so deservedly to General Marshall by the Senator from Oklahoma, by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], by the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], and by many other distinguished Members of the Senate. I should, however, like to add one very brief comment.

We in the State of Oregon, which is my native State, have always taken great pride in the fact that Oregon has been General Marshall's favorite scene of recreation. On many, many occasions General Marshall has gone fishing on the Umpqua River, which is one of our lovely coastal and tidewater streams, and in which steelhead trout, salmon, and other game fish abound.

Again and again General Marshall returned to Oregon, and always he has had praise for Oregon's magnificent outdoor beauty and grandeur.

I think it was in connection with his original military service in the Pacific Northwest that General Marshall first came to national attention. At the time the Russian fliers made their epic flight over the polar region in their antiquated airplane—at least antiquated by present-day standards—Gen. George Marshall was a brigadier general in command of the Vancouver Barracks. That is one of our oldest military posts, and is located on the banks of the Columbia River, near Vancouver, Wash., just across the Columbia from Portland, Oreg.

General Marshall at that time distinguished himself by his very adroit handling of the negotiations which took place with the Russian fliers, and in their presentation to our country and to the world after their remarkable feat of aviation. I recall editorials which were published in newspapers in the States of Washington and Oregon, citing the fact that the commandant at Vancouver Barracks was indeed an outstanding military

leader and also a man who knew how to handle his fellow men and to behave very capably in what might have been a delicate international situation.

I note the distinguished senior Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] is present on the floor. I am sure he will recall the time when General Marshall was commandant of one of the oldest and most traditional military posts in the State of Washington, and indeed in the Pacific Northwest.

I am happy indeed to have had this opportunity to bring to the attention of the Senate the heritage and legacy we of the Pacific Northwest feel we enjoy whenever the outstanding career, both in war and peace, of Gen. George C. Marshall is mentioned.

INTERNATIONAL PUBLIC HEALTH AND MEDICAL RESEARCH YEAR

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I submit, for appropriate reference, a resolution expressing the sense of the Senate on behalf of specific steps looking toward the observance of an International Public Health and Medical Research Year.

I ask unanimous consent that this resolution, lie over on the desk for 10 days so that all of my colleagues who may wish to join as cosponsors may have the opportunity to do so.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the resolution will lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from Minnesota.

The resolution (S. Res. 129) favoring continued efforts by all nations to strengthen cooperation in health and research activities, was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I hope that as many of my colleagues as possible will join with me, because I would like for the world to know explicitly that the Senate of the United States, and I hope the House, thereafter concurring, remain united in favor of this great ideal of an International Health and Medical Research Year.

PAST U.S. AND SENATE SUPPORT OF YEAR

It will be recalled that on August 11, 1958, the Senate unanimously approved my bills, Senate resolution 361 and Senate concurrent resolution 399, inviting the President of the United States to explore the possibility of such a year.

On December 5, 1958, the United Nations General Assembly, with full U.S. support, unanimously approved the concept of such a year and referred it to WHO.

However, the World Health Assembly, which has just concluded its 12th session in Geneva, decided to postpone the year. It asked, however, that the Director General and the Secretariat prepare specific plans for reconsideration of the year at the next meeting of the Assembly, in Geneva, in May 1960.

PURPOSES OF NEW FORM OF RESOLUTION

The purpose of my resolution today is as follows:

First. To utilize constructively the time period of 11 months before the World Health Assembly reconvenes.

We would do so by inviting the President of the United States, acting through the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare; the National Science Foundation; the National Academy of Sciences and National Research Council, and other public and private groups to ask the medical profession, and other professions and organizations in the life sciences, in cooperation with the scientific community of the world, to develop concrete plans and programs for the year.

REBUTTAL OF SOVIET CLAIMS

Second. A second purpose of my resolution is to rebut the erroneous Soviet claim to the effect that it was the Soviet Union which originated the concept of such a year.

I should like to say that it is a source of regret to me that the subject of health should be made a pawn in the East-West chess game, or power struggle.

So far as we Americans are concerned, we are interested in the health of mankind because of humanitarian reasons.

Unfortunately, however, the Soviet Union at the World Health Assembly in Geneva attempted to draw a false issue in speech after speech and to assert that it was the Soviet Union which is responsible for this concept.

The fact is that it was an American, former Gov. Adlai Stevenson, who first presented the idea publicly—3 months before the Ukrainian Socialist Soviet Republic took up the idea. It was an American resolution in the U.S. Senate which I had been privileged to draft, which first presented the idea in formal form. It was an American message to the executive board of the World Health Organization which first drew it to the attention of WHO in the form of my message to Surg. Gen. Leroy Burney.

The Soviet Union at the Geneva Assembly chose to disregard all of these facts, simply relying upon the fact that in September 1958, the Ukraine had introduced a resolution for the year in the United Nations.

I call the attention of the Senate to the fact that it was about 6 weeks before that when the Senate of the United States adopted a resolution asking for an international health and medical research year.

Let me say, in all candor, that I regret that it was not the American delegation in the United Nations which introduced such a resolution. The fact that it did not does not alter the fact that it was at American initiative, that this whole concept developed.

I believe that the U.S. Senate, as such, is to be complimented for having taken the initiative. Now, I want the Senate to maintain the initiative, but I want the executive branch to carry through fully—as I believe it very definitely will.

But authorship of the idea is not nearly as important as fulfillment of it.

SUMMIT CONFERENCE COULD ADVANCE THE YEAR

I believe that it is time that, at the highest possible level, this issue, now derailed, be put back on the track.

If a summit conference between East and West is held, and if a broad-range of nonpolitical issues is taken up, such

as was wisely done at Geneva at the summit, in 1955, then I believe that President Eisenhower, Premier Khrushchev, Prime Minister Macmillan, and President De Gaulle would do well first, to approve the concept of such a year; and, second, to signify their intention to have their governments financially support such a year. I am hopeful that our Government, in the person of our President, will take the initiative in these endeavors.

The fact is that a health year is precisely the sort of relatively noncontroversial issue on which East and West can and should unite. Last year, one quarter of a million Americans and a quarter of a million Russians died of cancer, for example. So, enlightened self-interest requires cooperation.

When I discussed the issue of the year with Premier Khrushchev in Moscow on December 1, 1958, he enthusiastically approved it.

Unfortunately, Soviet actions at WHO did not accord with his comments. This is not, however, an uncommon contrast.

Unfortunately, too, until heads of state shall encourage word to their own health ministers, to the effect that governments are ready, willing, and eager to back the year with dollars, rubles, francs, and pounds sterling, the health ministers will be unable to pledge more money to international health efforts.

This brings us to consideration of the action at the World Health Assembly, which I believe will be of interest to the Senate.

REASONS FOR ASSEMBLY'S DECISION OF POSTPONEMENT

It is only being frank to say that WHO's decision of postponement was a source of disappointment not only to myself, but to a great many individuals here and abroad who see in the year a magnificent opportunity to strengthen the health of the human race.

The reasons for the postponement are several. I shall not, at present, attempt a complete statement with regard to the Assembly's decision, because I have not as yet had the opportunity to take this up at first hand with American delegates, following their return from Geneva.

I have, however, through correspondence and through information obtained by the staff of the Government Operations Committee conducting the International Health Study, ascertained that the following were among the reasons for postponement:

First. It is universally recognized that the year will require extensive preparation. Yet, it is less than a year since the concept of such a year was first advanced. And many of the nations felt that it would have been preferable to have more definite plans before authorizing a full go-ahead.

By contrast, it should be noted that the eminently successful International Geophysical Year was first discussed as far back as April 1950 before its start 7 years later in July 1957.

Second. A second and equally or more compelling reason for postponement was stated in the World Health Assembly

resolution itself. It pointed to the fact that the nations are heavily committed at present to both national and international efforts to improve health. That means, I might add, principally the underdeveloped nations are so committed.

It is no fault of the delegates to the Assembly that they were apparently under instructions of their home governments not to attempt to undertake additional financial commitments, either nationally or through pro-rata international effort. The Assembly recognized that it still faces enormous financial burdens in programs such as malaria eradication.

Third. Apparently, a third reason for postponement was that the Soviet effort to make propaganda out of the Health Year apparently backfired. As a result of Soviet and satellite propaganda speeches, there was resentment by many delegates against Soviet efforts to take over the year. Let me say, Mr. President, that I do not view the Health Year as a propaganda stunt for or against any nation. I view it as a solid humanitarian effort.

When the Health Year is formally observed, it cannot possibly succeed unless all nations view it in this manner.

Its success will depend in very large measure on full Soviet participation—but Soviet effort should be conducted as a part of the community of nations and not in a manner which will estrange many nations.

If and when a summit conference takes place, I am hopeful that the President of the United States will say in no uncertain terms, with clarity and purpose, that we expect the Soviet Union in these international cooperative efforts to act responsibly, and cease their efforts at propaganda, and cease their efforts at harassment of important international purposes.

Notwithstanding East-West differences, I want it known that I continue to hope that the Soviet Union will leave no stone unturned to contribute to mankind's health. I believe that the impressive talent of Russian science, the manyfold abilities of Russian research should be just as dedicated to mankind's health as the ability and talent which we ourselves can mobilize.

THE IRONY OF INADEQUATE FINANCES FOR HEALTH

Now, let me state this fact concerning the financial problem:

Reports from Geneva indicated that the delegates and many of their governments were concerned about the \$600,000 price tag on administration of the Health Year.

I say in all candor, Mr. President, that it is a sad and tragic commentary on the world of the 20th century when the nations can spend \$100 billion on arms, but shrink from spending \$600,000 for human health.

It is a tragic commentary on man's system of values when the world spends billions to fire rockets into outer space, but hesitates to spend relatively pennies for experiments which will fire magic bullets against diseases which are the enemies of man.

I know that the United States at the appropriate time will make a substantial voluntary contribution for the success of the Year, just as it did in the case of the International Geophysical Year.

If it was appropriate for us to spend tens of millions of dollars not counting logistic support, for IGY, then it certainly is appropriate that we be prepared to make reasonable expenditures available for the International Health Year.

WHO'S ACTIONS PROVES NEED OF YEAR

I point out that the very decision of postponement of the Year underlined a reason why there should be such a Year.

The fact of the matter is that in many countries, the Ministers of Health, through no fault of their own, seem to be, in effect, considered "low men on the totem pole" by some of their governments. I am not speaking of our own country or of any one country in particular.

I am simply stating that when many national budgets are prepared by powerful Finance Ministers and are approved by parliaments, somehow money is always found for top priority Ministries and for armaments and for all sorts of governmental projects, like roads and harbors, etc. But often, at the bottom of budgetary priorities, money is doled out with an eyedropper when it comes to human health.

I have seen country after country where the biomedical community is virtually starved for finances.

I have seen country after country with potential scientific genius being wasted because there are no career opportunities and adequate salaries for medical researchers and for public health physicians.

An International Health Year could go a long way toward ending this unfortunate downgrading of human health.

Fortunately, we of the United States have considerably awakened to health needs. This awakening is due in large part to the superb efforts of the senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] and his colleague on the House side, Congressman JOHN FOGARTY.

NUMEROUS ACHIEVEMENTS AT HEALTH ASSEMBLY

But let me pay a well-deserved tribute to those thinking leaders in the executive branch who are likewise to be complimented.

Let me point out that we sent a very able delegation to the World Health Assembly and that fortunately, this year, at long last, it was under instructions to support, not oppose, an increase in WHO's budget.

Let me say further that the Surgeon General of the U.S. Public Health Service, Dr. Leroy Burney and his colleagues in the American delegation to the assembly are to be complimented for their devoted efforts not only on behalf of the International Public Health and Medical Research Year, but on behalf of the other important and constructive achievements of the assembly.

I refer in particular to the fact that it was agreed by a vote of 51 to 14 to add \$500,000 to the Director-General's proposal as a second stage in developing the intensified WHO research program.

As Dr. Burney wrote to me from Geneva, this is an exceedingly important step in the history of WHO. It establishes the principle that research activity is part and parcel of the regular WHO program, supported by all members. A special research fund was also established to permit the United States, and others who may wish to do so, to make special contributions or grants for research projects, as I certainly hope will prove to be the case.

FOUR ITEMS TO BE PRINTED IN RECORD

Mr. President, in conclusion, I ask unanimous consent that several items be printed in the RECORD following my comments:

First. The text of my resolution.

Second. A series of quotations from letters, telegrams, and postal cards which have come to me from all parts of the United States approving the concept of such a year. I have only selected a handful of the many messages which have come to me.

Third. A National Science Foundation memorandum, summarizing America's vital role in the various stages of the history of IGY. I believe this will be very helpful background, both as to similarity and dissimilarity as between IGY and IHY.

Fourth. The text of an article which appeared in the May 29 issue of *Science*, the official publication of the American Association for the Advancement of Science. This article outlines the history of the development of this IHY concept, and it reports upon an extensive discussion of it at the meeting of the National Citizen's Committee for WHO, which I had the privilege of addressing last month.

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

SENATE RESOLUTION 129

Whereas Senate Resolution 361, 85th Congress, agreed to August 11, 1958, expressed the unanimous sense of the Senate that the President of the United States be invited to explore through the World Health Organization and related organizations, the possibility of an International Health and Medical Research Year; and

Whereas on December 5, 1958, the United Nations General Assembly with full U.S. support, unanimously approved the concept of such a year; and

Whereas the 12th World Health Assembly in May 1959, expressed "deep appreciation and satisfaction at learning of the interest displayed by the General Assembly of the United Nations in international health matters, including medical research"; and

Whereas the World Health Assembly affirmed that it "appreciates the value and importance of an International Health and Medical Research Year"; and

Whereas the Assembly indicated that because of "the existing heavy commitment on national and international effort," it found it necessary to postpone the year for the present, but that it would reconsider the subject at the 13th World Health Assembly, convening in May 1960; and

Whereas the Assembly requested the Director General to transmit the views expressed in its resolution to the Economic and Social Council at its 28th session and to the General Assembly of the United Nations at its 14th session; and

Whereas the need is greater than ever before for all the nations to proceed without

delay to strengthen cooperation in health and research efforts on behalf of present and future generations; and

Whereas it is the hope and anticipation of the people of the United States that the 13th World Health Assembly will declare an International Public Health and Medical Research Year to be observed at an early and feasible date: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that the President of the United States, acting through the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare; the National Science Foundation; the National Academy of Sciences-National Research Council, and such other official and private bodies, as he deems appropriate, should (1) continue U.S. initiative in seeking to strengthen international cooperation in health and research efforts and, in connection therewith, (2) invite the medical profession of the United States, and other professions and organizations concerned with the healing arts and the life sciences to develop plans and programs in cooperation with the scientific community of other nations toward declaration and observance of an International Public Health and Medical Research Year.

EXCERPTS OF MESSAGES TO SENATOR HUMPHREY ENDORSING HIS EFFORTS FOR THE INTERNATIONAL PUBLIC HEALTH AND MEDICAL RESEARCH YEAR

BIRMINGHAM, ALA., May 15, 1959.

The Honorable HUBERT HUMPHREY,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR HUMPHREY: Your plan for an IHY year, as portrayed in the This Week magazine section, is just about the most heartening thing that has come up in a long, long time. With the almost overwhelming advance of cancer—scarcely a day goes by that you don't hear of it—and with the frighteningly unknown radiation hazard, it has been amazing to me that no more has been done.

With the vital need for a program such as this, I can see only two things wrong—first, why hasn't it come forth long ago, and second, why wait until 1961 to start it?

At any rate, I am most grateful to you for what you have done in starting it and hope you will never give up until it has become a realization.

Yours very truly

(Miss) FARRAR ARMSTRONG.

CLEVELAND, OHIO, January 9, 1959.

Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY,
U.S. Senate.

DEAR SENATOR HUMPHREY: * * *

Another matter that impressed me greatly was the idea of an International Medical Year. This is the kind of competition we should have with our rivals on this earth. Not only would it be very stimulating but only a great deal of good could come from this rivalry. * * *

Sincerely yours,

RALPH I. FRIED, M.D.

JANUARY 9, 1959.

Senator HUMPHREY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR HUMPHREY: I have just finished reading your interview with Mr. Khrushchev in Life.

As chairman of the health and sanitation committee, the Chicago American Chapel, Chicago Typographical Union No. 16, I am attracted to any reference to the subject of health.

Your proposal for an International Year for Public Health and Medical Research under U.N. auspices, it seems to me, has unusual implications for American initiative in strengthening international good will and understanding. Beyond that it opens up new vistas for solving some of the major health problems confronting mankind. Can-

didly, I feel it is one of the most brilliant proposals of this period. May your endeavor to make it a reality be successful.

Has your proposal been formalized as a statement, petition, or act? If it has I would appreciate receiving a copy. And is there anything a layman citizen could do to assist you in your endeavor?

Sincerely,

EDWARD STARR.

CHICAGO, ILL., May 19, 1959.

Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR HUMPHREY: I have read your article in This Week magazine for May 10, 1959, entitled "IHY, Our Best Hope To Stop Atomic Fallout." It is an excellent idea and I want to commend you for sponsoring it. I wish you success.

Sincerely yours,

HERBERT K. ABRAMS, M.D.

BURBANK, CALIF., May 10, 1959.

DEAR SENATOR HUMPHREY: Hooray for IHY. You are showing the kind of simple difficult, superlative imagination which may yet save this old world.

Keep thinking big. No matter what people say, Americans will prove big enough for your largest thoughts, and I believe all men will join them.

WM. LOUCHARD.

P.S.—I will help publicize IHY in this district.

ALHAMBRA, CALIF., May 11, 1959.

DEAR MR. HUMPHREY: At long last I feel all is not lost, and am quite excited and encouraged over two developments that have arisen from the other unpeaceful and immoral situations of today.

The first is the World Peace Through Law, from the American Bar Association, and the other is the International Health Year. May I congratulate you on the latter, and offer my most heartiest support and encouragement; may I also assure you that the peoples of this country and of all countries want peaceful and respectful coexistence.

I implore you to beseech your coworkers to recognize and exhort the dignity of all men.

Again, accept my wholehearted support and good wishes in this wonderful project.

Most sincerely,

Mrs. J. R. McCAFFERTY.

MIAMI, FLA., May 23, 1959.

The Honorable Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
Chairman of International Health Study,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. HUMPHREY: I read with interest your article, in This Week magazine (May 10 issue) concerning International Health Year.

I am very much interested in keeping up with the plans as they progress and will appreciate you advising me how best to do this, or send me any brochures or information being issued at this particular time, especially if nurses or other personnel will have an opportunity to train under this special organization in how to cope with nuclear radiation and its relation to health as soon as this information has been decided.

Thanking you, I am

Respectfully yours,

PATRICIA POWELL, R.N.

DALLAS, TEX., May 19, 1959.

Hon. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR HUMPHREY: Certainly your plan for an International Health Year would be as fruitful as it seems now that the International Geophysical Year has been.

Yours very sincerely,

ELIZABETH S. BRADLEY, R.N.

CHICAGO, ILL., May 9, 1959.

DEAR MR. HUMPHREY: Thank you for introducing the International Health Year project to the U.S. Senate.

Naturally, the article in This Week magazine is only an introduction for us readers. We hope to see and hear much more of this wonderful proposal. * * *

With appreciation for the problems involved, and with all best wishes for your personal efforts in this task, I am
Very sincerely,

MRS. NORBERT KACEU.

WATERTOWN, Wis., April 9, 1959.

Hon. HUBERT HUMPHREY.

DEAR MR. HUMPHREY: Have been reading a great deal about your international health program. Assure you many people throughout this area are looking very kindly toward your effort.

With kindest regards,

L. D. HEFTY.

PITTSBURGH, PA., May 11, 1959.

Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

SIR: In This Week magazine I read your article about IHY. To me this seems to be one of the most outstanding suggestions the world has faced in a good many years.

* * * * *

Yours respectfully,

HARRY LOEWY.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., May 29, 1959.

SENATOR HUMPHREY: Your article on IHY in May 10 This Week was the best thing I've read for a long time. So much good solid sense to it—and what wonderful promise. If the whole world would participate in your international health proposal, it not only would do great work toward solving some of the mysteries of bad health and disease, but would go farther than anything we've tried yet to bring about lasting world peace as a possibility.

Great success to you and yours.

Thanking you,

BILLY JENKINS.

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., May 15, 1959.

Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
Chairman of International Health Study,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR HUMPHREY: I have read the article in This Week magazine outlining your plans for an International Health Year. One should be commended for a program that will give healthier, happier, and fuller lives to all of the individuals of the world.

* * * * *

Yours truly,

W. D. PALLOCIC.

BACKGROUND TO THE INTERNATIONAL HEALTH YEAR: A BRIEF SUMMARY OF IGY HISTORY

I. HISTORICAL BACKGROUND AND INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATION OF THE INTERNATIONAL GEOPHYSICAL YEAR

The period July 1, 1957, through December 31, 1958, was designated as the International Geophysical Year (IGY). It was a period of worldwide observations and studies of the sun, and of the earth and its physical environment, including its atmosphere and the space through which it travels. Sixty-six nations took an active part in the program (attachment A).

The IGY was actually the third such scientific undertaking. In earlier periods geophysicists recognized the inherent advantages of studying geophysical phenomena over the entire earth within a relatively short interval of time. During 1882-83, the First Polar Year, 10 nations, including the United States, conducted simultaneous, cooperative scientific observations in the Arctic. Fifty years later the Second Polar Year, 1932-33,

was undertaken, in which 30 nations cooperated in observations primarily in the Arctic. Both of these periods contributed greatly to the store of basic knowledge in the geophysical sciences.

In April 1950 at an informal meeting of geophysicists in Silver Spring, Md., the suggestion was offered by Dr. L. V. Berkner that, because of the tremendous advances in instrumentation that had taken place in the 1940's consideration be given to holding a Third Polar Year 25 years after the second, which would place it in 1957-58, a period of maximum sunspot activity. The suggestion was received with enthusiasm, and in subsequent discussions scientists throughout the world recognized the benefits of extending the planned program to encompass the entire earth and renamed it the International Geophysical Year to reflect the increased scope in coverage.

During the next 18 months the initial proposal was considered and supported by a number of international scientific groups, most of them members of the International Council of Scientific Unions (ICSU). The Mixed Commission on the Ionosphere endorsed it, as did also, in rapid succession, the International Scientific Radio Union, the International Astronomical Union, the International Union of Geodesy and Geophysics, and finally the International Council of Scientific Unions itself.

In 1951 the executive board of ICSU appointed the Comité Spécial de l'Année Géophysique Internationale (CSAGI), composed of representatives of the various scientific unions involved and of the World Meteorological Organization and the International Consultative Committee for Radio Communications. A Bureau of CSAGI was appointed consisting of Prof. Sydney Chapman (Great Britain), president; Dr. Lloyd V. Berkner (United States), vice president; and Profs. M. Nicolet (Belgium), general secretary. Later (in June 1957) Prof. V. V. Belousov (U.S.S.R.) and Prof. J. Coulomb (France) were added as members of the Bureau.

In late 1951 and early 1952 CSAGI invited member nations of ICSU or its unions to establish special national committees to take part in the planning and guidance of the IGY. As the concept of the program expanded, invitations to all countries of the world were issued to join in the enterprise.

Individual countries were responsible for organizing and supporting their own portions of the IGY program. In general, this meant that each country provided the fund, equipment, and personnel for IGY activities that they undertook within their continental limits, possessions, or in areas where they had traditionally had an interest. In the case of the U.S. program, additional support was given to U.S. organizations to conduct oceanographic observations on the high seas; equipment and services were provided at a network of stations overseas for satellite tracking purposes; and equipment was supplied for certain scientific stations scattered throughout the world, particularly in South America along the 75-80° West longitude line.

The initial support of the international secretariat of the CSAGI was received from ICSU and UNESCO. Grants from the latter of \$1,000 to \$2,000 and \$20,000 were made during this initial period (1952-54), and were supplemented by additional amounts, \$15,000-\$25,000 a year (1955-58). It soon became evident that the cost of supporting the secretariat, including travel to international planning meetings, distribution of various planning documents, etc., would require considerably more support. The secretariat, therefore, appealed for voluntary contributions to the various national committees of the countries involved with the IGY. The response was quite successful. For example, over a 3-year period the U.S. National Academy of Sciences made available \$70,000 to the international secre-

tariat, the funds coming originally from the National Science Foundation.

A coordinated, worldwide scientific program for the IGY was synthesized from various proposals submitted by individual nations and modified through periodic meetings of CSAGI (Brussels, 1953; Rome, 1954; Brussels, 1955; and Barcelona, 1956). At a fifth reunion of CSAGI held in August-September 1958 in Moscow, consideration was given to a review of the accomplishments of the first two-thirds of the IGY, the question of the future of international cooperation in geophysics after the end of the IGY, the problem of the collection, storage, and cataloging of data at the world data centers, and the question of publication of IGY data and results.

II. U.S. PARTICIPATION IN THE INTERNATIONAL GEOPHYSICAL YEAR

U.S. National Committee for the IGY

The National Academy of Sciences-National Research Council, a nongovernmental organization, as the adhering body on behalf of American scientists to the International Council of Scientific Unions and most of its unions, was the group in the United States that received the CSAGI invitation for this country to participate in the IGY. In response to this invitation, the president of the Academy-Council established in February 1953 the U.S. National Committee for the International Geophysical Year 1957-58, under the chairmanship of Dr. Joseph Kaplan, professor of physics at the University of California at Los Angeles. Dr. Alan H. Shapley of the National Bureau of Standards was named vice chairman, and Dr. Hugh Odishaw, formerly of the National Bureau of Standards, the executive director.

The Committee membership was composed of appropriate representation from the various scientific disciplines involved, selected with a view toward securing as wide a geographical coverage as possible and to include both governmental and nongovernmental groups. An executive committee of the U.S. National Committee for the IGY was named, as were also subcommittees to cover the regional programs planned (Arctic, Antarctic, equatorial regions). In addition, 13 technical panels were established to direct the program in the scientific disciplines of meteorology, geomagnetism, aurora and airglow, ionosphere, solar activity, cosmic rays, longitude and latitude, glaciology, oceanography, seismology, gravity, and in the programs of rocketry and communications and world days. The latter were special intervals, some preselected, others based on observed solar activity during which enhanced observation schedules were activated.

Role of the National Science Foundation in the IGY

The Academy-Council, recognizing the importance of Government cooperation and support to the success of the U.S. portion of the IGY program, on November 25, 1953, asked the National Science Foundation to take responsibility for obtaining and administering Government funds required to carry out the program and to coordinate the interests of Government agencies involved.

After consideration of the recommendation and a study of the proposed program and budget, the National Science Board at its meeting of January 29, 1954, endorsed the general objectives of the program and the Foundation's participation in it.

After the proposed program and budget for the IGY had been submitted to the Bureau of the Budget, and after letters in support of the program had been submitted to the Bureau of the Budget from the Departments of State, Defense and Commerce, the Atomic Energy Commission, and the Office of Defense Mobilization, the President approved the program in a brief reference at one of his press conferences and included

the requested amount for the National Science Foundation in support of the International Geophysical Year in a supplemental appropriation request for fiscal year 1955. Action by the Congress was approval of an initial appropriation of \$2 million for the IGY program (Supplemental Appropriations Act of 1955, 83d Cong., 2d sess.). Subsequent appropriations to the National Science Foundation for the program have been \$10 million (Independent Offices Appropriations Act of 1956, 84th Cong., 1st sess.); \$27 million (Second Supplemental Appropriations Act of 1956, 84th Cong., 2d sess.); \$2 million (Second Supplemental Appropriations Act of 1958, 85th Cong., 2d sess.); \$2,500,000 (Supplemental Appropriations Act of 1959, 85th Cong., 2d sess.). The total amount, therefore, appropriated to the National Science Foundation for the U.S. IGY program was \$43,500,000.

Funding of the various projects in the U.S. IGY program has been administered through grants, contracts, and transfers of funds made by the National Science Foundation, upon recommendations received from the U.S. National Committee for the IGY. These totaled approximately \$43 million as of April 30, 1959.

The National Science Foundation has, in order to assure coordination, worked closely with other Federal agencies having an active interest and role in the IGY. These included the Department of Defense, Weather Bureau, National Bureau of Standards, Coast and Geodetic Survey, and Geological Survey. Additionally, the Department of Defense provided major logistic support to the Antarctic, Arctic, rocket and satellite programs.

III. EVOLUTION OF THE INTERNATIONAL GEOPHYSICAL YEAR PROGRAM AT NATIONAL AND INTERNATIONAL LEVELS

Taking the United States as an example of a country phase of the total IGY world effort, it can be seen how individual national programs were developed and synthesized into the international program.

First, the proposals for IGY projects were based on ideas conceived in individual laboratories or in the minds of individual scientists, thus originating at the grassroots levels in the scientific community. The original idea or proposal was first subjected to a screen process within the framework of the national committee. In the United States this initial screening took place in one of the technical advisory panels that had been established under the U.S. National Committee for the IGY.

The various individual projects that were accepted by the panel were then consolidated into a proposed disciplinary program in meteorology, or geomagnetism, for example. The disciplinary programs were next brought together into a proposed national program at committee level. After a process of trimming to adjust the complete national program to come within the country's budget, it was sent as a proposal to the general secretary of GSAGI, who received many such national program proposals.

A meeting of GSAGI and representatives from participating countries was called to review these programs and out of them to prepare the first draft of an international program. Working groups in the various disciplines were selected from among country delegates, generally capable scientists in the various fields of interest. These working groups were chaired by the appropriate GSAGI reporters, who had been designated to act as convenors for the development and coordination of worldwide programs suitable to the IGY in their respective fields of interest. The synthesis of the international program resulted in modifications to the individual country programs, which then went back to the national committees for reconsideration and implementation.

During the planning period for the IGY, additional suggestions for projects were received after the first cycle of approvals, necessitating a certain amount of reexamination, adjustment, enlistment of additional country support and the reconsideration of international aspects of the program. The United States IGY earth satellite project was a case in point. It was not until after the Rome meeting of CSAGI in 1954 that the U.S. National Committee determined that it was feasible technically to accept the CSAGI invitation to attempt to place a scientific earth satellite in orbit during the IGY period. Similarly, other new programs were introduced after the initial review, and significant additions were made to many other programs.

By the fall of 1956, when the fourth general meeting of CSAGI was held in Barcelona, the world program had been agreed to with but few minor exceptions. Operating details were subsequently resolved and complete accord was reached by the time of the beginning date set for the IGY, July 1, 1957.

Through the National Academy of Sciences' representation at the various international planning meetings held in connection with the IGY, American scientists dealt with their colleagues from other nations in the planning of the overall scientific program.

IV. IGY OBSERVATIONAL PERIOD

As far as the actual period of observations was concerned, a general statement can be made that the program was carried through essentially as planned. With minor exceptions, the spirit of cooperation that prevailed during the planning stage of the IGY extended throughout the period of observations. Inevitably, a few of the special stations and programs that had been planned for the IGY did not materialize, in some cases due to lack of financial support, personnel, or due to the fact that the plans were made too late to assemble, set up, and operate the necessary field equipment. Most of these omissions were in national programs other than the United States.

Both before the observing period and during the 18-month interval of field observations, representatives of the various national committees met on occasion to discuss in detail the kinds of data that would be placed in the various World Data Centers. These centers were established to insure the availability of IGY data to all interested scientists. One is located in the United States, one in the U.S.S.R., and one divided between Western Europe and Japan.

To a large extent, a high degree of acceptance was realized on the content and format of IGY data. The flow of data into the IGY World Data Centers is still continuing, since in many cases raw observations must be transmitted from rather remote field sites to central activities where processing is required prior to their transmittal to the international centers. Certainly, within the next year or two, most of this flow should have been completed. Furthermore, there is every reason to believe that fairly complete sets of data will be assembled at each of the three centers. This free interchange of IGY data is, of course, a crucial aspect as far as the ultimate gains produced by the IGY.

V. POST-IGY PERIOD

The major distribution of IGY data for research studies will occur in the post-IGY period. In addition, there is evidence of continued international cooperation to a degree that had not existed prior to the IGY in certain special areas of geophysics. The continued international scientific program in Antarctica is an example.

It is anticipated that scientific investigators will make continuing uses of IGY data over many years to come. These will form the "inputs" to many research projects

out of which, it can be confidently expected, will come substantial gains not only in increasing our knowledge of man's physical environment but perhaps, even more importantly, in indicating ways in which we can more effectively adapt ourselves to these conditions.

COUNTRIES PARTICIPATING IN THE INTERNATIONAL GEOPHYSICAL YEAR, APRIL 15, 1958 (66 COUNTRIES)

Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burma, Canada, Ceylon, Chile, China (Taipei), Colombia, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Dominican Republic, East Africa, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Finland, France, German Democratic Republic, German Federal Republic, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Ireland, Israel, Italy.

Japan, Democratic Republic of Korea, Malaya, Mexico, Mongolian People's Republic, Morocco, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Southern Rhodesia, Rumania, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Tunisia, Union of South Africa, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom, United States, Uruguay, Venezuela, Vietnam Democratic Republic, Vietnam (Republic), Yugoslavia.

[From *Science* magazine, May 29, 1959]

NEWS OF SCIENCE

WORLD HEALTH YEAR PLANS ADVANCED

Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare Arthur S. Flemming recently urged that a great world crusade of health for peace be launched through the International Health Year, a health study period that has been proposed to parallel the International Geophysical Year of 1957-58. His appeal was made at the opening dinner session of the second National Conference on World Health, which was held in Washington, May 7-9, under the auspices of the National Citizens Committee for the World Health Organization.

Milton S. Eisenhower, president of Johns Hopkins University, was chairman of the conference, which brought together leaders of Congress and of the executive branch of the Federal Government and representatives of organizations and industrial companies interested in health and international relations. The principal objectives of the conference were to discuss the international health legislation now before the Congress, to appraise the value of international health programs in developing habits of cooperation among nations, and to outline a future International Health Year.

STEVENSON FIRST TO PROPOSE

The original suggestion for such a year came from the former Governor of Illinois, Adlai Stevenson, in an address delivered June 8, 1958, at Michigan State University. On June 9, Senate Majority Leader LYNDON B. JOHNSON, Democrat of Texas, had Stevenson's remarks printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. That same day Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, Democrat of Minnesota, commended the address on the Senate floor. HUMPHREY has been the dedicated champion of the proposal ever since. In mid-August 1958 Senate Concurrent Resolution 99, which he had introduced was passed. It said: "The President of the United States is hereby invited to extend to the other nations of the world, through the World Health Organization, and related organizations, an invitation for the designation of representatives to meet and discuss the feasibility of designating an International Health and Medical Research Year, at such early date as adequate preparations can be made, or of other methods of developing such intensive international cooperation in the field of health as will lead toward the discovery and exchange of the answers on

coping with major killing and crippling diseases which afflict mankind."

Some 2 weeks later, on September 6, the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic presented to the United Nations General Assembly a resolution for the organization of an International Public Health and Medical Research Year. Under the auspices of 22 nations, including the United States, the resolution was approved in December 1958.

Next, in January 1959, the Health Year was considered by the World Health Organization's executive board, which asked the WHO director general to prepare plans for the proposed Year for presentation at the 12th WHO assembly. That assembly is now in session in Geneva.

FORUM DEFINES HEALTH YEAR

Participants in the recent National Conference on World Health in Washington included most of the U.S. delegation to the current Geneva meeting. Some of this group played an active part in a forum on the International Health Year that was held under the chairmanship of James E. Perkins, managing director of the National Tuberculosis Association. The panelists were Albert W. Dent, president of Dillard University; James E. Hundley, special assistant for international health at the National Institutes of Health; and Julius N. Cahn, project director of the International Health Study of the Senate Committee on Government Operations.

Cahn, who has been working closely with Senator HUMPHREY on the Health Year, was the first speaker. His statement, which represented the views of many of the discussants heard later, presented seven points formulated to help assure the success of the Year.

1. The program should be based on the individual nations' own felt needs.

2. There should be strong cooperation by national governments, but basically—as in the International Geophysical Year—success will be dependent on private initiative, the initiative of the complex of private scientific and other organizations.

3. The Year will require the enthusiastic support of the medical profession everywhere, but it should be broad enough in concept to allow the fullest possible contribution by laymen as well.

4. All the life sciences must be involved.

5. In addition to WHO, the other health-oriented international organizations that are allied with the U.N. should participate, such as the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization, the International Labor Organization, the Food and Agriculture Organization, and the United Nations Children's Fund.

6. Participants should be willing to undertake bold experiments in the health field. There must be an effort to establish new models of experimental collaboration, new approaches, new techniques.

7. Provision should be made for continuation of the projects started during the International Health Year so that the momentum gained during the period will be sustained in years to come.

Cahn then mentioned specific areas that ought to be involved in the project. He emphasized that the most important single IHY program should be the expansion of epidemiological services throughout the world and the strengthening of data concerning the distribution of various diseases. Another great need that could be met by IHY would be that for increased training of professional and nonprofessional medical personnel; this would include increased exchange of scientists in the health field and the organization of international seminars. Further, particular attention must be paid to the problems of providing the world's supply of water and food. The various nations should attempt to single out one or two diseases for a specific campaign of eradication. Examples given, in

addition to malaria and smallpox, currently the subject of control programs, were tuberculosis, cholera, and schistosomiasis. In like manner, certain important problems should be singled out for intensified research. Cahn suggested as possibilities radiation and air pollution. There should be health education of the masses. And finally, certain broad projects should be selected for emphasis during the IHY that would allow citizens to do things for themselves so that they would feel a sense of participation. For example, in the United States this might be achieved through a special campaign to increase the number of women who take annual diagnostic tests for uterine cancer.

The next panelist to present his views was James Hundley, who proposed that each country hold a meeting to reach agreement regarding the final plan for the year for that particular country. He pointed out that the year has two elements: an international cooperative element and the individual programs of the various nations.

With regard to a possible national plan for this country, Hundley made several specific suggestions that fell into three classes: research projects of special importance to the United States, research on problems as important to other countries as to the United States, and research that would be of benefit almost entirely to other countries.

Albert W. Dent was the final panelist to speak. He stressed the importance of citizen participation in the programs selected and the need to evolve better techniques in educating and motivating people to participate in health programs, such as in the program of vaccination against poliomyelitis and that of tuberculosis control. He pointed out that public apathy has developed with regard to both of these diseases.

PLAN BEING CONSIDERED BY WHO

In the general discussion that followed the panelists' presentations, H. van Zile Hyde of the U.S. Public Health Service, and U.S. member of the WHO executive board, outlined briefly what the director of the World Health Organization is proposing with respect to the International Health Year at the current World Health Assembly in Geneva. The object of the Health Year, as presented by the director general's report, is "to stimulate, primarily on a national basis, the intensification of international cooperation in carefully selected aspects of health and of medical research." This will involve the intensification of field activities in the control or eradication of specific diseases and the intensification of research related to WHO's growing program. Examples of field activity mentioned by the director general include renewed emphasis on malaria and smallpox eradication and installation of piped water supplies. As examples of fields for increased research, he cited cancer, cardio-vascular diseases, and virus diseases. The director general further suggested that national committees be formed throughout the world to stimulate interest in and to plan for the IHY.

The Washington forum carried this idea further by proposing that as a framework for the International Health Year a series of national assemblies be held, dealing with health problems in the respective countries, and that the year might close with a climactic congress held in connection with the World Health Assembly in the spring of 1963. The forum session ended with unanimous passage of a resolution that read: "Forum No. 2 recommends urging the U.S. delegation to the 12th World Health Assembly to support the assembly the designation of an International Health Year, to start in 1961, and further recommends that the National Citizens Committee for the World Health Organization, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, the Congress, and other groups give all possible support to the project."

Under last September's U.N. resolution, WHO has been invited to report on the International Health Year to the U.N.'s Economic and Social Council at its 28th session this July, and to the General Assembly at its 14th session, which will begin in September.

In the United States, congressional sources confidently predict that adequate funds will be provided for the IHY once the appropriate scientific authorities, governmental and nongovernmental, have developed specific programs for the year. As in the case of the International Geophysical Year, bodies such as the National Academy of Sciences, the National Science Foundation, and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare are being asked to draft the framework for the International Health Year program that will eventually be submitted to Congress for consideration.

SCIENTIFIC AND CULTURAL AID TO POLAND

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I received a letter the other day from Roman Michalowski, a member of the board of the Polish Institute of Arts and Sciences in America. He referred to my statement before this body on April 28, 1959, in which I spoke of the expansion of American aid to Poland and provided me with information showing the amount of assistance extended to Poland from 1957 to 1959 by the Polish Institute of Arts and Sciences in America.

I was particularly glad to receive this information since the assistance mentioned testifies to the continued effort by the Polish people in America to keep alive the spirit of freedom which exists in Poland, even in these difficult times.

The hunger of the Polish people for information and knowledge has been shown by the thousands of requests for scientific and cultural publications and books which the institute has received from individuals and institutions in Poland. The work which the Polish Institute has done in filling these requests and in preserving the Polish culture and tradition is worthy of sincere commendation by the American people.

Although there is evidence of renewed tightening of Communist control, the work of the institute and other Polish groups outside of Poland keeps alive the hope that someday the captive countries of Eastern Europe will again be free to determine their own future.

Because of the need to continue and extend the present program of medical aid and educational supplies, I repeat my proposal to establish a Polish-American foundation dedicated to the health of the Polish people and to the improvement of their educational opportunities through the use of counterpart currencies in Poland.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the letter from Mr. Roman Michalowski, dated May 20, 1959, be printed in the body of the RECORD.

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

POLISH INSTITUTE OF ARTS
AND SCIENCES IN AMERICA,
New York, N.Y., May 20, 1959.

Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR HUMPHREY: On April 28, 1959, you spoke on the floor of the Senate regard-

ing programs of Polish aid, undertaken by the U.S. Government and by private sources during the period 1957 to 1959.

In this speech you referred to the letter of Secretary Macomber dated April 22, 1959. In his letter, Assistant Secretary Macomber gives a comprehensive picture of assistance to Poland in the period between 1944 and 1956. However, as we are not sure that you have information about the assistance extended by the Polish Institute of Arts and Sciences in America, during the period from 1956 to the present date, we would like to offer you this most recent information.

The Polish Institute of Arts and Sciences in America has forwarded according to a plan based on formal requests received from Polish academic schools, medical schools, and engineering schools, the following items:

Books and periodicals to the value of	\$46,057
Medical instruments to the value of	25,420
Variotypes, multilith printers, office equipment to the value of	13,249
Stipends enabling Polish scholars and students to study abroad	7,310

Total of assistance provided 92,036

In addition, we have at present ready for shipment to Poland items in the book and medical categories to the value of \$7,000.

We are enclosing: The charter of the Polish Institute of Arts and Sciences in America, its bylaws, a certificate from the U.S. Treasury Department testifying to its tax exempt status, and some background material, a report of our activities for 1958, and the information leaflet issued in November 1958.

Respectfully yours,

ROMAN MICHALOWSKI,
Member of the Board.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. YOUNG of Ohio in the chair). The Senator from Illinois will state it.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Are we still in the morning hour?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate is still in the morning hour.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Are we operating under the 3-minute rule?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. We are supposed to be.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I most respectfully suggest that the rule be enforced.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Further morning business is in order under the 3-minute limitation.

NOMINATION OF LEWIS L. STRAUSS TO BE SECRETARY OF COMMERCE—TOPICAL INDEX FOR HEARINGS BEFORE COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, I observe on the desks of all Senators the hearings held by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce on the nomination of Lewis L. Strauss to be Secretary of Commerce. The hearings are in excess of 1,100 pages. It is doubtful that Senators will be able to read the hearings with facility without a topical index; so as a guide to myself, and perhaps as a help to other Senators, I have prepared an index by topic of the more controversial discussions during the hearings.

I ask unanimous consent that the topical index may be printed at this point in

the RECORD, so as to afford at least some assistance to Senators who may wish to read the record of the hearings for themselves.

Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my 3 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming yields back his remaining 2 minutes.

Without objection, the topical index will be printed in the RECORD.

The index is as follows:

TOPICAL INDEX FOR HEARINGS BEFORE COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE ON THE NOMINATION OF LEWIS L. SCHAFFER TO BE SECRETARY OF COMMERCE, MARCH 17—MAY 14, 1959

DIXON-YATES CONTROVERSY

Pages 129-190: Senator KEFAUVER testifies on Wenzell conflict of interest.

Pages 523-528: Senator ANDERSON testifies on Wenzell conflict of interest.

SEPARATION OF POWERS/EXECUTIVE PRIVILEGE

Pages 157-172: Senator KEFAUVER charges Strauss claimed privilege, cites testimony.

Pages 338-344: Strauss views on separation of powers and executive privilege.

Pages 781-788: Senator McCARTHY statement on separation of powers.

Page 856: Strauss rebuttal to Senator McCARTHY.

QUESTION OF ADEQUACY OF PREVIOUS SCHAFFER EXAMINATIONS

Pages 506-509: Senator ANDERSON claims no real hearing ever held.

Page 587: Strauss claims adequate hearing held.

Pages 592-593: Strauss refuses to withdraw hearing claim.

DR. DAVID INGLIS, TESTIMONY, CONTROVERSY

Pages 363-373: Inglis charges.

Pages 375-418: Examination of Inglis by committee.

Page 827: Strauss: "Never asked for anything on Inglis."

Pages 836-837: Pearson testifies Strauss called AEC about Inglis.

Pages 842-843: Strauss says he called AEC after Pearson's article.

Pages 845-846: Strauss: difference in date of call "heinous difference."

"DUPLICITY" EPISODE

Pages 870-893: Committee print; letter of AEC "duplicity, false, fraudulent."

Pages 915-936: Committee report; letter of AEC "duplicity."

Pages 941-947: Minority report.

Pages 970-983: Duplicity letter controversy.

Page 976: Strauss says House records "molded."

Page 979: Strauss quoted as standing by letter.

DR. DAVID HILL

Pages 429-445: Hill statement and charges.

Pages 730-732: Hill says Strauss persecuted Mr. Wilson, Henderson, Arneson.

Pages 768-773: Letter from Hill to committee.

Pages 824-826: Strauss denies persecution of Wilson, Henderson, Arneson.

Pages 856-864: Strauss' rebuttal to Hill's charges.

SHIPMENT OF ISOTOPES

Page 432: Hill charges Strauss opposed isotopes shipment.

Pages 420-423: Strauss says "unqualified falsehood" he opposed 1949 shipment.

Pages 495-502: Senator Anderson says 1949 "phony date."

Page 498: Senator Anderson says section 5a, 10a, McMahon Act, allow shipment.

Pages 610-629: Controversy over sections 5a, 10a of McMahon Act.

Pages 651-662: Discussion of Strauss' 1949 isotope statement.

Pages 654-662: Strauss' 1949 isotope statement.

Page 666: Strauss: "Stand on record."

Page 697: Strauss says his defense based on section 10a of McMahon Act.

Pages 818-821: Strauss says isotope position unchanged.

ADDITION OF WORD "ALL" TO M'MAHON ACT

Page 606: Strauss doesn't recall addition of word "all."

Page 607: Strauss doesn't believe "all" changed act.

Pages 644-645: Senator BRICKER statement on addition of "all."

Page 685: Strauss says "all" is redundant.

Page 686: Senator MONROE says "all" intended as rebuke.

Page 687: Strauss says "all" is "small matter."

ERPF

Page 807: Strauss says Armand Erpf being considered for study.

RELATIONS OF AEC WITH JOINT COMMITTEE

Pages 511-512: Senator ANDERSON says Strauss ignored Attorney General's letter.

Page 598: Strauss rebuttal to charge of not informing Joint Committee.

Page 601: Strauss cannot answer if letter reached his office.

Page 605: Strauss says he probably would have received a copy.

Pages 688-689: Strauss says he was in Havana when letter arrived AEC.

Page 695: Strauss says he should have seen letter, but didn't.

Pages 704-708: Submarine exchange chronology.

FISCAL IRRESPONSIBILITY

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, am I proceeding under the usual 3-minute limitation during the morning hour, or under the rule imposed by the Vice President upon the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] the other day?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. YOUNG in the chair). The Senator from Minnesota will please proceed under the 3-minute rule.

Mr. McCARTHY. The junior Senator from Minnesota will proceed under the rule of the Senate and will complete his remarks in 3 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota may proceed.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, almost every day the newspapers carry reports of statements by Republicans, ranging from the President of the United States, Mr. Eisenhower, down to ward chairmen of the Republican Party, charging the Democrats with fiscal irresponsibility.

Mr. President, let us look at the financial condition of the Federal Government as of June 1959—six and one-half years after Mr. Eisenhower was sworn in as President of the United States and the management of the fiscal affairs of the Government was turned over to his appointees. At the end of the fiscal year 1953, the Federal debt was \$266 billion; today, after six and one-half years of Republican administration, as we near the end of fiscal year 1959, the Federal debt is \$285 billion. When Mr. George Humphrey, the architect of this administration's fiscal policy, left the Government approximately 3 years ago, the national debt had increased to \$274 billion. Government interest payments

for the fiscal year 1953 were \$6,583 billion. Government interest payments for fiscal 1959 will come to approximately \$7,600 billion. Whereas the Government debt has increased by about 8 percent in this period, the interest paid on the Government debt has increased by approximately 15 percent. Interest payments on the public debt are expected to be \$500 million more in 1960 than they were in 1959. In 1953, the Secretary of the Treasury and the Republicans talked about stretching out the public debt. However, the Federal budget for fiscal 1960 indicates that interest payments on marketable obligations, mainly held by financial institutions, are almost two-thirds of all interest payments and the estimated increase of \$500 million in total expenditures for interest on the public debt will occur in the payment of interest on these obligations. The interest rate paid on taxable Government bonds has increased from 2.94 percent for fiscal 1953 to over 4 percent in 1959—an increase of more than 33 percent above the 1953 rate. In much the same manner, the interest rates on 3-month Treasury bills have increased from 1.9 percent to a high at the end of April of this year of over 3 percent.

Throughout 6½ years, the administration has received essentially what it wanted from the Congress in the way of taxation and revenue laws, and the appropriations by the Congress have been less than that which was asked for by the administration. The only major tax reduction was that of 1954 and was accomplished with administration approval. Today the administration is coming to what it has called the "irresponsible Democratically controlled Congress" with three major requests.

One, that we raise the debt ceiling.

Two, that we raise the interest rate on Government bonds.

Three, that we increase taxes on insurance companies and that we extend the corporate profits and the wartime excise taxes.

Mr. President, if it were not for the fact that this is a responsible Democratically controlled Congress, the administration and the Government of this country would well find itself in a financial crisis which would be in large part of the administration's own making. The deficits of recent years would not have been as great if the 1954 tax reduction program of the Republicans had not gone to extremes and if economic recession had not been indeed prolonged, consequently the need to increase the debt ceiling would not be as pressing. The need to increase the interest rates on Government securities is certainly in part the result of the hard money policy initiated in the spring of 1953 by Mr. George Humphrey who then issued long-term Government bonds with an interest rate set at 3 1/4 percent—a rate which was 30 percent higher than the prevailing rate of 2 1/2 percent. The issue, as you may recall, was extremely popular but what followed was not so popular. The value of all outstanding Government bonds dropped abruptly. In 8 weeks that spring, more than \$2 billion was lost in market value of these

bonds. Increased cost in interest on this bond issue alone has been estimated at \$200 million. The general increase in interest rates that followed not only increased the interest on the national debt, but also increased the cost of money to all borrowers.

This action was hailed by Republicans as marking the turning of the tide. It was said that George Humphrey meant business; he had replaced the office picture of his predecessor, John Snyder, with the picture of Andrew Mellon. This, it is now evident, was not an empty gesture. It is not surprising that investors hesitated to invest in Government bonds when they have no assurance that the Treasury will not arbitrarily increase the interest rates. A further factor contributing to the crisis in the sale and issuance of Government securities is the Tax Revision Act of 1954, which has undoubtedly encouraged speculation in the stock market and attracted investments to that field rather than to the field of Government bonds—a movement which has undoubtedly been encouraged also by the administration's continuous harping on inflation despite the fact that the price level has been relatively stable since 1957, the big rise in the cost of living occurring between 1953 and 1957, when it rose from 113.5 in 1952 to 120.2 in 1957.

Mr. President, in a number of the States in this United States, Democratic Governors are having financial problems, principally because Republican-controlled legislative bodies which supported appropriations have refused to provide the revenue or to meet the cost of programs which they have approved. This is true particularly in the State of Michigan, and it is true also in the State of Minnesota. It is significant that in the State of New York tax increases have been approved for a Republican Governor by a Republican legislature. And in the State of California tax increases and changes approved by a Democratic legislature for a Democratic Governor. However, in those State governments in which the administration is held by Democrats and the legislative bodies controlled by Republicans the disposition has been to create financial crisis.

If this Democratic Congress of the Federal Government were irresponsible—as the President has charged us with being—if it were irresponsible in the manner of Republican-controlled bodies in the State legislatures have been; we might anticipate a financial crisis at the Federal level. Everyone knows, of course, that this will not be the course taken by the Democrats here in the Congress of the United States. Despite the fact that the financial difficulties in which the Federal Government finds itself are largely the result of policies which we oppose—policies which the administration insisted upon—our response will be realistic and directed to doing what we can to correct the mistakes of this administration and meet the needs of the Federal Government.

I suggest, however, that it might be well for the President to be more aware of the facts and at least for the time being refrain from his baseless charges of irresponsibility against the Democratic Con-

gress. If he is concerned about the general welfare of the people of the United States, it might be well for him to send a message of advice and recommendation to Republican State Legislatures simply urging them to be as responsive in dealing with local and State fiscal problems as he expects and knows the Democratic Congress will be responsive to the needs of the Federal Government.

Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

INTEREST RATES ON GOVERNMENT BONDS

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Alabama desire to speak during the morning hour?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Yes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I withdraw my suggestion of the absence of a quorum.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I assure the Senator that my remarks will be confined to the 3 minutes under the rule during the morning hour.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama may proceed.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, the junior Senator from Minnesota has just spoken about fiscal irresponsibility. I wish to comment on a hearing which was held before the Committee on Banking and Currency this morning concerning a matter which was discussed briefly on the floor of the Senate several days ago. It relates to the proposed exchange of as much as \$335 million worth of 4 percent mortgages held by the Federal National Mortgage Association, and possibly as much as \$1 billion worth, for 2 3/4 percent Government bonds which are not marketable and are not due until 1975.

The 4 percent mortgages, according to the testimony before the committee this morning, will realize a return after servicing and administrative expenses, of 3 3/8 percent. They would be exchanged with banks, insurance companies, mutual savings institutions, and other groups, for bonds which will not become due until 1975, and which pay only 2 3/4 percent interest.

It was admitted in the testimony before the committee this morning that there would be a loss of \$40,000 for every \$1 million in mortgages exchanged. In other words, if the \$1 billion in mortgages is exchanged for bonds, the Federal Government will suffer a loss of \$40 million.

In addition, according to the Under Secretary of the Treasury, there will be a potential tax loss of \$8,400,000 at the outset.

The Treasury seeks to justify this action on the ground that it will aid in debt management and in balancing the budget, and that it will result in an orderly liquidation of mortgages in the FNMA portfolio. However, if the arithmetic of this proposal is analyzed fully, I think it will be most interesting to observe the rather curious outcome—one which we might keep in mind in trying

to ascertain the correct meaning of the term "fiscal irresponsibility."

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Alabama has expired.

Mr. SPARKMAN. My time has expired.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

RETIREMENT OF BARON ROBERT SILVERCRUYS, AMBASSADOR FROM BELGIUM

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the nation of Belgium has been represented in the United States for nearly 16 years by Baron Robert Silvercruys. These years have marked the climax of an outstanding diplomatic career that has spanned 41 years.

As Ambassador in Washington, Baron Silvercruys has served his country superbly. His work here has been in the finest traditions of diplomacy. It reflected at all times the tact, the geniality, and the wisdom and understanding which are so much a part of the man himself. He guarded and advanced Belgium's interests in the United States very well indeed. But he did not do so as though these interests were a thing apart. Rather, he advanced them as an element of the common interests of both nations. It is a tribute to his exceptional efforts that relations between the United States and Belgium have never been better.

In recent years, Baron Silvercruys has had the companionship and the help of the lovely and gifted Baroness Silvercruys. Mrs. Mansfield and I have had the privilege of knowing both the Silvercruys as warm friends. We are delighted to learn that although the baron has retired from his country's service, he and his wife plan to continue to make their home in Washington for at least part of each year.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to include at this point in the Record an editorial on the retirement of Ambassador Silvercruys which appeared in the New York Times.

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

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

A HAPPY AMBASSADOR

Baron Robert Silvercruys, who has just retired after 16 years as Belgian Ambassador and 41 years in his country's diplomatic service, has had a right to be happy. Best of all, he intends to remain that way in retirement and to spend half his time in Washington and half in Brussels.

The mark that Ambassador Silvercruys has made on Washington is unusual because it

was traditional. This may seem paradoxical, but the type of diplomat that the baron exemplified is, unhappily, a disappearing one—genial, cultivated, a superb host, an unostentatious representative of his nation. At the same time he was alert, intelligent, well-informed and skillful in furthering the interests of Belgium. There are centuries of training behind a diplomat like Baron Silvercruys, but not many men nowadays carry on such traditions or have the personality and ability to do so.

Ambassador Silvercruys had the good fortune to represent a country with which we have had no problems of magnitude. Relations between Belgium and the United States are and have been as friendly as possible and certainly Baron Silvercruys deserves some credit for keeping them that way. It goes without saying that he will be missed in the diplomatic corps but fortunately not in person, since Washington will continue to enjoy his presence.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I wish to join my distinguished colleague, the assistant majority leader, in his tribute to Baron Silvercruys, who has retired as Ambassador from Belgium. I have known this distinguished envoy during my 20 years in Washington, and I can safely say that during the 20 years I have never met a man who more ably or more sincerely represented his government in Washington or who more thoroughly understood the character, the ideals, and the inspirations of the American people.

He has truly been a great friend of America, and in representing his country he has done much to perpetuate the great historic association that resulted from World War I, and the interwar years, and continued during Belgium's travail in the World War II period.

It is most gratifying to know that Baron Silvercruys will remain in Washington, where his sound understanding of world affairs and the ever brilliant advice of one of the most charming diplomatic ladies ever to serve as the wife of an Ambassador will also be available. Baroness Silvercruys not only is a distinguished wife of a distinguished envoy, but, in her own right as an American citizen, and as the widow of the late great Senator Brien McMahon, she thoroughly understands the things which go to make American foreign and domestic policy and the kind of nation we seek to have.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there may be printed in the RECORD two editorials, one from the Washington Evening Star of June 4, entitled "Model For Diplomats," and one from the Washington Post and Times Herald of today, June 5, entitled "A Genial Ambassador," both expressing very clearly the great service Ambassador Silvercruys has contributed to his country, and, indirectly, to this country.

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

[From the Washington Star, June 4, 1959]

MODEL FOR DIPLOMATS

If a composite picture were to be drawn of a model diplomat, it might well be a portrait of Baron Silvercruys, who retired this week after 41 years in the Belgian diplomatic service. For nearly 16 of these years, he has been his country's Ambassador to the

United States. As it happens, Baron Silvercruys began his diplomatic career here in 1918 with the initial assignment of planning a visit to the United States by King Albert and Queen Elizabeth of Belgium. His final major assignment was to make similar arrangements for the visit last month by King Baudouin.

It is in appearance and personality, as well as competence, that the Belgian envoy may be considered the model of what a diplomat should be. Possessed of these qualifications, he has been a popular and respected figure in official circles in Washington. It is good to know that he and the equally popular Baroness Silvercruys are planning to continue as residential Washingtonians in the future.

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald, June 5, 1959]

A GENIAL AMBASSADOR

It is good news for the many friends of Baron Robert Silvercruys that his retirement as Ambassador of Belgium does not mean his departure from Washington. For 14 years before his official termination on Tuesday, Baron Silvercruys was his country's envoy here, and on numerous previous visits he had become familiar with the United States during a 41-year diplomatic career. As Ambassador he combined dignity and courtly bearing with wit and good counsel. He has been a good friend of this country and a devoted servant of free world and NATO affairs with particular interest in economic development matters. Not the least of his attractions has been the fact that he is married to the beauteous widow of the late Senator Brien McMahon. Except for the recent visit of King Baudouin, Belgium has been relatively little in the American news; this is in part a testimonial to the effectiveness with which this genial Ambassador worked to keep relationships between the two countries in good repair. As he is succeeded by Ambassador Louis Scheyven, Baron Silvercruys will have the community's good wishes and the hope that it will continue to see much of him and Baroness Silvercruys.

Mr. DIRKSEN. 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. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. 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.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask that the Senate proceed to consider the nomination of Lewis L. Strauss, of New York, to be Secretary of Commerce.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the nomination.

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Lewis L. Strauss, of New York, to be Secretary of Commerce.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and

consent to the nomination of Lewis L. Strauss to be Secretary of Commerce?

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, I suspect it is already too late to invite the Senate to consider the nomination of Lewis L. Strauss in our traditional mood of calm and objectivity.

This afternoon I shall speak briefly on this matter of great importance which has been placed before the Senate, the confirmation of the nomination of Admiral Strauss. I am well aware that there are those who share positive views on Admiral Strauss. Some are violently opposed; and many who know and favor this man wonder in amazement at the extent and character of the attacks upon him and his nomination for this responsible position in the Cabinet of the President of the United States.

Mr. Strauss has served under four Presidents of this Republic; he has given four decades of his life to public service, creditably, honorably, and forthrightly. I invite the attention of Senators to this phase of his brilliant record. It is attached to the report on Senators' desks.

A number of our colleagues publicly announced their intention of opposing Admiral Strauss even before his nomination had been voted on in committee.

The mere existence of this haste to get opposition on record indicates that this nomination is being accorded unique attention. Nominee Strauss is not being looked upon merely as a man whom the President would like to have in his Cabinet as Secretary of Commerce. He is being regarded as personifying a philosophy of government which some feel impelled to combat and destroy. Mr. Strauss, quite simply, is a conservative.

As a conservative, Admiral Strauss is drawing the fire of many militant advocates of change. Notably arrayed against him are some who have sought in the past to assert the strength of this body against Mr. Strauss, usually in an effort to push him into doing something he did not think it proper to do. He has never budged under pressure, and he has always stubbornly resisted anything which seemed to him to be an undue encroachment by the legislative branch.

The curious thing about this resistance is that it is not discussed on either side in terms which are properly descriptive. It is touched on, if at all, in some rather sweet-sounding euphemisms.

We are told, for example, that Admiral Strauss refused to give information to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

The admiral, in turn has said: I did not refuse. At most, I delayed. I gave everything the law allows.

Mr. President, none of us was born yesterday. We all know the technique, very common on Capitol Hill, of stridently demanding information when what we really want is to influence a course of action. A part of the game is to disclaim the true intent and to wax indignant when challenged.

It is also a part of the game for the people on whom the demand is made to pretend that they do not understand the true import of the demand. All of this is a stylized performance in the

never ending tug-of-war between the legislative and executive branches.

Knowing this, we have to understand that most of the criticisms of Admiral Strauss for refusal to supply information must be taken for what they are—criticisms of his unwillingness to let this or that committee chairman dictate to him on matters of policy not spelled out in the law.

Most of the hullabaloo surrounding this nomination, therefore, boils down to the simple fact that Admiral Strauss is a conservative who errs, if at all, on the side of caution in interpreting the legal rights of the legislative branch and his own legal duties toward it. Added to this is the fact that in resisting pressures from the legislative branch to be less conservative and more liberal, Admiral Strauss has preferred to cite narrow legalisms rather than to assert boldly, "Gentlemen, you are trespassing." This is not a crime. This is not dishonorable. To tolerant people, it is at most merely irritating.

Growing out of the nominee's habit of being legalistic in resisting pressures, there have developed instances which have been magnified out of all proportion. At least, that is the way the Senator from Kansas looks at it. A careful reading of the record will quickly illustrate this.

Efforts have been made to leave an impression that the nominee was evasive, uncooperative, and unrelenting.

Even when the cocoon is unraveled, it contains something that is dead, dried up, and worthless. Nevertheless, such instances are described over and over in grave and resonant tones as "serious, very serious."

Mr. President, saying so does not make it so, and the events will not seem serious to anyone who is reasonably observing and willing to search the total context of an event before judging its meaning.

No Senator will lose his way in searching for the truth about Admiral Strauss if he will bring to his quest his accumulated experience in appraising people, and his accumulated wisdom about what is likely to have happened in a given set of circumstances.

Thus prepared, he can avoid being snared into accepting the thesis that Admiral Strauss, without any advantage flowing from the act, lied to Congress just for the heck of it. On the other hand, any Senator who insists on wearing blinders can chop off enough at each side of each scene to mislead himself completely.

On the desk before each Senator is a copy of our hearings. It is forbiddingly thick. I can assure Senators that it contains all upon which our wisdom about people and events need focus to arrive at a sound judgment on this nomination.

Of the 1,128 pages in the volume, I should say that about 120 pages have to do with Admiral Strauss. The rest, nearly 1,000 pages, seem to me to tell far more about Admiral Strauss' accusers than about the Admiral himself. Those pages, inexorably, will have their own lengthy counterparts in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Less likely to receive attention here are the pages telling of the admiral's qualifications for the post to which he has been named. To those pages, I shall now refer.

The hearings on the Strauss nomination opened on March 17, which was not only St. Patrick's Day, but also the birthday of our colleagues, the junior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE] and the junior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. McGEE].

The first witnesses were the senior Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] and his junior colleague [Mr. KEATING]. Both testified that Mr. Strauss is outstandingly qualified to serve as Secretary of Commerce. Senator JAVITS, in particular, spoke from long personal acquaintance with the nominee, reaching back many years.

The hearing record next shows letters from our two Virginia colleagues, Senator HARRY F. BYRD and Senator WILLIS ROBERTSON, men of outstanding judgment and discernment. Both stated they had known Admiral Strauss for a long time, and both urged that his nomination be confirmed.

The nominee himself then began to testify. The details of his biography will be found summarized in the committee's report, as I indicated a moment ago. I have heretofore referred to parts of it, and the text of his testimony is, of course, printed in the hearings.

The biography is impressive, showing, as it does, important public service starting during the administration of President Wilson when the nominee was Secretary to Herbert Hoover, then U.S. Food Administrator and Chairman of the Commission for the Relief of Belgium.

The period between the two World Wars found Mr. Strauss associated with the investment firm of Kuhn, Loeb & Co., in New York. He was at the same time a member of the Naval Reserve, and was called to active duty 10 months before Pearl Harbor. Since that time, he has been almost continuously in public service, either as a naval officer, as a member or Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, or on special assignment by the executive branch of the Congress.

From all the recital of biographical detail, two things stand out in my mind.

The first is, that the nominee received the Medal of Freedom, personally awarded by President Eisenhower, in July of last year. This medal is not given lightly. Only 15 have been awarded by act of the President since the medal was authorized, the last recipient being the late revered John Foster Dulles.

The second point of interest in the biographical detail is that the nominee returned from retirement to accept appointment as Secretary of Commerce. Our colleague, Senator PASTORE, asked him why he did so, and this was Mr. Strauss' answer:

In the first place, I deeply respect and admire the President, and the duty to which he called me was a responsibility in which I felt I could be effective.

In the second place, I held it to be a very great honor to occupy a post in which my former chief, Mr. Hoover, had set so high a standard of public service.

Third, and finally, I believe that the economic warfare which the Soviet Government has declared upon the United States can be most effectively countered in the work and decisions of the Department of Commerce. I have certain strongly held views as to the gravity of the Communist offensive at the present time.

Mr. President, the nomination before us, is that of a man who retired from public service with glory enough for a full lifetime, but who returned when summoned to duty. We can only guess whether he would have responded to the summons if he had known of the obstacles to be strewn in his path.

It is fitting to note here—that his fitness, his competency, and his integrity have never heretofore been questioned.

The hearings which started on March 17 continued through the next day, then jumped to April 21, and then again to April 23.

During those 4 days, Admiral Strauss, in answer to questions put to him by the Committee, testified about many matters connected with his post. He touched upon foreign trade in general and upon trade with Iron Curtain countries in particular.

He talked about atomic-powered merchant ships, about the need for expanded studies in oceanography, about mandatory controls upon imports of petroleum products, about plans for handling the 1960 census, about delay in building superliners, about problems of the textile industry, and about the financing of ship construction.

He answered questions on functions of the Federal Maritime Board and the Maritime Administration, on so-called runaway flags, and on the transportation study requested by the President.

He gave his views on the Federal Highway Act of 1956, toll roads, the highway trust fund, taxes on aviation fuel, advisory committees to the Department of Commerce, trade missions, and commercial attachés. In answer to questions, he explained how he would deal with the press and volunteered to furnish any personal financial data in which the committee might be interested.

All of the foregoing was covered in hearings taking place on 4 days embracing 7 hours and 10 minutes of hearing time. The inquiry was important, and certainly it was relevant to confirmation of the nomination of a Secretary of Commerce.

However, when the hearings reconvened on April 28, they began to take on a different character. The opening witness was one of our Senate colleagues. He testified at considerable length on the Dixon-Yates matter, his testimony bearing on two points, the first of which can be summarized. I am summarizing the testimony very briefly;

Adolphe Wenzell was involved in a conflict of interest in the Dixon-Yates matter. Admiral Strauss denies knowing of the conflict although other people knew. Somebody could be lying. Perhaps it is Admiral Strauss. I further summarize the Senator's second point in this way: In the chronology prepared by the AEC and the Bureau of the Budget to show who took part in the Dixon-

Yates negotiation, Adolphe Wenzell's name was left out. All competent testimony agrees that Admiral Strauss had no part in preparing the chronology, but maybe he did anyway.

In all fairness to our colleague, who then testified, I must admit that he did not claim that his allegations added up to reasons for refusing to confirm the nomination of Admiral Strauss.

He did insist, however, that they presented questions which the Attorney General ought to investigate, and that until such an investigation is completed, the nomination of the admiral should not be confirmed. Maybe that is only a distinction without a difference, after all.

On April 30, Admiral Strauss was given an opportunity to testify in answer to his first adverse witness on the Dixon-Yates matter. The rebuttal testimony pointed out that there was nothing in the adverse testimony that had not been fully developed by exhaustive questioning before the Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee in December 1955.

Further, the rebuttal testimony renewed, most adequately, specific answers and explanations to each of the specific charges.

Mr. President, as I listened to the rebuttal, it seemed to me that any fair-minded and objective person would not have the slightest hesitancy in accepting the explanations. They would be troublesome only to someone embarrassed by the hope that others might find guilt where there is no guilt.

As I have already said, the Strauss hearings at their inception were confined to matters properly relevant to an examination of a nominee for Secretary of Commerce. Their nature changed with the calling of the first adverse witness. From then on, a number of witnesses testified. Their words and demeanor made plain that they share a common aim, namely, humiliating defeat of the nominee.

Concurrently, a reading of this record will show, in my judgment, that some on the committee departed from the role of inquiry on qualifications of a man for this important position to the role of grand inquisitors.

It is only fair to say that they were the members who take greatest pride in the label "liberal" and who look hopefully for the day when the last conservative will be stuffed and in a glass case at the Smithsonian. Let it be clear that I do not share their hope.

I was distressed at the turn taken by the Strauss hearings before our committee. I sensed, as did my colleagues on the committee, that what had started as a detour into genteel mudslinging had too soon degenerated into a far rougher game. It is our opportunity here to redress the balance of the committee hearings and assess the merits of the charges leveled at this nominee in the light of his conduct, his answers, and his responsibility to the security needs of our Nation.

In closing, let me say that I have not attempted to point out in detail much that transpired. In the more than 1,000 pages contained in the printed record of hearings, all those matters, and many

others which I consider irrelevant, have been covered. As this debate progresses these matters will be brought before the Senate.

Finally, I am of the firm conviction that Admiral Strauss merits having his nomination confirmed. I am confident that the great majority of the Senate will agree with me if and when they check into the record with open minds, as many of us have tried to approach this problem in the hearings.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I wish to say at the outset that, like my distinguished friend from Kansas, I shall be brief today. As the debate proceeds—and I hope it will not be a prolonged debate, but only sufficient reasonably to cover some of the questions raised by the nomination—I shall probably have something to add to what I shall say today.

I wish to place in the RECORD certain excerpts from the minority views and individual views of other members of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce with reference to the nomination which is now before the Senate. As the Senator from Kansas has pointed out, the hearings were long. The printed transcript of the hearings runs to 1,128 pages. A great number of subjects were covered, and it was a fairly difficult task to separate the important matters from others which were not quite so important, and yet make a report expressing the views of eight Senators on the committee who had opposite views from nine other members of the committee, and do it in the usual form of a committee report.

We had worked on the report a long time, and after many drafts we eliminated a great deal of it; yet it is still a fairly long report. I recommend the reading of the report and the individual views and the minority views to every member of the Senate. In it they will find constant references to the hearings themselves, and constant references also to digests of them. I note on my desk a mimeographed sheet of another index, which relates to the page numbers of different portions of the testimony and of the various subjects which were involved in the hearings.

I wish also to say for the RECORD that earlier in the session, sometime around the latter part of March or the first part of April, there appeared a great number of news articles and radio and television commentaries suggesting that a long time had elapsed since the name of Mr. Strauss had been sent to the Senate and that there may have been some dilatory tactics or delaying tactics in the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce with respect to the nomination. There appeared to be also a great number of people who wanted the committee to go ahead and report the nomination, and do it quickly. Between those two schools of thought, the committee decided that this was a matter which was not uncontroversial. I am sure when the President of the United States sent the name of Mr. Strauss to the Senate, nominating him to be Secretary of Commerce, the administration did not expect,

nor could it be anticipated, that this would be a nomination which would run along in the usual or normal course of the consideration of nominations, and would be reported to the Senate within 30 days, or the usual time.

I do not wish to reply to the articles and commentaries to which I have referred. The amazing thing about it all is that no one called on us and asked us about it. I believe that the Record should show, on behalf of the committee, that there was a reasonable explanation for the seemingly long time which elapsed from January 17, when the nomination was sent to the Senate, until the close of the hearings in committee.

First, the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce could not organize until after about the 20th of January, because the Republican caucus was having some difficulty in making assignments to committees. So there practically a week went by. Then we have a rule in committee, as the Senator from Kansas well knows, that all nominations must lie over 2 weeks, in case anyone wishes to be heard on a nominee. That put us into the middle of February, or about the 10th of February. Of course that is the week which is known as Lincoln Day Week in the Senate. Nearly half of the members of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce had felt impelled to go to various places throughout the country and talk about the Republican Party and Abraham Lincoln. I could not have obtained a corporal's guard during that week. That situation extended until the following Thursday, or so.

Then in order to expedite consideration of the nomination, there was some necessity, or at least it so appeared to me, knowing that there would be a great volume of testimony, of having a small subcommittee work on the matter, because such a subcommittee could sit regularly. My experience here has been that we save a great deal of time by operating that way.

That procedure was objected to, I suppose for very good reasons; apparently some members wanted the full committee to hear the matter. So I said, "Very well; I guess we will have to do that, if that is what a reasonable number of the members of the committee want. But I will insist on a quorum."

Mr. President, it was not possible to get the usual quorum in committee for about 10 days, because the Senate was not active, there were no votes in the Senate, the major committees had not started to their work, and there were not enough Senators here.

Along came the Easter vacation. In the meantime—because I had to hold hearings myself—I was responsible for about 3 weeks' delay, because of conditions beyond my control. I spent most of the time at a place north of town, called Bethesda. So there were at least 40 or 50, and perhaps even 60 days, in which business could not move along normally.

As chairman of the committee, I do not believe I expected at any time that we

would take 1,128 pages of testimony, although as a matter of fact, this was about as condensed a hearing on a confirmation as I have ever seen in the Senate, considering the number of people involved. Actually, about 1,100 of the pages of the testimony, other than documents, are taken up by 11 witnesses 6 of them U.S. Senators, 3 for Mr. Strauss and 3 against him; 4 scientists, 2 for Mr. Strauss and 2 against him; and the nominee himself.

I have thought at times that perhaps the witnesses should have come from wider segments, but that was the type of witness schedule we had in the hearings. Because of the nature of the controversy, and because we would be going back to matters which had happened 3 or 4 years ago in other committees of Congress, which had taken much testimony, all of us agreed, or at least I did, that in order to keep things in perspective—since the nominee was going to give an answer to everything—when one witness would testify to a certain matter, the nominee, would be given the unusual privilege of answering at that time when it was fresh in his mind. That was what was done.

I say that is unusual, because I have attended many hearings on nominations, and the usual, fair procedure is that the witnesses who favor the nomination testify first, followed by the witnesses who are opposed, and then the committee concludes the hearings. Sometimes a rebuttal will be allowed at the end of the hearings, if a nominee desires that privilege.

In the case of the pending nomination, additional time was afforded, because every time a matter was brought up during the rebuttal by the nominee, many other questions were opened up. That took much time. After we got started, and the chairman and the distinguished ranking Republican member of the committee insisted on a quorum, the members of the committee were in attendance almost all the time.

I do not know the number of pages of testimony which were required for the so-called rebuttal, but sometimes there were rebuttals within rebuttals, because we touched on many other subjects. But everything which was discussed is in the record.

I have heard some suggestion that the committee might have been conducting a sort of inquisition of Admiral Strauss. I do not think any question asked by any member of the committee, regardless of whether he was for or against Admiral Strauss, was not a fair question. Some of the criticism which was presented by some of the witnesses might have been in the nature of immaterial remarks or in the nature of picking on the nominee unfairly. But the committee itself certainly did not know what the witnesses would say. So, whatever was said by them had to be gaged as fairly and justly as possible. I think some of the witnesses got away off the subject.

I observe the distinguished senior Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] in the Chamber. He has attended many more hearings, probably, than all the rest of us in the Chamber combined. I am certain he will agree with me that there

never has been a hearing when some witness did not go off on a tangent and speak on something which was irrelevant to the subject under consideration.

Mr. HAYDEN. That frequently happens.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, the printed hearings are extensive. I took great pains to make certain that a copy of the hearings was on the desk of every Senator as soon as it came from the Printing Office. Perhaps Senators will not read the hearings in their entirety, but they will find in the hearings all the reports which were made and page references to many different subjects.

I have heard something lately about a kind of concerted effort on the part of the Democrats on the committee to hold up the President's nomination, or to look at it a little too carefully, with the implication that that was a terrible thing to do. I shall submit for the RECORD on Monday a compilation of the nominations which have passed through the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce since I have been the chairman. The number runs into the hundreds, and there has never been any trouble about them. Each one of the nominations was scrutinized. To some of them there was no opposition. Some of the nominations were of persons whom we knew well, and the nominations were acted on quickly.

I do not know of any nomination which we did not examine carefully. There were two or three of them I wish we had looked at longer, because of what happened after the nominees began to serve in their respective posts. But I do not know why it is so unusual that once in a while some Members of the Senate should have doubt about a particular nomination. I do not think anyone is anointed simply because he is appointed. This happened to be one of those cases.

I do not think anyone likes to indulge in acrimony deliberately. Nevertheless, every Senator has the right to uphold the Constitution according to the oath he took. I know of no amendment to the Constitution which has repealed the words "advice and consent."

No member of the committee had had very much contact with Mr. Strauss. Most of his contact with the Senate had been in two other committees. Some of us who have been Members of the Senate for a while knew Mr. Strauss in a social way or in a political way or in an official way. But certainly the committee did not begin the hearings with any pre-conceived ideas concerning Mr. Strauss; at least, I did not sense any such feeling. But we knew that his nomination would be controversial with respect to many matters, because we in the Senate knew of his activities in connection with the Dixon-Yates contract, for instance. We knew some of the problems which confronted the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy with respect to Mr. Strauss. I knew, for instance, about the controversy he had with the chairman of the House Committee on Appropriations.

So the committee did not expect that in the hearings on the nomination of Mr. Strauss we would all merely listen to his autobiography, consider the service he had rendered, and then simply report his nomination.

For the reasons I have stated, then, the hearings on the nomination took a long time. I think the members of the committee cooperated to the fullest extent. I attended every hearing except one, as I recall, on one afternoon. At that time the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE] assumed the chairmanship and presided at the hearing.

The testimony regarding the nominee was presented by only 11 witnesses.

The seven Senators who cast their votes against the confirmation of the nomination of Mr. Strauss have signed their views, both in the nature of so-called minority views and individual views. Much care was given to this document, which is in the report of the committee. I know similar care was given by those who voted in the committee for the confirmation of the nomination, because the committee had a very difficult task to perform.

I shall read excerpts from the report, but I ask unanimous consent that a portion of the report and the individual views be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the portion of the report—Executive Report No. 4—was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

**NOMINATION OF LEWIS L. STRAUSS TO BE
SECRETARY OF COMMERCE—REPORT**

The Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, to whom was referred the nomination of Lewis L. Strauss, of New York, to be Secretary of Commerce, having considered the same, report favorably thereon and recommend that the nomination be confirmed.

**VIEWS FAVORING CONFIRMATION OF LEWIS L.
STRAUSS**

We recommend that the Senate confirm the nomination of Lewis L. Strauss as Secretary of Commerce.

The hearings on the nominee's confirmation were of a scope to reflect to a large extent the nominee's long distinguished public service. The impressive record of Admiral Strauss is summarized in the biographical sketch appended hereto.

The three major points into which the Senate should inquire when considering confirmation of a cabinet appointment are: (1) the nominee's honesty and integrity; (2) his competence; and (3) his record for cooperation. On all of these points, the record of the hearings satisfies us beyond doubt that the nominee meets fully the requirements for confirmation.

Examining each of the criteria in more detail, we turn first to the honesty and integrity of the nominee.

Several witnesses at the hearings made charges against the honesty of Mr. Strauss. The charges were refuted, and much of the refutation was actually contained in adverse testimony. Some of the witnesses who came before the committee knew the nominee well; some had never known him nor had personal contact with him. Some witnesses voiced their belief that the nominee maintained a facade of innocence while operating in a devious manner. Others, and these with one exception, were people who have had the most contact with the nominee, have found him always honest, forthright, and courageous.

The wide divergence in views can be explained partly on the ground that adverse judgments rested largely on double or triple hearsay. It is not surprising that opinions resting on hearsay were the most vehement against the nominee, for unfriendly gossip,

gathers strength as it travels. In the main, however, the adverse testimony is found to stem from disagreements with the nominee on questions of judgment and philosophy, or from inferred affronts to personal or official dignity.

We were particularly impressed by the nominee's efforts to be exact in answering the most searching cross-examination on minute details of his activities throughout his long and useful public career.

After carefully reviewing all of the evidence before us, and after considering as well the nominee's reputation as a man of unblemished character through more than four decades in the public eye, we find Lewis L. Strauss to be a man of honesty and integrity.

On the question of competence, there is no adverse testimony. Even witnesses who testified against him acknowledged the breadth of his experience, his firm grasp of problems in the Commerce Department area and his long record of achievements as a top administrator. Few men in public life can match his long tenure in sensitive and responsible posts and his unique record of distinguished service under four Presidents. It is clear that the nominee is highly competent.

The next test is that of cooperation with Congress. Here, we can count noses. For example, during the time that the nominee served on the Atomic Energy Commission, the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy had five chairmen. The first of them, Senator Brien McMahon is dead, but a letter which he wrote to the nominee in 1950 in behalf of the Joint Committee praised Mr. Strauss' service during his first term on the AEC and invited him to become a consultant to the Joint Committee. The second chairman, Senator Bourke B. HICKENLOOPER, submitted a statement supporting the nominee and testifying to his fine cooperation. The third chairman, former Congressman W. STERLING COLE, by a May 5, 1959, cablegram to the nominee introduced into the record, confirmed "existence cordial relationship with you as Chairman AEC and I chairman Joint Committee * * *." The fourth chairman, Congressman CARL T. DURHAM, who immediately preceded Senator CLINTON P. ANDERSON as chairman of the Joint Committee, was reported in the hearing on May 6, 1959, as willing to appear and testify if our committee wished to hear him. We are authorized by Congressman DURHAM to say that had he appeared, he would have testified to a cordial and cooperative relationship with the nominee reaching back more than 20 years. In addition former Senator John W. Bricker, who was a member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy from 1948 through 1958, praised the nominee for his cooperation with Congress.

We would also direct attention to the fact that Senator PASTORE, a member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy since 1953, and chairman of the Subcommittee on Agreements for Cooperation during the review of the proposed transfer to Great Britain of information on the *Nutilus* reactor, on which the question of cooperation was specifically raised, is supporting the confirmation of the nominee. For a more detailed expression of Senator PASTORE on the nominee's cooperation, reference is made to the individual views of Senator PASTORE.

Our committee spent much time in detailed examination of specific instances in which it was charged that the nominee withheld or was grudging in giving information to congressional committees. The few instances charged represent a minute percentage of the nominee's dealings with the Congress. In fact, the nominee showed great diligence in keeping the Congress informed.

Conclusion

The testimony and documentation presented before our committee, in our judgment, does not justify an adverse recommendation on this nomination. On the contrary, there is an abundance of affirmative evidence to establish beyond doubt the nominee's honesty and integrity, competence, and his long record of cordial and willing cooperation with the Congress.

We recommend his confirmation as Secretary of Commerce.

ANDREW F. SCHOEPPEL.
JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER.
NORRIS COTTON
CLIFFORD P. CASE.
STROM THURMOND.
FRANK J. LAUSCHE.
THRUSTON B. MORTON.
HUGH SCOTT.

ABBREVIATED BIOGRAPHY, LEWIS LICHTENSTEIN STRAUSS

Government service

1917-19: Secretary to Herbert C. Hoover (then U.S. Food Administrator and Chairman of the Commission for the Relief of Belgium) in relief operations overseas, and in the U.S. Food Administration. U.S. delegate at final Armistice Convention.

1941-46: In Naval Reserve 1926; active duty from February 1941 to May 1946; successively promoted through officer grades to the rank of rear admiral.

1946: Appointed member of the first Atomic Energy Commission; resigned in April 1950.

1946-52: Member of the Naval Research Advisory Committee.

1950: Appointed consultant to Joint Congressional Committee on Atomic Energy.

1950-58: Adviser on occasions to congressional and executive agencies studying and reporting on production and procurement problems for the Department of Defense.

1953: Completed report on "Hazardous Duty and Other Special Pays," requested by the Armed Services Committee of the Senate.

1953: Appointed special assistant to President Eisenhower on March 9.

1953-58: Nominated to the U.S. Atomic Energy Commission on June 24, confirmed by the Senate on June 27, and took oath of office on July 2. Designated Chairman. Retired at end of 5-year term, June 30, 1958.

1955 and 1958: Chairman of U.S. delegation to the United Nations Conferences on the Peaceful Uses of Atomic Energy, held at Geneva, Switzerland, August 8-20, 1955, and September 1-13, 1958.

1958: Appointed special assistant to the President on matters concerning atoms for peace.

1958: Appointed on October 24, as Secretary of Commerce; took oath of office, November 13.

Business service

1919-46: Associated with the investment firm of Kuhn, Loeb & Co., New York, N.Y. Became partner in 1929, resigning in 1946 to take office as AEC Commissioner.

At various times was director of business enterprises, including Radio Corp. of America, National Broadcasting Co., General American Transportation Corp., U.S. Rubber Co., Industrial Rayon Corp., Hudson & Manhattan Railroad, Rockefeller Bros., Inc., Rockefeller Center, Inc., Merchants Fire Assurance Co., etc.

1950: Consultant and financial adviser to Messrs. Rockefeller.

Decorations, honors, and degrees

Awarded the Distinguished Service Medal; and the Legion of Merit with Gold Star (Navy) in lieu of a second award and an Oak Leaf Cluster (Army) in lieu of a third award.

Officer of the Legion of Honor (France); Grand Officer, Order of Leopold (Belgium);

and other decorations from foreign governments.

1958: Awarded the Medal of Freedom by President Eisenhower in person in July. Recipient of 23 honorary degrees from colleges and universities in the United States and abroad.

Trusteeships and other offices

President of the Board of Trustees of the Institute for Advanced Study at Princeton University, Princeton, N.J.

Trustee of the Hampton Institute, the Sloan-Kettering Institute Memorial Center for Cancer and Allied Diseases, the New York Institute for the Crippled and the Disabled, the Jewish Theological Seminary of America, Belgian-American Educational Foundation, Metropolitan Opera Association, Inc., Virginia Museum of Fine Arts at Richmond, and Congregation Emanuel of the City of New York (also its past president).

ADDITIONAL VIEWS OF SENATORS SCHOEPPEL, THURMOND, AND LAUSCHE

We believe it also worthy of mention that the nomination under consideration is for a Cabinet post, and as such, is an appointment to a position within the official family of the President.

As former Governors of our respective States, we are particularly sensitive to the fact that a Chief Executive is accountable to the people themselves for the conduct of members of the Executive's official family, or administration. Since the Chief Executive must, in the final analysis, answer for the actions of his official family or Cabinet, we feel that the President should be given the widest latitude in deciding whether the nominee's philosophy of government is acceptable; and that the Senate, in considering confirmation, should minimize consideration of his philosophy of government unless a question of loyalty is involved.

This viewpoint applies particularly to the objections to the nominee's confirmation raised by witnesses, whose own philosophy is basically opposed to that of the nominee and who, until challenged during the hearings, assumed the role of spokesmen for science.

The purported reason for these witnesses' objections, in essence, was that the nominee had in the past demonstrated that he was vindictive. As the principal example of the vindictiveness they charged, they cited the nominee's action with respect to the withdrawal of the security clearance of Dr. J. Robert Oppenheimer. The vindictiveness which allegedly motivated the nominee, according to the testimony of these witnesses, arose from the fact that Dr. Oppenheimer had opposed testing of the hydrogen bomb and had favored certain shipments of isotopes to friendly nations, on both of which questions the nominee admittedly felt quite strongly to the contrary.

In every facet of this issue, there was involved solely a question of judgment. On the Oppenheimer case, the nominee was one of nine in an official position who was required to pass on the revocation of the security clearance. The decision of the three-man Gray Board was reviewed by the Manager of the Atomic Energy Commission, and thereafter by the five-man Atomic Energy Commission itself. The Gray Board decision was 2 to 1 to revoke the security clearance, in which the manager of the AEC concurred and the Gray Board's decision was upheld on review by the Commission by a vote of 4 to 1. The very number of persons who participated officially in the Oppenheimer case indicated conclusively that the decision was a matter of judgment, not of personal prejudice.

There has certainly been no question of loyalty raised with respect to the nominee. On the contrary, the adverse scientists testified that the nominee's allegedly poor judgment, on which they based their objection

to his confirmation, stemmed from what they suggested was an over-security-consciousness which permeated the nominee's thinking. If the nominee erred in his judgment, it was on the side of our Nation's security for which, in our opinion, he should be commended, rather than condemned.

ANDREW F. SCHOEPPEL.
STROM THURMOND.
FRANK J. LAUSCHE.

INDIVIDUAL VIEWS OF SENATOR JOHN O. PASTORE

Through the years I have had the opportunity sufficient in my own reasoning to appraise the nominee, Lewis L. Strauss, and to form my judgment of his qualifications for appointment to the Cabinet of the President of the United States. It is not within my province to pass upon him for any other office or any other purpose—political or economic.

The chasm that separates us in these two categories is wide and, in some instances, unbridgeable. Furthermore, it is not my purpose to persuade the thinking of any other person. It is possible that I do not share the reasoning of any other individual on this committee. I vote my own conscience alone.

In these open hearings I have already voiced the qualifications to which I felt all testimony should be addressed. While these were expressed in running comment during the proceedings I see no reason to add or subtract from them. These qualifications are:

1. The character and integrity of the nominee as it affects his membership in the President's Cabinet.

2. No conflict of interest.

3. Sufficient stability, emotionally and temperamentally, for the position to which he is nominated.

4. The competence, morally and intellectually, to assume the responsibility.

The committee has made an exhaustive record, but nothing materially new has been adduced with which I was not already familiar and, I dare say, not known to the President who nominated him to this responsibility.

I did not know the nominee until I was appointed as a member of the Joint Committee of the Congress on Atomic Energy. But since then, because of our official responsibilities, we came in frequent and close contact, especially so in my capacity as chairman of the Subcommittee on International Agreements for Cooperation. It was my responsibility to work out with the nominee, his colleagues on the Commission, and staff members of the Atomic Energy Commission 43 bilateral agreements for cooperation with 41 nations.

Moreover, as a member of the U.S. delegation to the 10th General Assembly of the United Nations in 1955 where the resolution for the establishment of the International Agency for the Peaceful Uses of Atomic Energy was discussed and enacted, again at the Atoms for Peace Conference at Geneva in the same year, and again as a congressional adviser to the Conference on the Statute of the International Atomic Energy Agency at the United Nations in 1956, and also at the first general conference of the Atomic Energy Agency in Vienna in 1957, I was brought in close association with the nominee to work out our assigned tasks.

In all of these dealings I found Mr. Strauss to be patriotic, honorable, and competent.

We did not always agree and I did not expect perfection. I would not trespass on the divine to say, "There is no fault in this man."

From a similar set of experiences there are those who make a different deduction. They too are honorable men whose record of patriotic service is unimpeachable. I do not quarrel with their right to reason as they

may. I merely vote my own conscience in this matter as I feel it concerns our country.

I vote to recommend the confirmation of Lewis L. Strauss as a man who has given to our country an effective patriotism over a period of 40 years and as one who, in my opinion, will make a good Secretary of Commerce.

JOHN O. PASTORE,
By C. J. MAISANO,
Administrative Assistant.

MINORITY AND INDIVIDUAL VIEWS

I

Lewis L. Strauss was given a recess appointment as Secretary of Commerce on October 24, 1958, and began serving in that capacity on November 13, 1958. His nomination was referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce on January 17, 1959. The committee was compelled to cancel hearings originally scheduled for February, and on March 2 announced hearings for later that month.

Hearings were held on March 17 and 18, and were then suspended because of advice to the committee that Secretary Strauss had previous commitments and because of the official Easter recess. The chairman had suggested the appointment of a subcommittee to expedite proceedings, but upon objection by the minority members the matter was kept in the full committee. This technically required a quorum, which put the hearings in conflict with other committee business and senatorial duties. Hearings were resumed on April 21, and 14 hearings were held in the next 18 weekdays. During the entire series of 16 hearings Mr. Strauss testified at length in his own behalf and as to questions of policy raised by the committee with respect to matters within its jurisdiction over the Department of Commerce. In addition, he requested and was given the unusual opportunity to speak in rebuttal at the conclusion of the testimony of each of the witnesses who appeared in opposition to his confirmation. Senators JAVITS and KEATING, of New York, testified in the nominee's behalf and a statement in his support was read for Senator HICKENLOOPER, of Iowa. In addition, former Senator Bricker, of Ohio; Dr. Edward Teller, and Dr. Detlev W. Bronk appeared in support of the nomination. Letters urging confirmation were received from Senators BYRD and ROBERTSON, of Virginia; Senator CAPEHART, of Indiana; and Senator CHAVEZ, of New Mexico, and were incorporated in the record.

The witnesses testifying in opposition to confirmation were Senator Kefauver, of Tennessee; Senator Anderson, of New Mexico; Senator McCarthy, of Minnesota; Dr. David R. Inglis, Dr. David L. Hill, Jarrell Garonzik, James B. Carey, and Benjamin C. Sigal. There was placed in the record a letter from Senator LANGER, of North Dakota, opposing confirmation. In addition, Drew Pearson, Jack Anderson, Robert J. Dodds, Jr., and Arthur Arundel testified briefly with respect to questions which arose during the hearings. This testimony, together with materials inserted into the record, occupies 1,128 pages of printed record.

On May 19, 1959, the committee met in executive session to consider the nomination. At that time Senators PASTORE, THURMOND, SCHOEPPEL, BUTLER, COTTON, CASE, MORTON, and SCOTT voted to report the nomination favorably, while Senators MAGNUSON, MONRONEY, SMATHERS, YARBOROUGH, ENGLE, BARTLETT, HARTKE, and McGEE voted to the contrary.

II. The Senate's role in connection with nominations

The undersigned strongly believe that the Senate should not confirm the nomination of Lewis L. Strauss to be Secretary of Commerce. This is a conclusion which we do not reach lightly and without the deepest consideration, because we believe, as do those

supporting this nomination, that great latitude should be given to a President in the selection of individuals to fill high posts in Government. However, we cannot in good conscience agree with the contention frequently advanced since this nomination was submitted to the Senate that we who serve in that body should automatically and unquestioningly give our consent to every nomination.

The Constitution provides that the President "shall nominate, and by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, shall appoint Ambassadors, other public Ministers and Consuls, Judges of the Supreme Court, and all other Officers of the United States, whose appointments are not herein otherwise provided for, and which shall be established by Law."

We do not understand that this requirement of the advice and consent of the Senate on major appointments was inadvertently included in our Constitution. We believe, rather, that it is one of the most important of the checks and balances which have contributed so greatly to the vitality and stability of our system of government. We believe the Senate should no more abuse its power to withhold its consent than the President should abuse his power to veto laws enacted by the Congress. It is clear that there have been and will continue to be instances in which both of these restraints are entirely proper. This was so intended by the Constitution. We are not prepared to abdicate the role assigned to the Senate by the Constitution. When serious questions are raised as to the fitness of a nominee, as is true in this case, we feel that the Senate must discharge its function carefully and resolutely. The performance of its duty may be both distasteful and time consuming but it cannot be shirked on either ground.

It appears to us that those who contend that the President should be completely unhampered in the choice of his Cabinet should, if they are sincere, seek to amend the Constitution accordingly. We believe that in most cases the restraint inherent in the Senate's power to withhold its consent is effectuated by the incentive provided for the exercise of great care before a nomination is proposed. If this check upon the power of the Executive were removed or denied all effectiveness by abandonment of the prerogative, the way would be opened for abuses. We took an oath to uphold the Constitution as it is now written.

A. Differences in Philosophy Cannot Be Controlling

We agree that a President may appoint associates who support his political views, if no violence is done to the Constitution or to our democratic processes. This remains true when, as now, the President is of one party and the majority of the Senate of another. We do not, therefore, base our opposition to the confirmation of Mr. Strauss upon the differences in opinion which no doubt exist between us and the nominee on a number of important political, social, and economic issues.

Some or all of us have perhaps differed with Mr. Strauss on the Dixon-Yates contract; on the development of atomic power and the related controversy over the Gore-Hollifield bill; on the threat of radioactive fallout to the health and genetic future of our people; on the possibility of detection of atomic tests as a basis for enforceable limitations on such tests in the future; on the proper role of our systems of personnel security and classification of information in providing the maximum of freedom and public information consonant with sound national security; or on the policies to be pursued in the fields of international relations and foreign trade. We have not reached our conclusions as to Mr. Strauss' qualifications

solely upon any disagreements we may have as to these matters.

During the first 4 days of hearings, the committee interrogated Mr. Strauss with regard to various matters within the jurisdiction of the Department of Commerce. Beyond these preliminary inquiries traditionally addressed to nominees for important positions, we are confident that even a cursory reading of the record will demonstrate that we were not only concerned with Mr. Strauss' position on questions of substantive policy. Rather, we were more concerned as time went on with questions of the nominee's attitude toward Congress, his past relations with Congress, and the methods he followed in the course of our own hearings.

B. The Basic Criteria

Confirmation should be denied a nominee for a Cabinet post only for very compelling reasons. Two criteria were cited by Senator Cotton during the course of our hearings—though there may well be other factors which would have to be considered. In essence, the criteria were that a nomination should be rejected for lack of integrity or lack of competence.

As to the latter point, we freely concede that Mr. Strauss has demonstrated competence in the investment banking field and rendered wartime service in the Navy. He no doubt possesses the capacity to direct significant business enterprises or to administer certain types of governmental programs. However, this does not necessarily establish competence for the post to which he has been nominated.

When related to a major administrative and policymaking post in the executive branch of our Government, competence involves something more than mere capability in other ventures. It also involves balance, stability, and appreciation for differing views, a willingness to abandon or modify earlier views when their error is demonstrated, and an ability to work with others in the difficult but essential adjustment of the conflicting interests of different segments and sections of our Nation. If competence in Government entails these and similar traits and abilities—and we believe it does—then Mr. Strauss' record leaves us unconvinced of his competence for the high office to which he seeks confirmation.

It is true that his activities have been impressive in some aspects. We believe, however, that a careful scrutiny of his performance as Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission from July 3, 1953, to June 30, 1958—and that constitutes his principal record in the field of civil administration—leaves one with grave doubts that he could serve effectively as Secretary of Commerce. We believe that the public record as well as the hearings before our committee indicate rather clearly that he overturned a successful pattern of Commission operation, that he involved the Commission for the first time in partisan political controversy, that he estranged a substantial segment of the country's scientists, and that he substantially impaired what had become, prior to his chairmanship, a very effective working relationship with the Congress.

We do not believe that a man can be adjudged competent for a Cabinet post unless there exists a sound basis for mutual confidence between him and the Congress, despite a showing of the capabilities for competence. As we have already indicated, this does not depend upon political agreement. Now and in recent years Congress has enjoyed satisfactory relations with many executive officials who frequently held sharply opposed views on fundamental policy. This has been true because there existed mutual respect and esteem between them and because the Congress felt assurance that these officials were dealing openly and fairly with it and that the information imparted to the committees of Congress was reliable and

sufficiently complete to serve as the basis for congressional action. The country gained by this relationship. We are forced reluctantly to conclude that there is no likelihood that this vital mutual respect and its resulting relationship can exist between Mr. Strauss and the Congress. This would be a loss to what we consider democratic processes at a time when democracy is on trial.

Based in part upon the past record of his relations with different committees of the Congress, and even more strongly upon his conduct before our committee, we have come to the conviction that Mr. Strauss does not understand the proper relationship between the legislative and executive branches. The record indicates he claims for himself the right to withhold certain information from Congress. The record also indicates such withholding is without basis in law and that the nominee had no concern for the law in this respect. From the record it is clear that the nominee time after time has resisted furnishing the appropriate committees of the Congress with information needed in order for Congress to properly perform its legislative functions. This has led to seriously adverse consequences in the atomic energy field, and so we believe it would in the important post of Secretary of Commerce.

In our opinion, he sought to mislead our committee either by means of what we considered direct misrepresentations of fact or by resort to half truths intended to divert the committee from full discovery of the relevant facts. This course of conduct was repeated so often that it must be judged to have been deliberate. He has so impaired our confidence that we cannot recommend his confirmation.

III. Surprising course taken by hearings

We recognize that Mr. Strauss has sought to serve the best interests of the country, as he sees them, and has made real contributions to its welfare. Most of the committee expected at the outset to vote for his confirmation. We embarked upon our hearings with the expectation that those who were critical of Mr. Strauss would air their past differences, that he would explain his position on these matters, and that conflicts would be resolved.

At the outset the committee discussed with Mr. Strauss certain matters with which he would deal as Secretary of Commerce. But even in this phase of our hearings we began to encounter half facts and misstatements which later seemed to us to become habitual. For instance, on the first day of our hearings in his prepared statement the committee received a very distorted view in respect to his role in the development of a long-range detection system and the development of the H-bomb, particularly in light of subsequent testimony. Mr. Strauss continued this pattern the second day, making two material misstatements of fact with regard to a very important matter, namely, his rejection of an application for a license to export. This was the central feature of a fairly extensive discussion of foreign trade policy and is dealt with at some length below and in the appendix to the hearings. This matter deals with his responsibilities as Secretary of Commerce.

We became mainly concerned over allegations bearing upon Mr. Strauss' allegedly devious and delusional methods which he had employed in certain cited cases. The record of his past performance was convincing in a number of instances. Together with other facts the weight of evidence which primarily has impelled us to our conclusion that Mr. Strauss is lacking in the sincerity and the tolerance required for confirmation came in the manner in which he attempted to meet the criticism leveled against

him. (In addition to this, other facts bearing on our conclusion will be given in the views of other Senators included below.)

(1) The nominee was guilty of an outright misrepresentation in regard to his recent rejection, as Secretary of Commerce, of an export license for the shipment of steel pipe. Mr. Strauss informed the committee that his action was taken with the "complete concurrence" of the Department of State—that "there was absolutely no difference between the State Department and the Department of Commerce on this." In actual fact, State's position was completely opposed to that of Commerce—the State Department had objected in unequivocal terms to the denial of the license. Its objection was a matter of record and Mr. Strauss knew of it when he spoke. As the final authority for making a decision in this matter lay with the Secretary of Commerce, Mr. Strauss was perfectly within his legal right in overriding State's views. In this light, his outright misrepresentation of the position of another agency is all the more shocking. (See hearings, pp. 43-44 and p. 1067.)

(2) The nominee challenged the integrity of an official transcript of a hearing before a committee of the House, thus impugning the integrity of those responsible for this preparation. He charged that a reported statement by him before a subcommittee of the House Appropriations Committee in 1956, in which he had accepted full responsibility for having asked for the preparation of a highly embarrassing letter to the Joint Committee, had in fact never been made. Such an assertion, by itself, reflects a virtually contemptuous attitude toward congressional procedures. Whatever defense the nominee might have had for making this charge evaporated completely when a check of the hearing reporter's stenotype notes showed conclusively that the portion of the record in question had not been altered in any way whatsoever. (See hearings, pp. 978 and 981.)

(4) The nominee consistently offered only partial or oblique defenses in his effort to reply to Senator ANDERSON's charges of failure to keep the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy "fully and currently informed" of AEC's activities as required by law.

As an example of this, the nominee completely ignored the Senator's assertion that Mr. Strauss had suppressed an important letter from the Attorney General concerning the legality of the 1956 amendments to the agreement for cooperation with England. Instead, he based his defense on the wisdom of the proposed amendments to the agreement and on his notification to the Joint Committee that negotiations had taken place. Even as to the latter, he sought to distort the record in order to establish that the Joint Committee had been informed in a timely manner. Actually, contrary to the mandate of the law and contrary to the advice of the Attorney General, the Joint Committee was not informed of these important negotiations until after the completed agreement had been submitted to the President for his signature (hearings, pp. 598-607, 687-695, 1024-1030).

(5) The nominee claimed credit for un-supportable public benefits from a prospective transaction while disclaiming knowledge of or responsibility for underlying issues that question the validity of his plans. When the Dixon-Yates power contract became jeopardized by the conflict of interest of a key participant, Mr. Strauss who was principal architect of the contract denied: (1) Knowledge of Senator HILL's speech regarding the dual role of Adolphe Wenzell and thereby denied responsibility for proceeding on such a questionable plan (hearings, pp. 333-334); (2) knowledge of the false chronology on Dixon-Yates issued by the AEC on August 21, 1954 (hearings, p.

285) even though Mr. Strauss, as AEC Chairman, discussed with Mr. Hughes the contents of that record (hearings, p. 493); and (3) knowledge of the Government capacity of Wenzell even though Wenzell testified that he told Mr. Strauss that he represented the Bureau of the Budget (hearings, p. 319).

(6) The nominee was prone to accept only official responsibility for ill-advised official actions by the Atomic Energy Commission while trying to create the impression that he in fact really had no connection with them.

An example of this was his explanation of the circumstances surrounding the classification of an adverse safety report on the Detroit reactor project made in June of 1956 by an advisory committee to the AEC. Mr. Strauss admitted that the report's classification, and its consequent suppression from the public, had been a mistake—a mistake which he now seeks to attribute to members of his staff. Yet, a review of the record shows conclusively that he knew this report had been classified and in fact had vigorously defended its classification in correspondence with the Joint Committee. (See hearings, p. 607, and Joint Committee on Atomic Energy print, "A Study of AEC Procedures and Organization in the Licensing of Reactor Facilities," April 1957, pp. 117-122.)

(7) The nominee often resorted to unnecessary untruths in what appeared to be an attempt to put himself in the best possible light before the committee. He categorically denied, for example, that he had ever asked for any information on adverse witness, Dr. David Inglis, and sought to create the impression that the only data which he had received was furnished to him gratuitously by a member of his staff at the time Dr. Inglis testified. Yet, when the question of the nominee's attempts to gain possibly unfavorable security information on Dr. Inglis was put seriously in issue, he admitted that he had personally called the AEC prior to the Dr. Inglis appearance for background material. His exact words were, "I have never asked for anything on Mr. Inglis in my life" (hearings, p. 827). This statement was made May 11, 1959. On May 13 1959 (hearings, p. 844), a letter was read into the hearings from the Atomic Energy Commission dated May 11, 1959, that flatly stated Mr. Strauss had inquired about Dr. Inglis about April 20, and had been given some information on April 21.

When questioned on this point, Mr. Strauss, after first saying, "I see absolutely no significance in whether the date was the 22d of April or May the 5th or what," finally stated, "I have nothing more to say, Mr. Chairman, on this point" (hearings, pp. 845-846).

Some of the foregoing it appeared to us was not dictated by necessity, because other and better answers or explanations seemed possible. But this would have involved admission by Mr. Strauss that he had been in error, or had forgotten something he had once known, or had misunderstood the charge against him. Such things are understandable, because they involve familiar human failings—but Mr. Strauss seems unable to confess to error in any way. He still insists that the Atomic Energy Act of 1946 forbade the export of isotopes for metallurgical research though the other four Atomic Energy Commissioners, the General Counsel of the Atomic Energy Commission, and the majority of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy (including Senator McMahon, the principal author of the act) all disagreed. He still insists that Senator ANDERSON made his case on isotopes on section 5 of the act whereas he (Strauss) had made his on section 10 (hearings, p. 610), although anyone who reads the record can see that Senator ANDERSON properly consid-

ered the sections jointly (hearings, pp. 498-499).

Mr. Strauss has shown a willingness to seek to fit the facts to his preconceived notions as regards the fallout danger (hearing, pp. 433 and 728) and the ability to detect bomb tests (hearings, pp. 441 and 558). He has demonstrated a tendency to carry over from a high security area (atomic energy) to the area of foreign commerce his highly restrictive concepts as to the permissible degree of contact with any nation. The act of February 14, 1903 (5 U.S.C. 596) in setting out the duties of the Department of Commerce, provided, among other things, that "It shall be the province and duty of said Department to foster, promote, and develop the foreign and domestic commerce, * * * of the United States." His rigidity of position and insistence upon policy decisions which ignore or make over the facts hardly seem to promise the kind of flexibility and adaptability required of a Secretary of Commerce in the discharge of his duties both at home and abroad (hearings, p. 1074). These limitations raise serious questions as to the qualifications of the nominee for the position of Secretary of Commerce.

The nominee questioned the integrity of Members of the Congress, charging in one instance that the records and reports of a committee had been changed to his detriment (hearings, p. 976). He insisted on this position to the point of telling a member of our committee that a report was not a report, and that he should be suspicious of the man who supplied it (hearings, p. 973). This statement was made almost immediately after Mr. Strauss had been told the chairman of the committee involved had stated, in writing, that this committee could "use any portion of it without reservation as this is the official copy of the report of the subcommittee" (hearings, p. 971).

Two chairmen of important committees of Congress, one in the House and one in the Senate, have openly and publicly charged Mr. Strauss, when head of the Atomic Energy Commission, with giving false and misleading information to the Congress and to the public.

We believe the printed hearings on this nomination demonstrate how hard it is to get a direct and complete answer from the nominee. The questioning went on for days, yet we had no choice but to continue if we wanted answers. Standing alone, it might be said that some of the things asked were not too important, but tied into the whole proceeding, an impartial and unbiased reader will clearly see the necessity for the manner in which we proceeded.

We think the key role played by Mr. Strauss in the notorious Dixon-Yates case was a deliberate use of public office for improper aid to private business. When the details of this abortive attempt to cripple TVA was finally brought to the attention of the public through the efforts of Members of Congress and some of our great newspapers, the President was forced to repudiate the contract. But Mr. Strauss still defends that contract, as a good one (hearing, p. 329). The hearings disclose that there are many unresolved questions that indicate, we believe, a great deal more knowledge on the part of Mr. Strauss, than he has yet revealed.

The record and background of the Dixon-Yates case is not such as to inspire confidence in this nominee's future relations with Congress and the public, if he is confirmed.

There have been many editorials, discussions, and even arguments as to the constitutional privilege of the President to be unhampered in his selection of his official family. This has been much on our minds.

On this point, one of the distinguished constitutional lawyers of our time, the Honorable JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY, senior Senator

from Wyoming, wrote to the editor of the Washington Post under date of May 8, 1959. His letter, which we believe ably answers these arguments, follows:

U.S. SENATE,
Washington, D.C., May 8, 1959.
EDITOR, THE WASHINGTON POST,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: May I not take the liberty of suggesting that your editorial of Saturday, May 2, 1959, entitled "Grasping at Strauss," seems to be based upon a mistaken constitutional premise, namely, that "The President, we believe, ought to be entitled to have in his Cabinet the persons in whom he has confidence."

This is not what the framers of the Constitution believed. They were of the opinion that the President should be required to have the advice and consent of the Senate not only to the appointment of Ambassadors, other public ministers and consuls and Judges of the Supreme Court, but also "all other officers of the United States, whose appointments are not herein otherwise provided for, and which shall be established by law."

After placing that limitation upon the power of the President to make appointments, the framers of the Constitution added another proviso in these words: "But the Congress may by law vest the appointment of such inferior offices, as they think proper, in the President alone, in the courts of law, or in the heads of departments." It is not necessary to point out that Congress has never by law authorized the President to appoint without limitation persons "in whom he has confidence" to his Cabinet.

To sustain your argument that the Senate should waive its constitutional power to give advice and consent to the appointment of Cabinet members, you must be able to show that the drafters of the Constitution were wrong in the belief that the public interest requires the Senate to have a check upon the selection of Cabinet members.

Is there any present reason to support this view of the members of the Constitutional Convention? Yes. It is to be found not only in the traditional American principle that this is a government by law, not a government by men, but also in the words of your editorial. You said:

"This newspaper has not been by any means an admirer of Admiral Strauss. It has differed with him strongly in the Oppenheimer case, on his defense of the Dixon-Yates contract, on excessive secrecy in nuclear matters and on a number of other important policy questions."

Let me add, it is more important now that we have a President who delegates to others so much of his power that the Senate should not waive its constitutional right to deny confirmation in the case of a nominee whose record amply establishes the charge that he aspires to have his own way in matters of public importance, the Congress and even the President to the contrary notwithstanding. In the Dixon-Yates case Mr. Strauss denied the Judiciary Committee of the U.S. Senate information with respect to the negotiations after the President had indicated his desire to have a full disclosure made, but also in the present hearings, despite the fact that the President had ordered the cancellation of the Dixon-Yates contract, Mr. Strauss proclaimed his view that it was a good contract. It was not a good contract from the public point of view, because it was a contract designed to defeat the purpose of a law of the United States by transferring to a private utility combination a function that Congress had given to the TVA.

The battle that is being waged now in the United States is a battle to transfer to private management the powers granted by the Constitution to the Congress to regulate interstate and foreign commerce. It is not

necessary in a case like this to find "evidence of serious misconduct or some similar compelling disqualification," as your editorial asserts. It is only necessary to insist that a man nominated to be a Cabinet officer shall have a record which justifies the belief that he will support a government by law instead of a government by men.

This constitutional view was never better exemplified than in the case of Charles Beecher Warren of Michigan, nominated on March 5, 1925, to be Attorney General of the United States. He was rejected on March 10, 1925, by the Senate by a vote of 41 to 39. President Coolidge renominated him 2 days later and the Senate again rejected him, this time by a vote of 46 to 39. He was opposed by both Senators from the State of Michigan—James Couzens, a Republican, and Woodbridge N. Ferris, a Democrat. The burden of the argument against him was made by Senator Thomas J. Walsh of Montana, whose qualifications as a constitutional lawyer no one will deny.

Senator Walsh, in opposing the nomination of Warren, made no personal attack upon him and did not oppose him for any inferior office. He said he was not qualified to be the Attorney General because of his association in the activities of the American Sugar Co. which was then generally known as the Sugar Trust. These activities, Senator Walsh contended, were such that he could not be entrusted with the enforcement of the antitrust laws. Thus the President's nominee, under clear constitutional authority, was rejected because, in the belief of a majority of the Senate, public policy required his rejection.

This is the situation that exists now in the case of Mr. Strauss. Public policy requires his rejection as Secretary of Commerce. Surely the President can find another nominee in whom he has equal confidence who will be qualified both from the President's personal point of view and from the public policy point of view.

Sincerely yours,
JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY,
Senator from Wyoming.

It appears to us from careful attention to the testimony, that Mr. Strauss has withheld or manipulated information to serve policy or personal ends. On the basis of the record, we have grave doubts as to whether or not information furnished by Mr. Strauss, as Secretary of Commerce would be accurate or complete.

We believe that Congress is entitled to all the facts—whether we agree with the conclusions of the Secretary, or his policies, and we say again that we would not vote against Secretary Strauss solely because of disagreement with his policy positions, but the hearings developed cold hard facts on even this aspect, that go deep into any hope of his ever being, or being able to be, a competent Secretary of Commerce.

As was so well stated in an editorial of the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of May 7, 1959, "If a Cabinet officer must have the confidence of the President, he must have the confidence of a majority of Senators as well. Though the majority cannot fairly demand that a nominee agree with its views, it can and should demand that he possess qualifications of character and a record which warrant consent to his nomination."

Conclusion

We have concluded for all the reasons set forth above—partly on evidence as to his past record, but mostly on the basis of his conduct and demeanor before us—that Lewis L. Strauss is lacking in the degree of integrity and competence essential to proper performance of the duties of the office to which he has been nominated. We regret that this is so, but we cannot otherwise read the record he has made before our committee.

We therefore recommend that the Senate reject the nomination of Lewis L. Strauss to be Secretary of Commerce.

Respectfully submitted.

WARREN G. MAGNUSON.
GEORGE A. SMATHERS.
RALPH W. YARBOROUGH.
CLAIR ENGLE.
E. L. BARTLETT.
VANCE HARTKE.
GALE W. McGEE.

ADDITIONAL VIEWS OF SENATOR MAGNUSON

There was a direct conflict of testimony regarding the role of the nominee and his contacts with Mr. Wenzell in the Dixon-Yates negotiations. Even if I could accept the nominee's version of his participation, I am forced by the weight of evidence and the long testimony before the Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly of the Judiciary Committee to conclude that he knew much more about the negotiations than he revealed before three Senate committees, and that he was one of the chief architects of this bad contract.

It was so directly contrary to the interests of the people of the United States that I cannot but expect from him in the Department of Commerce, a continuation of policies not in the public interest.

The people I represent would find me sadly lacking if I did not voice vigorous protest of such policies in Government, and surely would find me wholly lacking if I should give my advice and consent.

WARREN G. MAGNUSON.

SEPARATE MINORITY VIEW OF SENATOR MONRONEY

I must reluctantly recommend that the Senate decline to consent to the appointment of Mr. Strauss to be Secretary of Commerce.

It has been suggested that there is something improper in the Senate's withholding its consent to an appointment to a Cabinet post. Because of the intimate relationship of trust and confidence which must exist between the President and the members of his Cabinet, it is argued that the selection of his Cabinet is the sole prerogative of the President, in which the Senate must automatically concur after the formality of a hearing. This view, widely urged in connection with the confirmation of Mr. Strauss, implies that no conduct of the nominee short of criminality is sufficient to justify his rejection.

While a plausible argument might be made for such a procedure, in my view it is not the one provided in our Constitution. I do not regard the Senate's consent as a formality or the withholding of its consent as tantamount to conviction on impeachment. Hamilton wrote of the power of the Senate to obstruct the course of honors, and emphasized that "If an ill appointment should be made, the Executive for nominating, and the Senate for approving, would participate, though in different degrees, in the opprobrium * * *." Nor is the Senate limited, in the exercise of its constitutional obligation, as to the grounds on which its consent may be withheld, the authors of the Constitution wisely leaving it to the Senate to determine the circumstances which would justify its disapproval of a nomination.

It is true that the Senate's consent to an appointment has seldom been refused, largely because of the wise resort to its advice, even in advance of a nomination. In the rather rare periods when different parties control the executive and legislative branches, the Senate has much less opportunity to exercise the advisory function and can only discharge its constitutional obligation by granting or withholding consent.

Mr. Strauss comes before the Senate for promotion to a Cabinet post, after a long period of service in an important, but lesser, position in the Government. The Chairman

of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy appeared before this committee and testified concerning the conduct of Mr. Strauss during the years in which he was Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission. The incidents discussed in his testimony reflect a continuing pattern of refusal to deal frankly and openly with the Congress; of withholding information which there was a statutory obligation to divulge; of evasion and obfuscation. My association with this witness is sufficient to convince me that his charges are not made lightly, but from deep conviction born of personal experience. I do not propose to reargue the sufficiency of the examples offered to illustrate this pattern, for Mr. Strauss has adhered to it in his conduct and testimony during the hearings on his confirmation.

He labeled it "an unqualified falsehood" that he had opposed the export of isotopes for medical research in 1949, but later acknowledged that he had done so in 1947.

He denied having ever asked for information on a hostile witness, and when confronted with evidence that he had done so, denied that he had denied it.

He devoted several days of testimony to a discussion of his views on the functions and responsibilities of the Department of Commerce, but avoided any reference to proposals for its drastic reorganization.

He denied that he had made a statement attributed to him in a transcript of hearings before the House Appropriations Committee, which statement was inconsistent with his testimony before this committee, charging that the transcript had been altered—a charge which later was disproved.

He stated that limitations on exports of pipe to the Soviet Union had been imposed with the complete concurrence of the State Department, when in fact they had been imposed over its written objection.

He alternately exaggerated or minimized his role in decisions in direct relation to whether they now appear to have been wise or unwise, proper or improper, acknowledging no error of judgment during all his years of public service.

His initial assertions on almost every topic were misleading, and only after persistent questioning was the full story available to the committee.

Information on the conduct of their government is not only the people's right, but an absolute necessity for their effective supervision of that government. They must know, and know in time to be heard before action is taken. Likewise their representatives must be fully informed if they are to legislate wisely. Both the people and the press are entitled to expect from the legislative branch of Government the vigilant protection of the people's right to know. For the Senate to seek to give that protection in the exercise of its power of confirmation is not only proper, it is obligatory.

I conceive it to be basic to democratic government that the people, and their elected representatives in the Congress, are entitled to receive from the officials of the executive branch, not merely literal truth, but full information, freely given without design to soothe, to confuse, or to divert. Because I am convinced that this cannot be expected of Mr. Strauss, I do not believe that it is in the public interest that he be confirmed as Secretary of Commerce.

MIKE MONRONEY.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, the Dixon-Yates controversy was one of the matters in which the nominee was involved. Much of the time of the committee was also taken up with a consideration of the nominee's viewpoint regarding the so-called separation of powers and executive privilege. Much

time was taken up with previous examinations of the nominee before other committees; and a great deal of the evidence dealt with questions involving the Atomic Energy Commission, the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, and the entire field of atomic energy, all the way from the H-bomb down to isotope shipments to Norway. The committee has covered most of those items.

Following the chronology, the minority views state the position of the minority as fairly as we knew how to state it, in view of what we felt. From our minority views, I now read the following:

II. THE SENATE'S ROLE IN CONNECTION WITH NOMINATIONS

The undersigned strongly believe that the Senate should not confirm the nomination of Lewis L. Strauss to be Secretary of Commerce.

After due consideration, we seven Senators say that; and we add the following:

This is a conclusion which we do not reach lightly and without the deepest consideration, because we believe, as do those supporting this nomination, that great latitude should be given to a President in the selection of individuals to fill high posts in Government. However, we cannot in good conscience agree with the contention frequently advanced since this nomination was submitted to the Senate that we who serve in that body should automatically and unquestioningly give our consent to every nomination.

The Constitution provides that the President shall nominate, and by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, shall appoint Ambassadors, other public Ministers and Consuls, Judges of the Supreme Court, and all other Officers of the United States, whose appointments are not herein otherwise provided for, and which shall be established by law.

We do not understand that this requirement of the advice and consent of the Senate on major appointments was improvidently included in our Constitution.

I am sure the Founding Fathers had good reason for it, and discussed it at some length.

Then we say:

We believe, rather, that it is one of the most important of the checks and balances which have contributed so greatly to the vitality and stability of our system of Government. We believe the Senate should no more abuse its power to withhold its consent than the President should abuse his power to veto laws enacted by the Congress. It is clear that there have been and will continue to be instances in which both of these restraints are entirely proper.

And here is one.

Then we say:

This was so intended by the Constitution. We are not prepared to abdicate the role assigned to the Senate by the Constitution. When serious questions are raised as to the fitness of a nominee, as is true in this case, we feel that the Senate must discharge its function carefully and resolutely. The performance of its duty may be both distasteful and time consuming but it cannot be shirked on either ground.

It appears to us that those who contend that the President should be completely unhampered in the choice of his Cabinet should, if they are sincere, seek to amend the Constitution accordingly. We believe that in most cases the restraint inherent in the Senate's

power to withhold its consent is effectuated by the incentive provided for the exercise of great care before a nomination is proposed.

Mr. President, at this point let me suggest that during the course of the hearings, and also several days before, and lately, I have heard some expressions of amazement by persons who say they cannot understand why the nomination of Mr. Strauss is controversial; they say they did not realize it was controversial. Well, Mr. President, perhaps they have not been paying close attention to the proceedings of Congress, or perhaps they did not have such knowledge of what has taken place. They state that he is a fine man, and they say they cannot understand the controversy.

I believe there was rather common knowledge of many of these controversies; and surely nothing received wider publicity all over the Nation, including in this body, than the so-called Dixon-Yates controversy in which his name was prominently mentioned.

Then in our minority views we state:

If this check upon the power of the Executive were removed or denied all effectiveness by abandonment of the prerogative, the way would be opened for abuses. We took an oath to uphold the Constitution as it is now written.

We further state:

A. Differences in philosophy cannot be controlling

We agree that a President may appoint associates who support his political views, if no violence is done to the Constitution or to our democratic processes. This remains true when, as now, the President is of one party and the majority of the Senate of another. We do not, therefore, base our opposition to the confirmation of Mr. Strauss upon the differences in opinion which no doubt exist between us and the nominee on a number of important political, social, and economic issues.

Some or all of us have perhaps differed with Mr. Strauss on the Dixon-Yates contract; on the development of atomic power and the related controversy over the Gore-Holifield bill; on the threat of radioactive fallout to the health and genetic future of our people;

And, Mr. President, the last mentioned is an important matter upon which a great deal of testimony was taken, and I am sure it is a matter on which the American people, even as of today, need real enlightenment:

On the possibility of detection of atomic tests as a basis for enforceable limitations on such tests in the future; on the proper role of our systems of personnel security and classification of information in providing the maximum of freedom and public information consonant with sound national security; or on the policies to be pursued in the fields of international relations and foreign trade. We have not reached our conclusions as to Mr. Strauss' qualifications solely upon any disagreements we may have as to these matters.

During the first 4 days of hearings, the committee interrogated Mr. Strauss with regard to various matters within the jurisdiction of the Department of Commerce.

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL] mentioned some of those instances.

I read further from our minority views:

Beyond these preliminary inquiries traditionally addressed to nominees for important positions, we are confident—

And I am—

that even a cursory reading of the record will demonstrate that we were not only concerned with Mr. Strauss' position on questions of substantive policy. Rather, we were more concerned as time went on with questions of the nominee's attitude toward Congress, his past relations with Congress, and the methods he followed in the course of our own hearings.

Mr. President, from that point on, I think the minority views have gone into every detail, step by step, case by case, indexed and documented by testimony, from which we finally arrived at our conclusion.

Mr. President, I recommend the minority views and the individual views for reading.

There are many other matters which we could have discussed in a longer report. As a matter of fact, Mr. President, I am not so sure that we should not have gone a great deal further into many matters which were brought up in the hearing. In other words, perhaps we should have taken the time to proceed deeper and further into some of those matters. But we felt that we could not take the time to do so, and that we did not have sufficient staff to do so, in view of the great number of matters which come before the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and those which come before the Senate as a whole.

Mr. President, in concluding what I have to say this afternoon on this question, I repeat that I hope the debate will not be protracted or unduly long. However, I think there should be sufficient debate on the floor of the Senate, so that every Member of the Senate who did not have an opportunity to sit through the hearings will have sufficient information to be able to exercise his own judgment.

Before I yield to my friend, the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. McGEE], I also wish to state that I do not believe that any Member, including myself, who signed the minority views has ever sought, either since the hearings were held and since the report has been filed, or before then, to suggest or to use any suggestion or influence or to take advantage of any relationship with any other Senator, to ask him to vote either one way or the other on this nomination. I think we have been almost deliberate in our attempt not to be drawn into any such sort of an arrangement or any such campaign to induce any Senator to vote for or against this nominee. We have been deliberate, however, in documenting what we think is the case against him, in the hope that those who read the record and use their own judgment will probably see the issue as we see it.

Despite reports to the contrary, to the knowledge of the chairman there has been at no time any sort of a gathering, caucus, meeting, or anything else, in an attempt to line up any Senators on this side of the aisle so that it would be a partisan matter.

I have heard that Members on the other side of the aisle will vote solidly the other way. I do not know. But, surely, there are many fine Democrats on this side of the aisle who do not agree with us, and we have made no attempt to do anything but to suggest by our actions that if they have an honest disagreement with us, or we with them, that should determine their action.

I do not know of anyone in the committee, or outside the committee, or on the floor of the Senate, or in the leadership, or anywhere else, who has even made such a suggestion. The only time members of the committee, including the chairman, have ever discussed this matter, other than to submit statements as to the facts, has been when a Senator may have asked something about what happened in the hearing, because this matter has been so much in the public eye, or when he has asked us a question, and we have given him a courteous answer. That is going to be the attitude of the Senator from Washington during all the debate on the nomination.

All the facts are set forth in the hearings. Surely, there are enough instances, there has been enough said, enough evidence has been documented, so that each Senator can make up his mind, dictated by his own conscience.

I should like to mention one other matter. I know many Members of the Senate are lawyers. There has been some discussion among the lawyers in the Senate as to their interpretation of the Constitution on this question and matters pertaining to constitutional law. On many occasions since this nomination came to the Senate, the suggestion has been made that the President of the United States has the right to have as members of his Cabinet those whom he appoints, and that the Senate should allow him to exercise that right without any suggestion to him under the advice-and-consent clause of the Constitution.

I think that involves a very important legal question. The actual role of the Senate in the exercise of the advice and consent constitutional provision is sometimes misunderstood. As a result, a couple of pages in the report were used to discuss this question. I must confess we did not write it ourselves, because I thought the thesis of the senior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] on this question was so complete and so precise and so understandable by either a lawyer or a layman that his views on the question should be included in the report. I am sure every Senator, or anyone who knows him will agree with the statement in the report that he is one of the outstanding constitutional lawyers, not only in this body, but in the country.

Mr. President, the chairman of the committee submitted some individual views. Those views are very brief. They touch on a fundamental question. I read from my views:

There was a direct conflict of testimony regarding the role of the nominee and his contacts with Mr. Wenzell in the Dixon-Yates negotiations. Even if I could accept the nominee's version of his participation,

I am forced by the weight of evidence and the long testimony before the Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly of the Judiciary Committee to conclude that he knew much more about the negotiations than he revealed before three Senate committees.

I am not only convinced that he knew more about those negotiations but I am almost firmly convinced that he was the chief architect of the Dixon-Yates contract. I can come to no other conclusion. But, of course, no one wants to have it suggested that he had been associated with that contract in any way. I am convinced that he was a part and parcel of it. Coming from where I do, Mr. President, I believe such negotiations and such a contract are directly contrary to the interests of the people of the United States. I am forced to conclude that the same kind of thinking would be transferred to the Department of Commerce. I would be sadly lacking in the representation of the people of my State if I did not make a vigorous protest against that kind of policy and thinking. And, I surely would be wholly lacking in my duty if I gave my advice and consent to the confirmation of the nomination. That is what I would be doing if I voted for the confirmation of the nomination. Many matters, of course, are controlling on this question, but, to me, this is the controlling one.

Mr. President, I have been hearing the testimony of witnesses before congressional committees for a long time. Before I came to Congress 23 years ago, I had a little experience both as a U.S. attorney and as a district attorney in my hometown of Seattle and King County. I have had much to do with witnesses. After a time, one can tell pretty well what the thoughts of witnesses are from what they say, just as some persons can tell a lot about my thinking if I were testifying.

I think there is something much bigger involved in this case than appears on the surface. I have been worried for a long time. I had not been worried much about my country before this. I remember, when World War II broke out, I thought it would be only a brief matter of time before it would end. All of us thought so. We thought we were so superior we could handle the situation and could work out way out of it. But conditions are becoming worse and worse.

I may be wrong, and I do not say this as a reflection on anyone's integrity or as a lack of confidence, but surely I have a right to have some thoughts regarding the nominee's thinking. I think he has—may be honestly so—a sort of adamant attitude, almost a stubbornness, which, it seems to me, is getting us nowhere in our relations with the world at large. Perhaps it is the proper course; only history will disclose. It bothers me, because I see the breach growing wider and wider and wider.

I say that such an adamant way of thinking—not moving, not trying to work things out—may be the best course in the long run; I do not know; but it seems to me it will lead us down a long road. It is not a road of no return, but I can only see one return if we continue, and that is a return to the whine

of some bombs and falling walls and death.

I am hopeful that those who formulate our policy, those who conduct our policy, will look at the world in a little more flexible way, because we are going to have to live in it a long time under different conditions, and we are going to have to do something other than simply be inflexible in our opinions and in our views toward the hundreds of millions or billions of other people who live in the world.

I have many reasons for my position, but the real reason is documented in the report. We reached our conclusion reluctantly, but we have a duty which we must face. At times it has not been easy to make a decision. I hope that in this matter we are correct in our conclusions. I hope time will prove us to be correct, and that we shall make a contribution to the best interests of the United States.

Mr. ENGLE and Mr. McGEE addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BARTLETT in the chair). Does the Senator from Washington yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield first to the Senator from California.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, I should like to compliment the distinguished chairman of the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce for his excellent, moderate, and fair presentation. I wish to say, as a new Member of the U.S. Senate, that this is the first nomination which has been vigorously contested as to which I have had an opportunity to sit through the hearings. I cannot imagine a more fair hearing being given to any man than was given to Mr. Strauss by the chairman of the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Mr. Strauss was accorded every opportunity to answer every criticism against him. He was given the opportunity to sit at the witness table during the time those who testified against the confirmation of his nomination were testifying. He was permitted to interject during the testimony of witnesses who were testifying against him in answer to, and often disputing, statements which were made by the witnesses.

If I had been a witness against Mr. Strauss—and I was not—I would have taken rather serious exception, I think, to having the nominee sit there and interrupt every time he saw fit with reference to remarks made in a prepared statement.

Furthermore, the nominee was given the opportunity to rebut immediately and on the spot, following statements made by each of the witnesses, anything with which he disagreed.

As the chairman has stated, this was an unusual procedure. As I say, I had not previously participated in a hearing on a contested nomination. I assume it would be considered an unusual procedure.

Extreme fairness, moderation, and patience were exhibited by the chairman of the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, which certainly have

not warranted some of the criticism he has received in the public press.

Moreover, our distinguished chairman did his best to accelerate the hearings, in the light of the calendar of business before his committee and before the Senate. There were continuous hearings in the afternoon, sometimes much to my inconvenience. If I had been an older and more senior Member of this body I might have protested the procedure, because in some instances the hearings were subject to a point of order. No such point of order was made by any Democrat or by any opponent of Mr. Strauss. The hearings continued, afternoon following afternoon, without objection from some of us, and many times without a quorum being present.

Mr. President, I want to compliment our distinguished chairman not only for the fair, moderate, temperate, and sensible statement he has made today, but also for the kind of management and chairmanship he gave to the hearings on this highly controversial and difficult question.

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. McGEE. I only wish to associate myself with the remarks just made by the Senator from California in regard to the excellent presentation this afternoon by the chairman of the committee.

I should like to add, likewise, my appreciation for the forthrightness of the ranking minority member of the committee. As one who sat through the hearings, I think we have had the varying positions very honestly and fairly represented here.

I think there needs to be a particular focus on the aspect of the matter which the Senator from California was just discussing, which was the fairness of the chairman himself in conducting the hearings under sometimes very trying circumstances. At times it was necessary to suspend the ground rules and to meet even when a quorum could not be scraped up in an attempt to keep the hearings moving along, because we were running behind. We met at times when the session of the Senate would have interfered, and when we had agreed in advance we would not meet, in an attempt to speed up the hearings.

I think this is a further tribute to the chairman of the committee, who was interested that there be no more delay than was absolutely necessary.

Finally, I think the fairness of the chairman to the nominee himself was one of the exemplary evidences of how to conduct a committee hearing. The chairman of our committee, the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] leaned away over backward to accommodate Mr. Strauss. There were times when we even interrupted our committee hearings so that Mr. Strauss might make a speech he had long since committed himself to make elsewhere. I think this was a proper accommodation.

It was my observation that there was no attempt to abuse in any way Mr. Strauss' convenience, his requests, or his wishes.

I noted in the RECORD, Mr. President, after a comment by the distinguished

Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH] as to the importance of a very careful examination of a presidential nomination for a Cabinet position, which was well reasoned and carried forward in the discussion today by the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], that Mr. Strauss himself replied:

I most certainly agree with you that there must be a detailed and careful examination of an appointment of this stature.

This, I think, was lived up to. I suppose in a way, the ultimate tribute to the chairman is paid not by his committee colleagues on both sides, but by the ladies and gentlemen of the press. Several of them mentioned in my presence—and I see two of them in the press gallery at the present time—that in all their experience in covering hearings on the Hill, they could not recall when a committee chairman had conducted himself with such responsibility and had leaned over so far backward to try to be fair to all concerned.

Mr. President, I think the chairman rightly deserves the plaudits of his colleagues, as well as of the American public, for his conduct in conducting a hearing on a question which was painful, difficult, and tortuous.

I should like to add a little footnote to the observations with regard to the sincere efforts, and I think successful efforts, to prevent any political insinuations with regard to the Senator's part in these deliberations. At no time do I know of an instance when any attempt was made to line up the antisentiment with regard to Mr. Strauss. At no time to my knowledge was there a call of any group of the committee to try to have a meeting of minds with regard to the candidate.

I do note, however, in a Washington newspaper printed the day before yesterday, June 3, that there is a quotation attributed to the distinguished minority leader [Mr. DIRKSEN], which suggests that there had been a discussion of this question by the minority policy committee of this body. That may be proper, and I have no quarrel with it. I merely wish the RECORD to show that fact.

The distinguished minority leader is further quoted as saying:

I have no great alarm about defections on our side. I am sure of my troops.

I think that, too, is commendable. But I think the RECORD should show where this is being done.

To my knowledge, there has been no official majority effort to hold a policy meeting on this question. I think the chairman was absolutely correct in saying that this is a serious question. As he has said, the issues are deep, and the possible consequences are of such great moment that the question can be resolved only in the conscience of each Senator. It must be an individual resolution, rather than a party or group operation.

I commend the distinguished chairman of the committee for the high plane on which he placed the issue before this body today.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I thank the Senator.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I wish to commend the distinguished senior Senator from Washington for the service he has rendered as chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and for the fine manner in which the Strauss hearings were conducted during the period of time when he was present and presiding.

I do not believe Senators know all the difficulties under which the chairman labored. The chairman of the committee had sustained a broken foot. He had come to the committee hearings on that foot, in pain, for several days, unwilling to give up and go to a hospital, not knowing that the bones were broken. The foot became so badly swollen and the pain so intense that he was unable to bear any weight on it.

An examination revealed that the bones in the chairman's foot were broken. The foot was placed in a cast, and the chairman came to the committee hearings despite the pain, in an effort to expedite the hearings and to give the nominee an opportunity to have the hearings move forward. He came to the hearings day after day with his foot in a cast, walking with a cane, in intense pain, in order to keep the hearings moving. I think the fairness and calmness with which he presided are a great tribute to him. Often, he was the calmest person in the hearing room.

Such qualities are the result of his background as a State district attorney, as U.S. district attorney, as a Member of the House of Representatives, and as a U.S. Senator. I believe it required many years of service to give him the self-control and self-discipline necessary to enable him to conduct the hearing in the very fair manner in which it was conducted, while unjust attacks were being made upon him at the same time by the ranking minority member of the committee, who assailed him in the hearing with a statement to the effect that the hearing was some kind of persecution. Nothing was further from the fact. I believe that the manner in which the hearing was conducted was a great tribute to the chairman of the committee. I am proud that I sat with that committee, and had the opportunity to see the kind of governmental service that the distinguished chairman rendered.

The chairman of the committee did not even respond to the attack by the ranking minority member. It requires great personal self-control and public dedication for a man to be able to perform that kind of service.

In his statement today the chairman of the committee has stated that perhaps we did not go far enough into certain questions. As one member of the committee, I believe that the committee should have gone further in inquiring into certain subjects, particularly the questions raised by the attorney Jarrell Garonzik, of Dallas, and dealt with on page 448 of the record, regarding certain uranium stocks.

There is a sketchy memorandum on page 1100 of the record, on the

question of interlocking directorships and the relationships of Kuhn-Loeb and Rockefeller interests in the uranium field. I sought to have the committee go into the question of what happened to the prices of uranium stocks following the statement by Jesse C. Johnson, Director, Division of Raw Materials, Atomic Energy Commission, in a memorandum dated June 14, 1956. I sought information as to who owned uranium stocks before the statement, and who acquired stocks after the market was broken by the statement.

I do not criticize the committee for its decision. It was the thought of the majority of the committee that this was not a subject properly within our jurisdiction, but rather one that came under the jurisdiction of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. I believe that it was a proper subject for consideration in connection with the nomination of Mr. Strauss.

I am merely trying to illustrate how fair the chairman was to the nominee. I am not criticizing the majority on its decision on the question raised as to whether or not that particular subject came within the province of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce or some other committee. Jurisdiction was not assumed by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

In the light of what actually happened at the hearing, I believe that nothing could be a worse misrepresentation of the facts than the criticism to the effect that the hearing was a witch hunt, or a trial by innuendo. Other derogatory terms about the hearing were used here on the floor this week by the junior Senator from Pennsylvania.

This hearing was conducted by the distinguished senior Senator from Washington in a manner to reflect credit not only upon the committee, but upon the U.S. Senate itself. It would have done credit to any tribunal. I sat for 5 years as a trial judge in my State in a court of general jurisdiction. For 3½ years I was presiding judge over 33 counties. I have served as the law member of a military commission. I have served as the law officer at courts-martial. I have appeared before many administrative tribunals. I have served some. I have never seen a hearing before a tribunal of any kind, whether it be a court or a board, military or civil, that was more fair and just than the hearing presided over by the distinguished chairman of the committee in his conduct of the hearings on the days when he was present. I think he was present every day except one afternoon, when the pain and swelling in his foot forced him into a hospital.

This is a most important issue to the United States. I hope that each Member of the Senate will study the entire 1,128 pages of the record. That is a difficult task. Most Members have two or three committees meeting simultaneously, and they are under obligation to be present at those committee meetings. Sometimes they are testifying before another committee. Often the Senate is in session at the same time. A Senator

is required by the rules to be present at three or four places at the same time, while having a multitude of other duties to perform for his constituents.

I ask Senators to take the time to read the 1,128 pages of the record. I know that that represents quite an undertaking for them, and that this is a broad request to make. However, in view of the attacks that have been made on the integrity of the committee, I ask my colleagues to read the record before they believe any of the attacks. We have seen an effort to confirm an appointee by propaganda.

One Member of the Senate who is not a member of the committee said to me today, "I am reading the record, and I am more impressed every day by the fairness of the hearing."

Again I add my word of appreciation to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce for the objective manner in which the hearing was conducted.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I rise in support of the confirmation of the nomination of Lewis L. Strauss to be Secretary of Commerce.

Let me acknowledge at the outset that this is a controversial question. The fact that it is controversial is in some respects reassuring to me. Mr. Strauss has a record of long public service in high office. Were there to be no objection to his confirmation, I might be influenced to believe that during this long period of service the nominee was, in essence, a do-nothing. I am proud that such is not the case.

Although the nominee's record of service is long in period of time, his record of accomplishments in behalf of our country is much longer. He has served in the administrations of the last three Presidents—Roosevelt, Truman, and Eisenhower. As a member, and subsequently as Chairman, of the Atomic Energy Commission, Mr. Strauss participated at the highest level in dealing with the most volatile and controversial issue of modern times. The scientific advance in the field of atomic energy, with its original application in the field of weaponry, was so rapid that the fact of its existence preceded a full public awareness and consciousness of its potentialities and far-reaching effects on every phase of our lives. The controversy in this field has not been lessened by the suspicion in the public's mind stemming from the secretiveness necessarily accompanying the scientific advances because of its military applications.

It was in this novel field that Mr. Strauss applied his long and valuable experience as an administrator and his clear and logical judgment in the public interest. In response to his official duties, and consistent with his honest judgment, Mr. Strauss took a firm and resolute stand on such widely controversial issues as testing of the hydrogen bomb, shipping of radioactive isotopes to foreign nations, the dangers posed by radioactive fallout, the adequacy of our nuclear detection system, the extent to which private industry should participate

in peaceful uses of atomic energy, and—certainly not the least controversial—the questions on security clearances for employees in the atomic energy field. The judgments which he made on these questions stand as a magnificent tribute to the competency and ability, as well as the unflinching patriotism of the nominee.

It was, indeed, inevitable that there would be a serious conflict in judgment between any public servant in this field who took a firm stand and others in the same and allied fields. The differences in judgment arose and, indeed, were foredoomed, not only from divergent prognoses as to contemplated courses of action in the atomic energy field, but from basic differences in philosophy. Place any man of deep convictions—and I doubt that anyone will question that Mr. Strauss is a man of deep convictions—in the same circumstances, and controversy will result.

Contrary to what appears to be the impression in some quarters—the Washington Post, for example—the fact that a man is controversial does not disqualify him from public service. If such were the case, few, if any, men with the requisite experience would be eligible to serve, and the Cabinet of every President would necessarily be staffed with mediocrity, rather than quality and ability. Let us dispel once and for all any illusion that may exist that the Senate shall establish a new criterion for confirmation based on whether a man is controversial.

As stated in the supplemental views of the committee report on this nomination, I believe that differences in philosophy should be minimized in the Senate's consideration of a confirmation of an appointment to a Cabinet post. The President is presumably aware of the philosophy of any man he appoints to a Cabinet post, and it is inconceivable that the President would appoint a man to a Cabinet post if the nominee adhered to a philosophy substantially contrary to that of the President, or his administration, in the area in which the nominee is to function. The President and his party are accountable to the people at the polls for their philosophy as it is embodied in policy and actions. At the same time, let us hope that the Senate will always have members who are not in accord with the philosophy of the President, for unanimity to this extent would be quite indicative of an abysmal lack of freedom of thought among the people themselves.

The transcript of the hearings on this nomination is voluminous. It contains a variety of objections to the nominee's confirmation. Others have also raised reasons for objections both on the Senate floor and in statements in the press, but they are not substantially different from the reasons given in the hearings.

I attended as many of these hearings as my schedule would permit, and I have studied the transcript extensively. It is my firm conclusion that every objection to the confirmation of this nomination is founded, basically, on a difference in judgment or philosophy, whether the objectors are, or are not, conscious that such is the case.

It is unquestionable that our objectivity is weakened by our emotions. It is an equally human characteristic that our emotions are aroused by the advocacy of philosophies to which we feel deeply opposed.

The hearings on this nomination were prone to arouse emotions, as is obvious to anyone who observed them and even to one who reads the transcript. Although I approached the hearings without any strong feelings about the nominee—in fact, I had never met the man before his appointment—I found myself having to resist emotions of antagonism, inspired by the advocacy of views and philosophies to which I am violently opposed. For instance, when two of the witnesses from the ranks of scientists continued to defend Dr. Oppenheimer, to talk of our "national guilt" for having developed the hydrogen bomb—although they themselves worked vigorously for development of the atom bomb—and raised their wail of woe that our security laws were too rigidly enforced, it was only by the most determined exercise in willpower that I viewed the testimony of these witnesses as merely the expression of impractical idealists, rather than parrots of the Daily Worker.

Similarly, I can understand that those who disagree basically with the nominee's philosophy can unintentionally approach his testimony and record with a desire to find conflicts of statements, conflicts of interests, and unseemly conduct. With the presence of this desire, it is not too difficult to understand how their interpretation of the record and testimony is reached.

An objective consideration of the evidence will not bear out the charges that have been hurled at the nominee. Take, for example, the charge of noncooperation with Congress. There can be no doubt that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] conscientiously believes that Mr. Strauss, as Chairman of the AEC, failed to keep Congress informed and failed to cooperate with it. In considering this question, however, we cannot overlook the fact that all the others who had the same official relationship as chairmen of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, with the nominee, take a contrary view to the Senator from New Mexico. The other chairmen were Senator McMahon, Senator Hickenlooper, Representative Cole, and Representative Durham, whose attitudes are summarized in the committee report on this nomination. Lest there be any doubt that the divergent opinion of Senator ANDERSON be attributable to philosophical differences, rather than the nominee's action during the particular period when Senator ANDERSON, as chairman of the Joint Committee, worked with the nominee, one need only to refer to the individual views of the junior Senator from Rhode Island on this nomination. Senator PASTORE was chairman of the Subcommittee on Agreements for Cooperation and a member of the Joint Committee during Senator ANDERSON's chairmanship. It is also indicative that the attitude of these others on the nominee's cooperation does not stem from an

agreement in philosophy. Senator PASTORE has pointed out that the chasm that separates him and the nominee in the political and economic categories is "wide, and in some instances, unbridgeable."

Another charge, which has been continuously reiterated by opponents of confirmation, centers around the unequivocal dispute in testimony between the nominee and Adolph Wenzell. Mr. Wenzell stated that he informed Admiral Strauss that he was an employee of the Bureau of the Budget, and the nominee stated that he knew Mr. Wenzell only as a representative of First Boston Corporation. This conflict of testimony is not a late occurrence, but, in fact was given in 1954. It was related and re-related during the hearings on the nomination in question. Time and again it has been reiterated that one of the two was lying. With this assertion I am satisfied that few will argue; but it is extremely significant that no witness would assert, as distinguished from insinuate, that the nominee was the liar in this instance.

The reason for the innuendo, rather than a clear-cut charge of falsehood, is evident from the facts surrounding the transaction. Mr. Wenzell was involved in a personal conflict of interest matter. Criminal prosecution was in the offing. It was, from his standpoint, a self-service to establish that he had been dealing in the Dixon-Yates transaction above board and out in the open, with no intention to represent conflicting interests at the same time. His statement, in point of law, is known as a self-serving declaration, and, as a practical matter, raises a suspicion, even when not contradicted. It was contradicted by a public servant with a long and devoted record of unselfish service to our country, who had no axe to grind.

The transaction in which Mr. Wenzell was involved concerned an issue of the deepest political and economic philosophy—public power versus private power. There are those who feel most strongly—yes, even emotionally—about this issue. And that emotion is ever present in any discussion of action with relation to the much discussed Dixon-Yates transaction.

The relevant fact with respect to the nominee in the Dixon-Yates transaction is that there was no conflict of interest on his part, and all the rationalization in the world cannot attribute the actions of Mr. Wenzell to the nominee. Even such a springboard of emotions as Dixon-Yates cannot bridge this gap and attribute misconduct to Mr. Strauss.

The whole play of emotions in viewing this confirmation, or any other question, was most ably and succinctly stated by the junior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE] during the hearings, and I quote:

If you don't like a man, I suppose you can construe anything he has done as being ill advised, as being deceitful, as being cunning. It is like anything else.

I have seen a lot of men brag about their children for having done something that they might have spanked someone else's child for having done. But just because it happens to be their child and they see him

only with eyes of love, they interpret that action with a certain sense of benevolence. Yet when somebody else does it, that they don't like too much, it seems to be an evil act.

The Senator from Rhode Island has summed up this matter in a nutshell.

The nominee has taken an active part in public affairs for a period of 40 years. He has, in an official capacity, testified before numerous congressional hearings. He has been widely reported in the press, and many columnists have commented on his actions. His services, as I have pointed out, have been connected with highly controversial issues.

With such a public record for a playground, anyone who is so minded can except apparent inconsistencies and apparent illustrations of deceitfulness of the nominee, just as could be done from the record of any other public servant or person in the public eye to the extent that the nominee has been. Viewed in its entire context, however, the record and the verbal expressions of the nominee disclose no disqualification.

In assuming this approach I am not unaware that at least one witness before the committee based his objections solely on the political philosophy of the nominee. The question of political philosophy has not historically been a criterion for the confirmation of nominations, except to the extent that it might affect loyalty to our form of government. I do not believe that the Senate is ready to adopt a new criterion, and I know that I am not.

Only recently it was argued persuasively to this body that the historic criteria used by the Senate on questions of confirmation of appointments were four in number, and consisted of good character and mental soundness, freedom from conflict of interest, loyalty to our system of government, and competency to perform the job for which the appointment was made.

Viewed objectively from these criteria, the nominee should be confirmed by the Senate.

On the question of character, there is an abundance of evidence. An overwhelming majority of the reputable press has supported him editorially. People who have known the nominee for a lifetime of public service have come forward with unsolicited testimonials to his unimpeachable character. These testimonials include statements by Members of our own body from both sides of the aisle. As examples, I shall read, first, a letter from our esteemed former colleague, Senator H. Alexander Smith, of New Jersey:

DEAR STROM: I am writing this personal note to those present Members of the Senate who were colleagues of mine during these past years.

I am distressed over the charges that have been made in the current debate on the confirmation of Adm. Lewis Strauss to be Secretary of Commerce which appear to reflect on his character and on his integrity. We must bear in mind that he has been nominated by President Eisenhower to be a member of the President's Cabinet.

I have known Lewis Strauss since World War I when we served together in the U.S. Food Administration under former President Hoover. I have been privileged to be asso-

ciated with him in all President Hoover's postwar relief and educational activities. We are both members of the Belgian-American Educational Foundation.

I have followed with great interest and admiration his brilliant business career and his outstanding military service in World War II. I know of no one who has maintained during his entire life higher standards of integrity and dedicated selfless public service than Adm. Lewis Strauss.

Let me add that Lewis has had no part in my sending this letter nor does he know I have done so.

With warm personal regards, I remain
Always cordially yours,

H. ALEXANDER SMITH.

From our side of the aisle, we draw on the recommendation of the able senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], who wrote the following letter to the chairman of the Commerce Committee:

Hon. WARREN G. MAGNUSON,
Chairman, Senate Committee on Interstate
and Foreign Commerce, Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR WARREN: Thank you for your letter with respect to the hearing on the nomination of Lewis L. Strauss to be Secretary of Commerce.

I have known Admiral Strauss for a long time. I think he is a man of very great ability and is eminently qualified for this position. He has a great breadth of experience and is splendidly equipped in every way.

I trust your committee will report his nomination as promptly as possible.

With best wishes, I am
Faithfully yours,

HARRY F. BYRD.

These are only examples of the testimony to the good character of the nominee.

Opponents to the confirmation of this nominee point repeatedly to the legalistic answers of Mr. Strauss. I mention the inclination of the nominee to give legalistic answers to congressional committees, not as it affects his character, for it has no bearing on that matter, and reflects to no extent on his forthrightness, in my opinion. On the contrary, it does reflect on the question of mental soundness, for it shows that the abundance of experience that the nominee has had in testifying before congressional committees has not gone unheeded. Legalistic answers are often a necessity if one is to survive congressional grilling.

There is no question, actually, as to the mental soundness of the nominee. Even the witnesses who most vigorously opposed his confirmation admitted that the nominee was a man of acute mental perception. There was even a hint that his mental ability was somewhat too good for the likes of his antagonists.

There is no conflict of interest disqualification. Charges in this regard have been substantiated by innuendo only. There has been an effort to find conflict of interest in the Dixon-Yates matter, which I have previously mentioned; and on Wenzell's part, there may well have been; but there is no evidence of conflict of interest insofar as the nominee is concerned.

There is printed in the transcript of the hearings, at page 1100, a staff study of interlocking relationships of Kuhn-Loeb and Rockefeller interests in the uranium field. I can only suppose that this study

was prepared in connection with the testimony of Mr. Garonzik, who testified in executive session, but whose testimony is included in the hearings. No relationship by the nominee with either Kuhn-Loeb or the Rockefellers was shown during the periods of the nominee's Government service, nor was any current connection shown. The witness, Garonzik, in substance, testified that, in his opinion, the nominee and Kuhn-Loeb think alike. This sort of testimony is involved and is voluminous, and best typified as "full of sound and fury, signifying nothing."

Although there has not been forthcoming any evidence that the nominee would have a conflict of interest, were he to be appointed to any job in the Government, it is still important to remember that the nomination is for Secretary of Commerce, not to some post in the atomic energy field, to which the meaningless testimony on this point was apparently directed.

The nominee is loyal to our form of government. He is intensely patriotic. Every iota of testimony and evidence points unequivocally to this conclusion. As a matter of fact, some of the witnesses objected to his preoccupation with security. If, indeed, he be one of the few preoccupied with security, he should be commended, rather than condemned. It is interesting to note that these witnesses attempted to sustain this particular point by directing attention to remarks in a speech delivered by the nominee at Columbus, Ohio, in November 1953. The remarks of Mr. Strauss which the witness suggested showed his oversecurity consciousness are as follows:

There are some who think that in the past we have erred on the side of excessive security. There are others who think we have revealed too much information. Many years of association with the problem have shown me that when the error is on the side of too much security, that can be rectified; but if the error has been in the other direction, there is nothing appropriate but handwringing and vain regrets.

I can only summarize the evidence on the question of loyalty by quoting another patriotic Virginian's apt remark, "If this be treason, make the most of it."

As to the fourth of the criteria to which I have referred, it is my opinion that the country is indeed fortunate that a man of the nominee's ability will still consent to undertake this public service. His experience as an administrator extends back for several decades. He has rendered outstanding service in each of the positions of government in which he has served. It would be difficult, if, indeed, not impossible, to find in another man the combination of knowledge of commerce, administrative ability and experience, and familiarity with governmental practices and procedures, to the degree that this combination is present in the nominee.

If, then, we put aside differences in political and economic philosophies, which exist most broadly among the Members of this body on almost any given question, and concern ourselves with pertinent qualifications of the nominee, the evidence is overwhelmingly in favor of confirmation.

I feel that I would be remiss if I concluded without at least mentioning what I consider to be a factor for consideration in voting on this nomination, although it is not within the usual criteria of the Senate's tests on confirmations. It arises from unusual circumstances of this nomination, and, indeed, from the unusual times in which we live.

As I have pointed out earlier, and as all of us are aware, the nominee has been in positions of prominence in the administration of our security programs. He has been unflinchingly diligent in enforcing security laws. In the process, the nominee has unquestionably been a thorn in the flesh of subversive elements; for some time, he has even been a target for such brickbats as were at their disposal.

I do not mean to imply that the Communists are in any way directly responsible for the opposition to this nomination in the Senate. Unquestionably, the opposition in the Senate and the opposition of the Communists to the confirmation of Mr. Strauss are for completely dissimilar reasons.

Nevertheless—and this is my point—if the nomination of Admiral Strauss as Secretary of Commerce is not confirmed, the Communists will undoubtedly, albeit falsely, claim credit for having purged from the Government another strong advocate of security. Although such a claim may be without any substance or truth, there is a distinct possibility that the claim will have a deterring, although unconscious, effect on persons who might be called upon to administer our security program in the future.

Fanciful though it may seem at first glance, it is a possibility which deserves the mature and objective consideration of every Member of this body. I do not suggest for a moment that it is a controlling factor; but it is certainly more vital, by far, than some of the considerations which have been suggested.

In conclusion, I admonish each Member of this body to read the entire transcript of the hearings on this nomination. They are voluminous; but only in the full context can the issues be clearly put into proper perspective. In the transcript is everything except the demeanor of the witnesses; and in some instances even that is apparent in the transcript.

Mr. President, I am convinced beyond any shadow of a doubt, from the evidence before the Senate, that the nomination of Lewis L. Strauss to be Secretary of Commerce should be confirmed.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Carolina yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HART in the chair). Does the Senator from South Carolina yield to the Senator from New Hampshire?

Mr. THURMOND. I yield.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, in view of the fact that I was one of those who for many days sat with the Senator from South Carolina through the hearings before the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and after having listened today to his direct, unimpassioned analysis of the evidence relating to the factors bearing on the question of confirmation of the nomination of Mr.

Strauss to be Secretary of Commerce, I cannot refrain from saying to the Senator from South Carolina that, although perhaps it means little for one to be commended by someone who happens to agree with him, I only hope that it will be my privilege to be a Member of this body in future years when a nomination to a Cabinet post or other high post in the Government is before the Senate and when the nominee is not of my party or of my philosophy. In such case, the example the distinguished Senator from South Carolina has set here, today, will remain in my mind; and I hope I may follow it, and that I may be as broad in my statesmanship, as unimpassioned and as fair in my approach and as unwavering to my convictions as a Senator as the distinguished Senator from South Carolina has been this day.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I wish to thank the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire for his kind remarks.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Carolina yield to me?

Mr. THURMOND. I yield.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I wish to join the Senator from New Hampshire in his commendation of the Senator from South Carolina for the outstanding address we have just heard on a most important subject.

I have known the Senator from South Carolina for a considerable length of time. I have the highest admiration for his perception, his courage, and his devotion to duty. I can say to him that this is another outstanding example of the dedication of the Senator from South Carolina to what he believes to be right. I shall speak about this matter later, on my own time, but I should like to say to the Senator at this moment that I have had rather intimate public association with Lewis Strauss since 1946 and that the association included the formative days of the atomic energy program, and other activities.

The Senator from South Carolina, in my judgment, is completely right and sound not only in his analysis, but in his conclusions. I know of no man in public life who has devoted more conscientious time to his country and to the duties of numerous high offices which he has held than has Lewis Strauss.

I think the Senator's brilliant, but unimpassioned, approach to a most serious matter—and the confirmation of the nomination of a proposed Cabinet member is a serious matter—is in keeping with the Senator's own serious dedication to duty in an unimpassioned and highly intelligent, determined, and courageous way.

As a long-time acquaintance, associate, and friend of Lewis Strauss, I want to thank the Senator for his objective approach.

While this is perhaps a comparison which I should not even refer to at this time, I feel I must. I think the difference between the Senator's objective approach to this whole problem and his clear analysis of the facts, are in contrast with some of the impassioned, emo-

tional approaches which have been made to this subject by other Senators whose discussions have been based upon chimera rather than upon the facts as adduced on the record and from the nominee's history.

I want personally again to express my appreciation to the Senator from South Carolina for courageously, intelligently, and forthrightly discharging his duties as a United States Senator in an unassailable manner.

Mr. THURMOND. I wish to thank the distinguished Senator from Iowa for his kind remarks.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THURMOND. I yield to the distinguished Senator from Kansas.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. I wish to commend the distinguished Senator from South Carolina for his very able and brilliant presentation on the fundamental issues involved. I know the Senator has given careful consideration to the question and has been faithful in his attendance on the hearings. With his experience and background, I can say very frankly the Senator has made a fine presentation, because it has touched upon some of the cardinal issues the Senate will have to decide when it finally votes on the confirmation of the nomination.

Mr. THURMOND. I wish to thank the distinguished Senator from Kansas.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I rise to support the nomination of Lewis L. Strauss to be Secretary of Commerce.

Through my service on the Appropriations Committee, I have had the opportunity to work closely with Admiral Strauss for almost 10 years. Since early 1947, shortly after he was appointed a member of the first Atomic Energy Commission by President Truman, until his resignation in 1950, and again from 1953 when his nomination to that body was confirmed by the Senate until he resigned as chairman in 1958, we have worked together on fiscal matters. During those periods of time, therefore, I have observed Lewis Strauss and participated with him in a most important area of the work of the Atomic Energy Commission, and have formed strong convictions about his competency, dedication and integrity as a high-level public servant.

I have always found Admiral Strauss to be clear and forthright, cooperative and honest, in his dealings with me and the Appropriations Committee. His competency was demonstrated to me, for instance, by his fine understanding of fiscal matters, particularly important during the early years of the AEC. I certainly believe Lewis Strauss to be aggressive in going after what he believes in, and I commend him for this necessary characteristic of leadership which is so critically needed in these challenging times.

The fact that the nominee has worked at high levels with such dedication for so long—under three Presidents, and with decorations from both the Army and the Navy for service in wartime—is also naturally influential on my decision. In addition, let me say that I have been

able to find no substantial criticism of Admiral Strauss' capability to handle the job of Secretary of Commerce, the job he has performed competently, it appears, since he took the oath of office on November 13, 1958.

For these reasons, Mr. President, I believe that the nomination of Lewis L. Strauss to succeed Sinclair Weeks as Secretary of Commerce should be confirmed.

Concerning the current debate on this matter, Mr. President, and the ultimate vote on confirmation, I wish to commend our distinguished majority leader for the criteria which he set down recently. I think the Senate as a whole can benefit very deeply from his standards. On May 21, the able senior Senator from Texas mentioned that the duty of the Senate to pass upon the President's nominations, whereas not a perfunctory function, ought not to be a political one either. All Senators, he advised, should vote according to the conscientious judgment of each, applying the standards of conscience and conviction "without regard to partisanship." He pointed out that the Senate generally has not attempted to harass the President, and that he would be no party to such a movement. He also said:

We have to consent and we have to confirm the nominations of the President if we think the nominees will carry out the laws in the manner that they ought to be carried out.

All of us in this body should be grateful to the esteemed majority leader for his words, and I personally hope very deeply that the Senate, in regard to this or any other nomination, will uphold the standards he has set forth. It would be tragic, and against the best tradition of this body, to put Admiral Strauss on trial on the basis of narrower Democratic-Republican loyalties, or, for that matter, according to the so-called liberal-conservative ideological split.

We will do a grave disservice to our country, its governmental system, and to the prestige of this body itself if we consider this question in a partisan or petty way. Emotional reaction and personal rancor have no place here, either.

Much emphasis has been placed on individual decisions and actions of Mr. Strauss. Because he is a man of action, there will of course be those who oppose him. History may prove some of his actions to have been wrong. Every one of us faces the same risk when historians weigh what we have done. However, in the aggregate Mr. Strauss has proven himself to be a devoted public servant of rare ability. His career in recent days has been marked more strongly by the critical cries of those who disagree with some of his decisions than by the words of praise for the able, forthright actions which he has brought to pass.

The heart of the matter, Mr. President, is the nominee's integrity and competence.

The "advice and consent" duty given to the Senate by the Constitution provides a function under America's vital balance of power arrangements. The Senate must discharge this duty thoroughly, yet with

a faithfulness to its purpose. The spirit and tradition of the Constitution give broad leeway to the President in the choice of his Cabinet members.

One of the opportunities which has been afforded me in public life was to serve as Governor of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts. Many other Members of the Senate have held similar office where the responsibility for planning and carrying out a program of government action has weighed as the heaviest of the many duties of the office. Anyone who has this task becomes immediately aware of his need for top-flight men to serve in the key positions of his official family.

To a much higher degree, the President of the United States is entitled to have in his Cabinet those persons in whom he has confidence, and it is my deep belief that the Senate should confirm his nominees unless there is serious disqualification in the areas which we have discussed—competency and integrity. I do not think it is within the spirit of the Constitution, as written by the Founding Fathers and as valid throughout the years, for the Senate to attempt to revise policies in which the President of the United States believes, by controlling the appointment of his top advisers rather than by the legislative process. Our President, with the demands and almost inhuman burdens of his position, must have the people he wants close by to help him. It is with this belief, incidentally, that I cast my vote for Henry Wallace as Secretary of Commerce in 1945, even though I disagreed emphatically with most of the views which he expressed at that time and afterward.

I hope, then, Mr. President, that the Senate will demonstrate its traditionally high degree of statesmanship in this matter, and confirm the nomination of Secretary Strauss.

NIKE-HERCULES AND BOMARC MISSILES

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I shall direct my comments particularly to House bill 5674, which was reported to the Senate by the Committee on Armed Services on May 19, and I shall direct my comments particularly to that part of the report of the Senate Armed Services Committee contained on pages 14, 42, 43, and 60.

Mr. President, two of the defense weapons in our growing arsenal of ballistic missiles are the Nike-Hercules, developed by the Army, and the Bomarc, developed by the Air Force.

President Eisenhower has requested \$22,413,000 for the extension and improvement of the Nike-Hercules defense system for the next fiscal year beginning July 1, and \$26,900,000 for facilities for Bomarc sites. The House of Representatives has approved legislation authorizing appropriations in these recommended amounts to be made by Congress for the next fiscal year.

The Senate Armed Services Committee now has approved this legislation, the

military construction authorization bill, but with an amendment which would sharply cut back the requested extension and improvement of the Nike-Hercules system. It recommends that appropriation of only \$5,081,000 be authorized for the coming fiscal year for expansion of the Nike-Hercules system. This would be a cut of \$17,332,000 below what President Eisenhower recommended. The committee would authorize the full \$26,900,000 appropriation for the Bomarc program.

Mr. President, the proposed cutback in the requested extension of the Nike-Hercules ballistic missile system could be seriously detrimental to our national defense, even to our continued national existence. This comes at a time when the Nike-Hercules is the only close-defense missile in our military arsenal that is ready for use, with proven ability to destroy enemy aircraft flying at supersonic speed.

I am one of the economy-minded Members of this body, and I believe that Government expenditures in all fields should be held to the lowest possible figures consistent with the national welfare. In this particular case, however, the proposed reduction in expenditures would not be consistent with the national welfare. The proposed cutback in the Army's Nike program could seriously impair our ability to intercept an invader and prevent him from wreaking destruction on our homeland. This proposal comes at a time when we cannot afford to create such a gap in our air-defense capability.

The cutback is proposed on the theory that the entire Nike-Hercules defense missile system now in use is obsolete and needlessly duplicates the Air Force's Bomarc weapon.

I vigorously support the Bomarc because, when fully developed, it will become a most effective weapon for our air-defense system.

But the Bomarc still is in the development stage. It will be at least 2, and more likely 3, or perhaps 4, years before the advanced Bomarc B will be ready for full-scale use. Meanwhile, we have the Nike-Hercules in being and fully operational. Army plans for the coming fiscal year are based on a program which would see installations constructed for 50 Nike-Hercules batteries at 25 different locations in the continental United States, and an additional 8 batteries installed in Hawaii. Under the amendment to the military construction authorization bill proposed by the Senate Armed Services Committee, the authorization for the construction and equipping of these installations would be eliminated at a time when they are seriously needed to give us our only existing proven defense capability against invading supersonic planes and ballistic missiles.

I hope the amendment proposed by the Committee on Armed Services will be defeated because I firmly believe the Nike-Hercules and its installations are necessary to our defense system now and for several years ahead. They are essential to help protect us during the in-

term before Bomarc B missiles are ready to be deployed for use. Together with the newer and more effective Nike-Zeus missile now being developed, they will be highly valuable complements to the Bomarc when the Bomarc B is fully operational.

The Bomarc B is expected ultimately to have an effective range of about 400 miles. The effective range of the Nike-Hercules is about 80 miles, and that of the Nike-Zeus will be substantially greater. No matter how good the Bomarc ultimately is, some enemy supersonic planes and missiles may get past the Bomarc curtain in any attack made on us. As a last defense against such elusive aircraft and missiles, we would still have the Nike system for a final attempt to destroy them before they reach their targets. Such a role for the Hercules and Zeus is vitally important.

Many remarks have been bandied about in recent days to the effect that the Nike missiles system already is obsolete, that it is not a system which can be of value in missile warfare. Let us see what the proven facts are.

It was on November 27, 1951, that a Nike-Ajax made the first successful guided missile intercept of an aircraft. In December 1953, the first Nike-Ajax battalion was deployed in a defensive position to protect a strategic target area. That same year, 1953, intensive work was begun on the second generation, more effective Nike-Hercules.

In November 1958, a Nike-Hercules missile achieved the first free-world intercept of a supersonic target missile by destroying a missile which was traveling over 1,500 miles per hour at an altitude of more than 60,000 feet. Also, in November of 1958, a Nike-Hercules successfully intercepted a balloon-launched target at an altitude of more than 100,000 feet. In December 1958, a Nike-Hercules intercepted a supersonic missile target traveling at more than 2,000 miles an hour at an altitude of 14 miles. This record effectively refutes any contention that the Nike system should be arbitrarily abandoned by congressional action.

An additional factor in favor of continuing the Nike program as scheduled lies in the large number of personnel who have already been trained in handling this weapon. There are now more than 2,000 trained technicians stationed at existing Nike sites. Present programs will about double this number. But a major point in this connection is the extensive training program which the Army has been conducting for National Guardsmen in handling Nike weapons. The National Guard now is itself manning three battalion equivalents of Nike-Ajax units within continental United States, and about 10 additional elements of National Guardsmen are being used in the training of other National Guardsmen in Nike operations. Furthermore, two additional Nike-Hercules battalion equivalents scheduled for deployment in Hawaii will likewise be used to train guardsmen. Guardsmen already trained in handling Nike-Ajax weapons can be

made expert in the handling of Nike-Hercules weapons with only a few additional weeks training. These trained guardsmen represent a reservoir of proficiency in the handling of weapons which it would take a substantial time to duplicate for a completely different weapon. This entire schedule would necessarily be abandoned if the amendment under discussion is adopted.

The President, who is charged with primary responsibility for developing and directing our national defenses, is not advocating that the Nike missiles be discarded. Rather, he has recommended their further development and expansion. The vocal arguments for curtailment and abandonment, on the other hand, are coming from right here on Capitol Hill.

The Congress should leave such military decisions where they rightfully belong—in the hands of the President. He is reported to feel that at least for the time being, development and production should be continued on both the Nike and Bomarc weapons systems. I have confidence in the President's judgment, and this is what he regards as necessary. In the absence of any compelling evidence to the contrary, I believe we should authorize and appropriate the necessary funds. All the evidence I have found confirms the President's finding that we need both weapons systems.

I respect and congratulate those members of the Armed Services Committee of the Senate who are toiling so diligently and assiduously to prevent any waste or undue duplication or overlapping in the expenditure of the billions upon billions of dollars which we necessarily must spend to maintain our defenses. I wish them the greatest of success in these efforts. But on the point of cutting down funds for development and deployment of Nike weapons, I must differ. The extra defense capability provided by these weapons will be more than worth their cost.

If a major new war should break out, we will need to use every weapon we can lay our hands on, for both our immediate defense and for our own strategic retaliation. We have developed the Nike-Hercules and have made it an operational, ready-to-use weapon. We are making real progress in developing the Nike-Zeus. To abandon them now would be perilous folly.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MARTIN. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I hope every Member of the Senate will read the views expressed by the distinguished Senator from Iowa. My friend from Iowa does not rise in this Chamber to talk on a subject until he has studied it carefully and has thoroughly digested both sides. I served with the Senator when he was a Member of the House of Representatives. I know of his record for economy in government. I know he is a staunch advocate of balancing the budget.

I daresay the Senator feels, as I do, that when it comes to our national defense, if the President tells us a certain development is necessary, we will be

greatly influenced by the views of this great military leader. The President has expressed his views on this subject. I have not given this matter the study which the Senator from Iowa has or the study which it deserves. I intend to do so before passing on the proposed amendment.

I am greatly influenced by the views so ably expressed by my friend from Iowa, and I commend and compliment him on the fine presentation he has given us today.

Mr. MARTIN. I thank the junior Senator from New York for his very kind remarks, which are appreciated.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

NEW YORK AND THE FEDERAL SYSTEM

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, when our Founding Fathers drafted that greatest of all human documents, the Constitution of the United States, they anticipated many of the challenges which would later confront the Nation. The almost uncanny foresight of that document, combined with its inherent qualities of precision which delineate the bounds for private and public conduct in this land, have permitted the Constitution to grow with time and progress. Indeed, that document—unmatched in the annals of history—has continued to grow in stature and meaning as our Nation has grown great and strong and independent.

Today, our Constitution constitutes the bedrock of our civil liberties and serves as the rallying point for men everywhere who yearn for freedom and for the preservation and protection of human rights, and for the equality which should be the birthright of every human being.

I rise today to speak on one aspect of that great document. And I rise to speak in a manner which that immortal document has made possible. For I speak as both a citizen of New York State and as a citizen of the United States of America. I speak as a free man, proud of my Nation's heritage and traditions, and as one determined to see to it that our Nation progresses and remains free.

Mr. President, I speak today as one who believes devoutly in our Federal system. I subscribe with all the strength at my command to reasonable application of the great principle of States rights. But I also adhere with determination to the concept that in certain areas, the power and prestige and resources of the Federal Government must be applied to solving social, economic, and human problems of the American people.

The difficult balancing between where States rights begin and end and where the responsibility of the Federal Government must come to the fore is not a new problem. It has confronted the people and the lawmakers of our Nation for years. Indeed, Federal-State relations have been the subject of lively discussion and spirited controversy since the early days of the Republic.

Never has the discussion been more heated, nor the stakes higher than today. Nor does it seem likely that there will be any substantial abatement in the argument in the foreseeable future.

Unfortunately, many people tend to paint this problem in black-and-white terms. Too many people tend to look only to the Federal Government for the answers to all our problems, thus ignoring the great place to be occupied by our State governments in meeting challenges. On the other hand, many feel that the States should do almost every job, should be given the responsibility to answer almost every question confronting our people, thus overlooking the important responsibility of the Federal Government in our Federal system.

I have always believed that a middle course held the best hope for serving the best interests of the American people. Succinctly stated, I believe that where fundamental human rights, human liberties, and human equality are concerned, we should not hesitate to bring the full power of the Federal Government to bear in order to insure full compliance with our Constitution's guarantees of equal protection of the laws and full opportunity for every man, regardless of his race, creed, color, or national origin. But where economic issues are concerned—and I refer most specifically to the spending of taxpayers' money—I believe we should look initially to the States for answers, and only where their powers or resources are inadequate should we bring the Federal Government into the picture. Of course, as interstate problems arise, as situations where nationwide uniformity is found essential, and as challenges which uniquely demand Federal intervention arise, we can and should utilize the tremendous power of the Federal Government.

But more fully than we now do, I feel we should seek means in these situations for more equitable partnership arrangements between the Federal Government and the States. We should try to stimulate a more nearly equal sharing of responsibilities, of costs, and of administration. We should never, in consonance with the Federal concept of our Constitution, allow federally run programs to discriminate against any one State or region of the country. We should never permit Federal projects to favor unfairly any one State or even type of State to the detriment of other States. Yet that is the situation which confronts us today. It is a situation which cries out for exposure, study, and correction.

To me, as a citizen of New York State, the present overall picture of Federal-State relations is particularly disturbing. As a citizen of the United States, who believes sincerely in the Federal system, it is a picture which causes me acute dismay. It is about time we did something about the inequitable manner in which Federal programs of aid to the States are being drafted and administered.

In a sense, of course, the great debate about Federal-State relations is inevitable. Under our Constitution, the powers of the Government are divided

between the Federal Government and the States. The Constitution sets forth the powers delegated to the Federal Government and declares, by the 10th amendment, that "the powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States, respectively, or to the people." Nevertheless, for 170 years, the judiciary, lawmakers, and learned scholars have been wrestling with the proper sphere of the jurisdictions, the State and the Federal.

The problem of the peculiar function of the Federal Government in its relationships to the individual States is one of particular importance to the U.S. Senate. In one sphere or another, the most distinguished Members of this body have struggled with this question. We need only think of Webster, Clay, and Calhoun, to mention only three of the most illustrious of our predecessors. But we need not go back as far as the 19th century.

My distinguished predecessors as Senators from the State of New York, of both political parties, were vitally concerned with this eternal enigma of American government. All grappled with the question of the proper role of Federal and State governments in various areas.

Senator Irving M. Ives, both as a U.S. Senator and earlier for many years as a member of the New York Assembly, demonstrated a keen grasp and full understanding of this problem. In his outstanding work in the field of labor relations, particularly, he recognized the ramifications, and came to grips with the relationship between Federal and State jurisdictions.

As a State legislator, Irving Ives was closely associated with the drafting of New York's laws on unemployment insurance, workmen's compensation, and elimination of discriminatory employment practices. All of these subjects were also matters of Federal legislation, in which, as a Member of this body, Senator Ives proved himself equally distinguished. In the legislative halls in Albany, as well as in Washington, he consistently worked for legislation which would contribute to the sound growth of America's great labor movement.

Senator Herbert H. Lehman, for 10 years Governor of New York before coming to the Senate, in his own manner proved himself the untiring and eternal guardian and defender of human rights. He was an effective and eloquent opponent of social and religious discrimination, an advocate of a more liberal immigration policy, and an unrelenting champion of civil rights legislation.

Senator Robert F. Wagner, a Justice of the New York Supreme Court before his election in 1926 to the Senate, was a chief sponsor of much of the legislation introduced during President Roosevelt's early years in office, which sought to bolster and strengthen the American economy. He worked long and hard for the Social Security Act, the first National Housing Act, and, of course, the National Labor Relations Act, with

which his name will always be associated.

Each of these measures, in its own way, had an impact on Federal-State relations. Each provided for greater Federal responsibility in particular economic areas, with new problems and opportunities for the governments of each of our separate States.

I should also pay tribute to numerous other men who have preceded me in representing New York State in the U.S. Senate. Each, in his own way, has provided a special and unique inspiration to guide my actions in this body. Suffice to say that I intend to adhere to the high principles of dedication and patriotism they exhibited, never forgetting that I am at once a citizen of New York State and a citizen of the United States.

I cannot refrain from also saying a word of appreciation about some of the recent Governors of my State who have been acutely concerned with the problems of Federal-State relations, and who have added luster, not merely to the history of the State of New York, but to the Nation as well.

Gov. Thomas E. Dewey, who served as my State's chief executive for a longer term than any other Governor, compiled a record seldom equaled for brilliance and accomplishment. He set a standard for progressive, efficient, economical government which would bear emulation by all on both the Federal and State level.

Tom Dewey's talent for administration won him well-merited nationwide acclaim. His political party called upon him twice to be its national standard bearer. He bears the distinction of being one of the youngest men ever nominated for the Presidency.

As Governor of New York, he was intensely concerned with the relationships between the Federal Government and his State. His concern for the effect of Federal activities on his State led, for example, to his recommendation for the appointment of the Temporary Commission on the Fiscal Affairs of State Government. This group made a comprehensive study and appraisal of New York's financial affairs, including its relationship with the Federal Government and units of local government. The report it submitted deserves the highest praise.

I am delighted to note that the present incumbent in the Governor's mansion in Albany, Nelson A. Rockefeller, has begun his administration in the finest traditions of action and accomplishment which characterized Tom Dewey's stewardship in office. I am confident Nelson Rockefeller will blaze new and progressive trails as Governor, and I know that from his long and rich experience at all levels of governmental activities he is acutely aware of the problems involved in Federal-State relations.

Mr. President, four Governors of my State have gone on to the presidency of the United States: Martin Van Buren, Grover Cleveland, Theodore Roosevelt, and Franklin Delano Roosevelt. In this century, three more Governors, Charles Evans Hughes, Alfred E. Smith, and

Thomas E. Dewey, were nominated for the Presidency.

To each of these men, the respective roles of the State and the Federal Government were matters of intense and active concern. To each of them, the Nation is forever indebted. And I personally, as representative of nearly 17 million people of New York State, look to each of these men for guidance and inspiration as I seek to serve my State and my Nation.

I want today to renew consideration of the respective roles of the Federal and State governments in our Republic. We have been much concerned with this problem in recent years in connection with civil rights legislation. In my opinion this should be one of the most noncontroversial aspects of Federal action since no one can deny the duty of the Federal Government under the Constitution to protect the equal rights of our citizens and to prevent this infringement by arbitrary or other unlawful State action.

It is ironical, under these circumstances, that so much debate has centered on the question of States rights in connection with civil rights and so little on the impact of Federal policies on the economic welfare of the States. It is to this latter problem that I will give attention today.

I particularly want to discuss the impact of several Federal spending programs in my own State of New York since it is becoming increasingly apparent that New York pays a heavy if not exorbitant charge for the services and financial aid it receives from the Federal Government.

It is, of course, unnecessary for me to dwell on the economic importance of the State of New York to our Nation. Today it has a population of about $16\frac{1}{2}$ million, still well ahead of California's $14\frac{1}{2}$ million. It has ranked first among the States in manufacturing since the 1830's. It leads all other States in number of wage earners and value of products. New York City is the commercial center of the Nation, if not of the world. Buffalo, at the other end of the State is the leading flour milling center of the world. New York's transportation network, beset with problems though it may be, is still superior to that of almost any other area on earth. It ranks first among the Eastern States in the amount of water power it can develop. New York State leads the Nation in the manufacture of such varied products as clothing, rugs and carpets, sugar, jewelry, paper, printing and publishing, photographic equipment. New York City is the financial, commercial, art, and cultural center of the country. The State ranks first in both foreign and domestic commerce.

As a result of this tremendous wealth, New York has always paid a substantial share of all the revenues of the Federal Government. In 1958, the latest period for which complete State data is available, New York individuals and business firms paid out to the Federal Government a total of \$15,348,079,000. This represents 19.19 percent of all Federal internal revenue collections in the United

States for the fiscal year, which aggregated \$79,978,476,000. New York paid more than twice as much as was paid by any other State, and more than 50 times as much as was paid by such States as Arkansas, Mississippi, and West Virginia.

Since New York is the leading State of the Nation in manufacturing, it comes as a surprise and a shock to learn that New York is no longer the leading State in the Union in the receipt of military prime contracts. During the Korean period, the 3 years from July 1950 through June 1953, New York received military prime contracts valued at \$14.5 billion or 15.3 percent of the Nation's total for that period. At the same time, the second ranking State, California, received military prime contracts of under \$13 billion, or 13.6 percent of the Nation's total. Now, during the recent three and a half year period, from January 1955 through June 1958, New York received a total of only \$7.6 billion in military prime contracts, or 12 percent of the Nation's total, compared to California's receiving, in this period, \$12.9 billion, or 20.3 percent of all military prime contracts let during the period.

For the fiscal year 1958, California received 21.4 percent of all military prime contracts, compared to New York's 11.6 percent, little more than half as much.

And for the first 3 months of the present fiscal year, California received nearly three times the volume of military prime contracts which New York did.

The growing importance of the aircraft and missiles industry in the military budget accounts in good measure for this shift to California, where a major share of the Nation's aircraft production facilities is located.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Young of Ohio in the chair). Does the Senator from New York yield to the Senator from California?

Mr. KEATING. I am happy to yield to my friend from California.

Mr. ENGLE. I have observed that the distinguished Senator from New York has referred to the State of California and to the number of defense contracts firms in California have received. He has compared those contracts with the total number received by the State of New York. Do I correctly understand the Senator from New York to be arguing that the defense business of the country should be allocated on a geographical basis, or a political basis, or a basis on which we would equate the defense business throughout the country in terms of the largest taxpaying States? Is that the import of the Senator's argument?

Mr. KEATING. No; and I believe that has been made very clear in the last sentence, in which I pointed out that there has been a major share of the Nation's aircraft production in the State of California and that—

Mr. ENGLE. Does the Senator protest that? Does he believe it to be unmerited?

Mr. KEATING. If the Senator will permit me to finish, I would say that

much of the reason for the change has been due to the great importance of the aircraft and missile industry in our defense structure.

Mr. ENGLE. Does the Senator say it was entirely justified to place that business in California where there is the plant capacity and the competence of personnel and the kind of climate in which people wish to live, as well as the capability of producing for America the defense items needed at the lowest possible cost?

Mr. KEATING. I appreciate the staunch support of the State of California by the Senator from California. I believe the selection of the place to locate a plant is something which should be left to those who are investing their funds in the plant. If a group of people desire to start a plant in California, the Government, in my philosophy, should not interfere with the desire to locate the plant wherever they wish to do so.

The point which I am bringing out is the very large increase in California in the amount of defense contracts which have been let, and the very large decrease in the percentage of defense contracts which have been let in New York, because New York does not yield in any respect to California in the abilities and capabilities of its industry or in the number of skilled workmen available to handle a very much larger share of the missile business and other defense business than New York is now getting.

Mr. ENGLE. Does the distinguished Senator from New York protest the allocation of this very large amount of defense business to California on the ground that it should have been placed, geographically, in New York, because geographically New York is a big State, because it pays large amounts in income taxes, regardless of whether New York has the plant capability and the competence of personnel to handle such contracts?

Mr. KEATING. New York has the plant capability and the capability of personnel to handle contracts. Therefore, it should have had a larger share of the total business.

Let me make one thing very clear. Perhaps this will set the mind of the Senator from California at rest. I have nothing but the highest commendation for California and its representation in Congress, especially its present representation in this body, and for the very magnificent way in which they have built up the business in California and the way that the California congressional delegation have met, time after time, for this purpose, and are meeting, I understand, as late as today, for the purpose of endeavoring to meet the New York threat.

What I say to the Senator from California is that it is high time that the Members of Congress from New York and from Pennsylvania—I observe the distinguished junior Senator from Pennsylvania on the floor—States which have not properly shared in this business, become equally alert to what the great Senator from California is saying.

Mr. ENGLE. May I make one comment before the Senator from New

York yields to the Senator from Pennsylvania?

Mr. KEATING. Yes.

Mr. ENGLE. I am trying to ascertain whether the Senator from New York thinks that California has gotten these contracts by political skulduggery or whether he is willing to admit that we got them because, on a competitive basis, either by contract bidding or on negotiated competition, California has demonstrated competency and the plant capability of producing these items at the lowest possible cost to the taxpayers. Which is it? The Senator certainly is not implying, is he, that political skulduggery is at the crossroads? Therefore, it must be the competence of the personnel and facilities in California which caused the awarding of the contracts to California.

Mr. KEATING. There has been no mention of skulduggery by the junior Senator from New York. In fact, any mention of skulduggery has always emanated from the California side. This really puzzles me. I cannot understand it because there has never been any such allegation on the part of anyone I know of representing the State of New York. It would be quite unthinkable that skulduggery would be engaged in in order to get defense contracts.

Mr. ENGLE. California fears the political power of New York.

Mr. KEATING. I cannot see why. I commend the State of California and its chamber of commerce and other organizations for the magnificent work they have been doing in this field. All I am saying is that the State of New York, its organizations, and its representatives in Congress, had better "get on the ball" and perhaps take a leaf from the book of the representatives of California in this respect.

Mr. ENGLE. Perhaps the distinguished Senator should make his speech in New York rather than on the floor of the Senate. It troubles me when the distinguished Senator from New York makes a speech on the floor of the Senate which implies that there is something improper in the fact that California has gotten these contracts. We assert we got them on the basis of our merits—plant capability and the fact that people like to live in California.

If New York wants to compete with California, California will be glad to compete with New York. We will be glad to compete through bidding or on any other basis. We will be glad to compete for the construction of earth satellites on a negotiated bid basis, because it is necessary to negotiate such contracts since the cost of building satellites and experimenting with them is not known.

I am trying to determine whether the Senator from New York is claiming that someone other than the industries of New York themselves is at fault in failing to stand up and slug it out with California in competing for these contracts, which we are perfectly willing to do.

I call attention to the fact that the distinguished senior Senator from New York introduced a bill in the Senate which, it was stated, was directly aimed at California contracts. Further, we

read in the press that an indignation meeting was held in New York, and that for the first time in 40 years or more the entire New York delegation got together and agreed upon one piece of proposed legislation, aimed in one direction, namely, to take some of the business away from California.

California is not afraid of losing business on the basis of competition; we fear the political power of New York. Therefore, we are concerned about the Senator's statement. I am trying to determine whether the Senator is saying that what has occurred has been due to our competence or our political power.

Mr. KEATING. I must answer the Senator when he speaks to the effect that there is any direction of our efforts against California. I feel it is constructive to have had this first consensus, as the Senator from California puts it, in 40 years from the representatives of the State of New York on a piece of proposed legislation, and I am very proud to have had a hand in bringing about such a meeting.

What we are seeking in the proposed legislation is just as much applicable to Pennsylvania, New Jersey, or, indeed, California, as it is to any other State. It is to make certain that the taxpayers get a dollar's worth for every dollar they spend.

I have nothing but the highest praise for California and its aims. I cannot understand the injection of the reference to skulduggery. It begins to make New York wonder what has been taking place. Although I entirely negate any charge of that kind, it simply is bound to raise a question in anybody's mind, when, the minute one tries to get a fair share of businesses for his State, someone comes up and says, "You are trying to practice political skulduggery in the matter."

I now yield to the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. YOUNG of Ohio in the chair). The Senator from Pennsylvania is recognized to speak for Pennsylvania and, perhaps, for its neighboring State of Ohio.

Mr. SCOTT. I thank the Chair.

I command the distinguished Senator from New York. His encomiums upon his great State have almost persuaded me that he has an interest, perhaps, as a Senator from New York. Certainly, seriously speaking, he is a good Senator, and a good ambassador from his State; for, in fact, all of us are sometimes called ambassadors from our States.

With reference to the suggestion of the distinguished Senator from California that perhaps these commentaries might be reserved for our home States, one of the reasons we are here present is not only as ambassadors from our States, but as missionaries, also, to carry to the Central Government in Washington pleas for fairness and equal treatment; the plea, too, that our tax moneys shall not be sent to Washington and then be diverted so far away, in so many cases, that the money actually gets tired and may, in fact, lose some of its purchasing power if we are not careful.

I am very much aware of the virtues of the State of California. It is one of

the most wonderful States which comprise our Union. In fact, I am decidedly aware of it, for in 17 years in these legislative halls I have heard many debates and I have observed the passage of many acts to provide, in California, for irrigation, conservation, highways, public improvements, harbors, and port developments of an enormous character, due in part, I am sure, to the extraordinarily able activities and representation of the virtues of California by its representatives in both bodies of Congress.

But I wonder whether it is valid to argue to New York and to Pennsylvania that a greater share than the national average perhaps should go to some States because they, alone, have the necessary facilities, when one considers that those facilities have been made possible in such enormous amounts by the taxpayers of all the States. As I have at many times said to the distinguished Senator from California, I would go along with him in regard to many of his proposals, so long as he does not ask us to build a bridge from San Francisco to the nearly adjoining State of Hawaii. [Laughter.] I think there has to be some limit to the westward trek of the Pennsylvania and the New York dollars.

I am so proud of the Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING] in his comments on New York, that I am very happy that so much of Pennsylvania adjoins the State of New York. I would point out that perhaps in some ways Pennsylvania has a peculiar reason for wishing to be recognized more often in connection with the award of Government contracts and facilities, in that in our State there is a distressingly bad, chronic unemployment situation. Our shipyards stand ready to build ships; our factories stand ready to produce munitions; our other production and manufacturing facilities stand ready and waiting, and in some cases yawning wide, for opportunities to produce the materials which the Government needs in its civilian and its military programs.

So I am very glad the Senator from New York has brought up this matter. Of course, I do not speak in derogation of any other State. Instead, I speak in admiration of the facility with which certain of the States have been able to secure substantial parts of the Federal tax dollar. But, Mr. President, I ask them not to penalize us by using the fact that we have sent our moneys to help build their great States, as an argument that contracts should not also be awarded in our great States.

I am sure the Senator from California will recognize our concern in this regard. He has a great State, a growing State, a wonderful State. But in our State there is chronic unemployment; and we hope he will leave us a few people to continue to pay the taxes.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. YOUNG of Ohio in the chair). Does the Senator from New York yield to the Senator from California?

Mr. KEATING. I yield.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, I appreciate the courtesy of the distinguished Senator from New York in yielding, so

that I may comment on the remarks which have been made by the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania.

Our three States are the first taxpayers of the Nation. At present time New York is the first of all, although it will not be first very much longer.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I did not yield for that purpose. [Laughter.]

Mr. ENGLE. Because California is rapidly overtaking New York, both in population and in the payment of taxes.

According to the last figures, I think Pennsylvania was even with California, or perhaps a little ahead of California, in regard to the payment of taxes. But Pennsylvania is now behind California in population.

So here we are, all three of us.

What the Senator from New York and the Senator from Pennsylvania are complaining of is that California gets more of the defense business than their States do. The Senator from Pennsylvania says there are depressed areas in his State, and that there is unemployment there, and that, therefore, defense contracts should be awarded there. But I say, "No." If Pennsylvania has unemployment, certainly I want to help in that situation. I supported the depressed-areas bill which recently was passed by this body.

Mr. SCOTT. I know; and I am grateful that the Senator from California did.

Mr. ENGLE. And I joined with the junior Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING], I believe, and certainly with the senior Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS], in supporting that proposed legislation.

Mr. KEATING. The Senator from California did not join with me in supporting that measure, because I do not think such legislation is sound. However, we do not wish to debate that point now.

Mr. ENGLE. No. But I have supported legislation to help depressed areas.

Mr. SCOTT. So have I, although the bills may have been somewhat different.

Mr. ENGLE. But the defense program should be handled separately, as a defense program, on its merits and on a competitive basis, either by competitive bidding or by negotiated competition, which is necessary in some instances.

What I say to my good friends is that if they want to compete with us, we shall be glad to meet them. But we do not believe the defense program of the Nation should be used as a WPA program; and we do not believe the defense program and the defense procurement of the Nation should be allocated on a political or a geographical basis, in order to take care of States which happen to pay large portions of the Federal revenues.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, on that point, will the Senator from New York yield again to me?

Mr. KEATING. I yield.

Mr. SCOTT. I do not wish it to be understood that Pennsylvania is asking for a WPA program. Perish the thought. Heaven forbid. We have gone through that experience; and all of us have suffered its consequences.

We only ask that the unemployed in our State be given a chance to work and be given a fair distribution of Government contracts, so they may be enabled to work, and thereby may avoid the temptation of moving in the direction of the setting sun, in order to find employment. We think that is an undesirable situation for our State. Hence, my expression of concern.

I thank the distinguished Senator from New York for yielding to me; I appreciate it very much.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, I, too, thank the Senator from New York for yielding to me.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I appreciate the comments my colleagues have made in connection with my presentation; such interjections are all to the good.

I realize that the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania has a problem which is very similar to New York's problem; and I know how much he has been concerned about it. He has talked with me about it. It is a very serious problem.

The situation is not, as the Senator from California has suggested, that this matter is so much one about which complaint is made. The Senator from California has said that I am complaining about it. It is true that I am complaining; but, principally, I am trying to place in the RECORD the facts in connection with this matter; and the same is true of Connecticut, Ohio, Massachusetts, and a number of other States. These are facts which I hope the Department of Defense and others who are concerned with this problem will read in this RECORD. I am making these remarks, today, in order to get the facts before the public.

I wish to say, here and now—and this will be a little balm to my friend, the Senator from California; certainly I desire to be fair about this matter—that the figures I have been submitting, although official figures of the Department of Defense, must be interpreted with some caution. As the Department itself points out, these data on prime contracts do not provide any direct indication as to the State in which the actual production work is done. For the majority of contracts with manufacturers, the data reflect the location of the plant where the product is finally processed and assembled. They do not in any way reflect the distribution of the very substantial amount of material, component fabrication, and other subcontract work which may be done outside the State where final assembly or delivery takes place. It is clear from the overall figures, however, that New York is not getting its fair share of defense work.

At the same time, New York is being heavily discriminated against under various Federal grant-in-aid programs. In the same year that New York individuals and business firms paid to the Federal Government a total of \$15,348,079,000, or 19.19 percent of all Federal internal revenue collections in the United States, New York State received in Federal aid payments only \$482,102,000, which was only 6.5 percent of

total Federal aid payments. California received more—\$611,951,000; and Texas, which contributed less than 3.4 percent of total tax collections—compared to New York's 19.19 percent—received almost as much as New York, namely \$452,710,000, or 6.1 percent of total Federal aid payments.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KEATING. Having mentioned the great State of Texas, I am happy to yield to the distinguished Senator from Texas.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I thank the distinguished Senator from the Empire State of this country for yielding to me. Since he has mentioned the placing of defense contracts in my State, I should like to ask him to what year the statistics he is reading refer.

Mr. KEATING. I think perhaps the Senator misunderstood me. I had passed from the percentage of defense contracts. I was giving the figures on the percentage of taxes paid by the residents of the States as compared to the amount which they received on all Federal grant-in-aid programs. I had completed that portion of my remarks which related to defense contracts.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I should like to call the attention of the distinguished Senator from New York to the fact that my State is in the identical situation to that which faces the State of New York.

With reference to the plight of defense contracts being awarded to industries in States other than Texas, I call attention to the fact that a few years ago 9 percent of the people who were engaged in the aircraft manufacturing industry worked in my State. That is down to 6 percent now, despite the fact that the total number of people engaged in the aircraft industry has increased. The assembly lines which have been in my State are moving out of the State. The people formerly employed in them have taken less remunerative ways of making a living or have moved out of the State to places where the contracts are being placed.

In January or February of last year, the Department of the Navy closed down overhauling and repairing facilities at the Corpus Christi Naval Base. It had been costing the U.S. Government \$20 million a year to maintain those facilities. It was claimed that the closing down of those facilities would save the Government money. The hearings before the Preparedness Subcommittee proved that people were being hired in other parts of the country for that purpose, to the extent of \$9 million. A private contract had been let for work in Long Island, amounting to \$14 million, for the purpose of overhauling aircraft engines replacing the work which had previously been done at Corpus Christi.

During the first year the Federal Government was compelled to spend \$23 million to replace the work which had been done at Corpus Christi at a cost of \$20 million, and that did not include the cost of flying or shipping equipment and personnel. Planes which had been repaired in installations on the Pacific coast and the gulf coast will have to be moved far-

ther east for that work, at great additional cost. A helicopter installation at San Marcos, about 30 miles from the State capital, was closed down. The mere fact that installations are being closed down in Texas does not mean that money is being saved. The way people are moving out of the State because of the closing of these installations recalls the movement of settlers across the Sabine River to escape the invading Gen. Santa Ana until Sam Houston stopped him.

Mr. KEATING. So far as I know, none of those facilities has been moved to New York State.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. The Navy witnesses testified that a \$14 million overhaul and repair installation was being moved from Corpus Christi to Long Island.

Mr. KEATING. That is the best news I have heard in this debate.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I am glad the Senator brought that matter up. Modesty forbade me mentioning my State, because this is a body where all States are supposed to be treated equally. The evidence shows that there has been a discrimination against the State of Texas in the case of defense contracts and military installations.

Recently, an attempt was about to be made to close down Nike-Hercules installations. On that particular point, the distinguished Senator from Iowa [Mr. MARTIN] spoke of the necessity of keeping the Nike-Hercules as our defense weapon.

I desire to say that if the State of New York is being treated inequitably in the letting of defense contracts, certainly my State has not been the recipient of those contracts, because we are on the losing end.

Mr. KEATING. I am sorry the Senator from Texas was temporarily detained and was unable to be present when I had my colloquy with the Senator from California. I would have been glad to have had him as an ally. But I will say to the distinguished Senator from Texas that this is the first time I have heard in Congress that Texas had not gotten at least its fair share of everything. [Laughter in the galleries.]

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair informs the visitors in the galleries that they are guests of the Senate and that they will have to remain silent. No laughter or other manifestation will be tolerated.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I thank the distinguished Senator from New York for having yielded to me.

Mr. KEATING. I am very happy that I yielded to my friend from Texas.

Mr. President, I was dealing with the comparison of the percentage which New York and some of the other States pay in Federal taxes, and the percentage of the total internal revenue collections, with the amount which they receive from Federal programs.

Continuing on that point, if New York had received 19.19 percent of the total Federal aid payments of \$7,420,770,000—that is, the percentage of total internal revenue collections from New York—it would have received a total of \$1,424,-

065,000 in Federal aid payments, or \$941,963,000 more than was actually received; more than enough to have balanced its current budget without any increase in State taxes.

Under present programs, for every dollar New York received in Federal aid payments, it paid in over \$2.95, or for all practical purposes, \$3 paid in for every \$1 received. How does this compare with payments to other States?

Texas, for each dollar received in Federal aid, paid only 55 cents, Alabama 25 cents, Arkansas 15 cents, Tennessee 41 cents, Wyoming 14 cents, and North Dakota 11 cents. Only little Delaware paid more than New York for each dollar received.

It is distressing that the States with the most progressive records in dealing with their own needs have become the economic victims of Federal grant-in-aid programs. New York, for example, for decades has been in the vanguard of the States with regard to highway engineering and construction. It has been one of the most active States participating in the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways, the 41,000 mile National Highway System designed to meet the highway needs of local and interstate commerce, as well as national and civil defense.

It has already completed or has under way 719.7 miles of new highways, which represents 58.6 percent of its total share of the Interstate System, compared to 28.2 percent of the entire Nation's Interstate System being completed or under construction.

The disconcerting side to this picture is that of the 719.7 miles completed or under way in New York, only 143.8 have been financed out of Interstate funds, which is less mileage than has been financed by Federal funds in 19 other States.

In effect, New York—which contributes more than any other State to the funds for this program—is being taken advantage of for having taken steps on its own in connection with the New York Thruway. Certainly it is unfair for any State to be penalized for its initiative in this manner; and it is imperative, therefore, to a proper administration of the program that States like New York receive a form of equitable reimbursement for their early positive action. The most constructive measure would be to allow Federal payments up to 90 percent—the percentage under the act—for substitute mileage to be added to the system in place of completed highway mileage already approved for the Interstate Highway System. The present law, which does not contain such provisions, is a striking illustration of the manner in which local initiative can be discouraged by the operation of a Federal grant-in-aid program.

These statistics tell quite a story. In the baldest terms they plainly show that the people of New York are being short-changed by the Federal Government under these national programs. Because of my deep interest in the facts, I asked the Library of Congress to prepare a comparative summary, on a State-by-State basis, of all Federal internal revenue collections and all Federal aid payments.

I ask unanimous consent that this table be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

Federal internal revenue collections and Federal-aid payments, by States, fiscal year 1958¹

State	Federal Internal revenue collections		Federal aid payments		Estimated amount of Federal internal revenue collections in each State allocated for Federal-aid payments (thousands)	Estimated amount of Federal internal revenue collections each State contributes for each \$1 received in Federal-aid payments
	Amount (thousands)	Percent	Amount (thousands)	Percent		
Alabama	\$496,155	0.62	\$185,196	2.50	\$46,036	\$0.25
Arizona	235,036	.29	71,395	.96	21,808	.31
Arkansas	186,009	.23	112,521	1.52	17,259	.15
California	6,753,950	8.44	611,951	8.25	626,662	1.02
Colorado	905,357	1.13	129,025	1.74	84,003	.65
Connecticut	1,398,277	1.75	71,446	.96	129,739	1.82
Delaware	784,815	.98	15,876	.21	72,819	4.59
Florida	1,094,513	1.37	149,794	2.02	101,554	.68
Georgia	846,084	1.06	191,042	2.57	78,504	.41
Idaho	134,826	.17	47,588	.64	12,510	.26
Illinois	6,478,405	8.10	284,860	3.84	601,096	2.11
Indiana	1,798,028	2.25	120,492	1.62	166,829	1.38
Iowa	625,272	.78	155,198	2.09	58,016	.37
Kansas	546,418	.68	106,339	1.43	50,699	.48
Kentucky	1,539,590	1.92	123,864	1.67	142,850	1.15
Louisiana	691,591	.86	177,006	2.39	64,169	.36
Maine	191,286	.24	39,391	.53	17,748	.45
Maryland and District of Columbia	1,871,897	2.34	158,196	2.13	173,683	1.10
Massachusetts	2,194,763	2.74	188,641	2.54	203,640	1.08
Michigan	6,198,156	7.75	248,527	3.35	575,093	2.31
Minnesota	1,245,617	1.56	142,967	1.93	115,574	.72
Mississippi	176,473	.22	136,593	1.84	16,374	.12
Missouri	1,892,308	2.37	244,439	3.29	175,577	.72
Montana	138,940	.17	53,071	.72	12,891	.24
Nebraska	444,234	.56	102,827	1.39	41,218	.40
Nevada	109,986	.14	25,538	.34	10,205	.40
New Hampshire	148,751	.19	27,504	.37	13,802	.50
New Jersey	2,420,308	3.03	119,565	1.61	224,567	1.88
New Mexico	157,411	.20	89,810	1.21	14,605	.16
New York	15,348,079	19.19	482,102	6.50	1,424,065	2.95
North Carolina	1,857,559	2.32	170,161	2.29	172,353	1.01
North Dakota	88,472	.11	73,201	.99	8,209	.11
Ohio	5,355,654	6.70	287,981	3.88	496,222	1.73
Oklahoma	817,388	1.02	183,193	2.47	75,841	.41
Oregon	472,025	.59	102,716	1.38	43,797	.43
Pennsylvania	5,804,794	7.26	294,679	3.97	538,595	1.83
Rhode Island	312,963	.39	44,428	.60	29,038	.65
South Carolina	287,511	.36	90,955	1.23	26,677	.29
South Dakota	87,999	.11	66,651	.90	8,165	.12
Tennessee	622,225	.78	141,049	1.90	57,733	.41
Texas	2,697,309	3.37	452,710	6.10	250,269	.55
Utah	200,622	.25	51,170	.69	18,559	.36
Vermont	76,641	.10	20,364	.27	7,111	.35
Virginia	1,239,931	1.55	100,161	1.35	115,046	1.15
Washington	931,643	1.16	138,503	1.87	86,442	.62
West Virginia	334,804	.42	65,301	.88	31,065	.48
Wisconsin	1,462,224	1.83	123,095	1.66	135,672	1.10
Wyoming	71,724	.09	48,137	.65	6,655	.14
Others ²	205,052	.26	353,551	4.76	19,026	.05
Total	79,978,476	100.00	7,420,770	100.00	7,420,770	

¹ Alaska and Hawaii are included in the table in the category "Others."

² "Others" includes Alaska, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, and other U.S. Territories, and amounts not detailed by States.

NOTE.—This table has been prepared specifically to respond to inquiries for a comparison of Federal tax collections in each of the States and the amount of collections returned to each of these States in the form of Federal aid payments. The internal revenue collections, as reported by the Internal Revenue Service for the collection districts, are used. There has been no effort to measure the extent to which the taxes collected in one State are borne by residents of another State.

Sources: (1) Federal internal revenue collections, U.S. Treasury Department, combined statement of receipts, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1958. (2) Federal-aid payments, Annual Report of the Secretary of the Treasury for the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 1958. The data presented here include (a) aid payments made to States and local units within the States, and (b) aid payments to individuals, etc. within the States. (3) Estimated amounts of Federal internal revenue collections in each State allocated for Federal-aid payments. These estimates were made by multiplying collections by the percentage constant 9.27845 percent. This constant is the percentage of total internal revenue collections (\$79,978,476,000) represented by Federal-aid payments (\$7,420,770,000). (4) Estimated amounts of Federal internal revenue collections each State contributes for each \$1 received in Federal aid payments. These estimates were computed by dividing for each State, the estimates in the preceding column by the Federal-aid payments to that State.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, the situation may be viewed from a slightly different angle by analyzing the source of revenues of the individual States—how much came from their own citizens through taxes and State and local charges and how much from Federal payments to the State. In 1957, total revenues of New York State and local governments amounted to \$4,553,969,000. Of this total 38.5 percent was derived from property taxes, 42.8 percent from other taxes, 13.1 percent from State and local charges, and only 5.6 percent from the Federal Government. Only two States derived a smaller share of

their general revenues from the Federal Government in 1957; New Jersey, with 4.7 percent and Connecticut with 5.4 percent. At the other end of the scale Wyoming received 24.8 percent of its general revenues from the Federal Government, New Mexico 22.6 and Alabama 29.9 percent. On a per capita basis, New York in 1957 ranked 2d among all the States in total State and local taxes collected from its residents, but 44th in the per capita revenues from the Federal Government.

Mr. President, I know that Senators will be interested in the figures for their

States and I, therefore, ask unanimous consent that a summary prepared by the U.S. Bureau of the Census showing the

source of general revenues of all State and local governments be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

STATE AND LOCAL GOVERNMENT FINANCES

General revenue of State and local governments, by source, by States: 1957

State	Amounts (in thousands of dollars)							Percent						
	Total	From Federal Government	General revenue from own sources					Total	From Federal Government	General revenue from own sources				
			Total	Taxes			Charges and miscellaneous			Total	From Federal Government	Taxes		
Continental United States	38,162,123	3,843,164	34,318,959	28,803,257	12,850,649	15,952,608	5,515,697	100.0	10.1	75.5	33.7	41.8	14.5	
Alabama	510,936	101,679	409,257	319,166	64,085	255,081	90,091	100.0	19.9	62.4	12.5	49.9	17.6	
Arizona	262,934	33,691	229,243	183,103	84,911	98,192	46,141	100.0	12.8	69.6	32.3	37.3	17.5	
Arkansas	268,694	50,519	218,175	178,716	47,272	131,444	39,460	100.0	18.8	66.5	17.6	48.9	14.7	
California	4,358,853	465,061	3,893,772	3,301,496	1,554,633	1,746,863	592,276	100.0	10.7	75.8	35.7	40.1	13.6	
Colorado	451,087	66,559	384,528	313,822	159,251	154,581	70,696	100.0	14.8	69.6	35.3	34.3	15.7	
Connecticut	559,612	30,359	529,253	464,624	233,706	230,918	64,628	100.0	5.4	83.1	41.8	41.3	11.3	
Delaware	89,721	8,149	81,572	58,752	14,102	44,650	22,818	100.0	9.1	65.5	15.7	49.8	25.4	
District of Columbia	194,750	35,133	159,617	143,258	52,766	90,492	16,359	100.0	18.0	73.6	27.1	46.5	8.4	
Florida	924,209	89,432	834,777	671,124	239,795	431,329	163,653	100.0	9.7	72.6	25.9	46.7	17.7	
Georgia	677,870	97,105	580,765	467,328	133,422	333,906	113,437	100.0	14.3	69.0	19.7	49.3	16.7	
Idaho	146,476	23,394	123,082	99,973	50,059	49,914	23,109	100.0	16.0	68.3	34.2	34.1	15.8	
Illinois	2,116,375	146,108	1,970,267	1,740,745	906,038	834,707	229,523	100.0	6.9	82.2	42.8	39.4	10.8	
Indiana	828,327	56,537	771,790	638,553	351,004	287,549	133,239	100.0	6.8	77.1	42.4	34.7	16.1	
Iowa	638,149	61,984	576,165	490,727	240,517	250,210	85,438	100.0	9.7	76.9	37.7	39.2	13.4	
Kansas	495,399	58,019	437,380	370,115	215,237	154,878	67,265	100.0	11.7	74.7	43.4	31.3	13.6	
Kentucky	459,914	66,536	393,378	326,704	119,605	207,099	66,675	100.0	14.5	71.0	26.0	45.0	14.5	
Louisiana	795,937	117,369	678,568	499,704	109,568	390,136	178,864	100.0	14.7	62.8	13.8	49.0	22.5	
Maine	188,022	22,057	165,965	145,126	74,694	70,432	20,838	100.0	11.7	77.2	39.7	37.5	11.1	
Maryland	600,031	51,823	548,208	457,477	192,085	265,392	90,731	100.0	8.6	76.2	32.0	44.2	15.1	
Massachusetts	1,218,069	87,886	1,130,183	1,014,657	587,303	427,354	115,525	100.0	7.2	83.3	48.2	35.1	9.5	
Michigan	1,809,482	142,921	1,666,561	1,395,625	643,597	752,028	270,936	100.0	7.9	77.2	35.6	41.6	15.0	
Minnesota	804,901	79,242	725,659	596,287	207,021	289,266	129,371	100.0	9.8	74.0	38.1	35.9	16.1	
Mississippi	346,976	59,094	287,882	235,184	65,543	169,641	52,698	100.0	17.0	67.8	18.9	48.9	15.2	
Missouri	769,472	128,159	641,313	535,028	244,064	308,964	88,284	100.0	16.7	71.9	31.7	40.2	11.5	
Montana	185,071	32,774	152,297	125,996	73,559	52,437	26,302	100.0	17.7	68.0	39.7	28.3	14.2	
Nebraska	281,020	33,764	247,256	202,211	141,844	60,367	45,045	100.0	12.0	72.0	50.5	21.5	16.0	
Nevada	93,789	16,339	77,450	60,062	21,780	38,282	17,386	100.0	17.4	64.0	23.2	40.8	18.5	
New Hampshire	112,459	10,451	102,008	87,206	54,852	32,354	14,802	100.0	9.3	77.6	48.8	28.8	13.2	
New Jersey	1,201,051	56,017	1,145,034	978,422	623,417	355,005	166,612	100.0	4.7	81.5	51.9	29.6	13.9	
New Mexico	240,486	54,214	186,272	128,086	29,575	98,511	58,185	100.0	22.6	53.3	12.3	41.0	24.2	
New York	4,553,969	254,179	4,299,700	3,720,839	1,754,784	1,948,055	596,950	100.0	5.6	81.3	38.5	42.8	13.1	
North Carolina	727,062	117,376	609,686	503,323	135,250	308,073	106,363	100.0	16.1	69.2	18.6	50.6	14.6	
North Dakota	167,073	20,614	146,459	107,490	56,665	50,825	38,968	100.0	12.3	64.3	33.9	30.4	23.3	
Ohio	1,844,931	147,232	1,697,699	1,408,327	678,169	730,158	289,372	100.0	8.0	76.4	36.8	39.6	15.7	
Oklahoma	526,316	91,972	434,344	346,929	105,657	241,272	87,415	100.0	17.5	65.9	20.1	45.8	16.6	
Oregon	483,784	67,150	416,634	349,785	148,607	201,178	66,850	100.0	13.9	72.3	30.7	41.6	13.8	
Pennsylvania	2,170,568	139,851	2,030,717	1,722,478	588,824	1,833,654	258,239	100.0	6.4	81.6	27.1	54.5	11.9	
Rhode Island	164,699	20,155	144,544	130,116	63,572	64,544	14,428	100.0	12.2	79.0	39.8	39.2	8.8	
South Carolina	353,872	46,799	307,073	245,981	56,668	189,313	61,092	100.0	13.2	69.5	16.0	53.5	17.3	
South Dakota	167,683	27,536	140,147	114,228	67,413	46,815	25,920	100.0	16.4	68.1	40.2	27.9	15.5	
Tennessee	569,876	80,894	488,982	406,672	119,193	287,479	82,311	100.0	14.2	71.3	20.9	50.4	14.4	
Texas	1,826,485	233,680	1,592,805	1,257,016	579,106	677,910	335,788	100.0	12.8	68.8	31.7	37.1	18.4	
Utah	192,103	27,933	164,170	136,680	59,739	76,941	27,490	100.0	14.5	71.2	31.1	40.1	14.3	
Vermont	84,591	10,998	73,593	65,628	29,928	35,700	7,964	100.0	13.0	77.6	35.4	42.2	9.4	
Virginia	686,274	66,196	620,078	503,819	161,575	342,244	116,259	100.0	9.6	73.4	23.5	49.9	16.9	
Washington	722,378	81,025	641,353	512,639	151,778	360,861	128,715	100.0	11.2	71.0	21.0	50.0	17.8	
West Virginia	295,539	37,560	257,979	220,014	55,680	164,334	37,965	100.0	12.7	74.4	18.8	55.6	12.8	
Wisconsin	886,460	62,711	823,760	711,210	369,462	341,748	112,558	100.0	7.1	80.3	41.7	38.6	12.7	
Wyoming	108,368	26,908	81,460	60,796	31,274	29,522	20,663	100.0	24.8	56.1	28.9	27.2	10.1	

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, "State and Local Government Finances in 1957" (CGA-No. 8). February 1959.

NOTE.—Local government amounts are preliminary, in part representing estimates subject to sampling variation; see text. Because of rounding, detail may not add to total.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent that a similar chart showing the per capita amounts of general revenue of State and local governments, by States, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

Per capita amounts of general revenue of State and local governments, by States: 1957

State	Per capita amounts ¹						State rank according to per capita amount of—					
	All general revenue	Revenue from Federal Government	All State and local taxes	Property tax	Other (non-property) taxes	Charges and miscellaneous general revenue	All general revenue	Revenue from Federal Government	All State and local taxes	Property tax	Other (non-property) taxes	Charges and miscellaneous general revenue
Continental United States	\$224,10	\$22,57	\$169,14	\$75,46	\$93,68	\$32,39	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)
Median State	227,09	25,47	160,98	77,61	88,51	31,34	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)
Alabama	161.59	32.16	100.94	20.27	80.67	28.49	44	14	48	49	31	32
Arizona	243.91	31.25	169.86	78.77	91.09	42.80	14	16	20	23	20	8
Arkansas	150.95	28.38	100.40	26.56	73.84	22.17	47	20	49	47	41	43
California	314.06	33.51	237.87	112.01	125.86	42.67	3	12	1	2	4	9
Colorado	271.25	40.02	188.71	95.76	92.95	42.51	8	7	8	11	17	10
Connecticut	246.63	13.38	204.77	103.00	101.77	28.48	13	46	5	6	13	33
Delaware	206.73	18.78	135.37	32.49	102.88	52.58	30	36	38	43	11	6
District of Columbia	237.50	42.85	174.71	64.35	110.36	19.95	17	5	18	30	8	47
Florida	219.58	21.25	159.45	56.97	102.48	38.88	26	33	26	33	12	13
Georgia	179.76	25.75	123.93	35.38	88.55	30.08	40	24	41	41	23	28
Idaho	227.09	36.27	155.00	77.61	77.39	35.83	25	11	29	25	37	19
Illinois	218.21	15.06	179.48	93.42	86.00	23.66	27	45	14	14	27	40

¹ Computation based on estimated population as of July 1, 1957; see table 14.

² Not applicable.

Per capita amounts of general revenue of State and local governments, by States: 1957—Continued

State	Per capita amounts ¹						State rank according to per capita amount of—					
	All general revenue	Revenue from Federal Government	All State and local taxes	Property tax	Other (non-property taxes)	Charges and miscellaneous general revenue	All general revenue	Revenue from Federal Government	All State and local taxes	Property tax	Other (non-property taxes)	Charges and miscellaneous general revenue
Indiana.....	\$183.79	\$12.54	\$141.68	\$77.88	\$63.80	\$29.56	38	48	35	24	46	30
Iowa.....	229.30	22.27	176.33	86.42	89.91	30.70	22	31	16	17	21	26
Kansas.....	235.90	27.63	176.24	102.49	73.75	32.03	18	21	17	7	42	22
Kentucky.....	151.14	21.87	107.36	39.30	68.06	21.91	46	32	46	38	44	44
Louisiana.....	259.60	38.28	162.99	35.74	127.25	58.34	10	10	23	40	3	5
Maine.....	200.24	23.49	154.56	79.55	75.01	22.19	32	30	30	22	39	42
Maryland.....	207.26	17.90	158.02	66.35	91.67	31.34	29	40	27	29	18	25
Massachusetts.....	252.34	18.21	210.20	121.67	88.53	23.94	12	39	4	1	24	37
Michigan.....	234.85	18.55	181.13	83.53	97.60	35.16	19	37	12	19	14	20
Minnesota.....	242.59	23.88	179.71	92.53	87.18	38.99	15	26	13	15	26	12
Mississippi.....	160.19	27.28	108.58	30.26	78.32	24.33	45	22	45	44	35	36
Missouri.....	181.56	30.24	130.49	57.59	72.90	20.83	39	17	40	32	43	46
Montana.....	275.81	43.84	187.78	109.63	78.15	39.20	7	4	10	4	36	11
Nebraska.....	195.56	23.50	140.72	98.71	42.01	31.35	36	28	36	8	49	24
Nevada.....	357.97	62.36	229.24	83.13	146.11	66.36	1	3	3	20	1	2
New Hampshire.....	196.26	18.24	162.19	95.73	56.46	25.83	35	38	33	12	48	34
New Jersey.....	213.82	9.97	174.19	110.99	63.20	29.66	28	49	19	3	47	29
New Mexico.....	295.80	66.68	157.55	36.38	121.17	71.57	4	2	28	39	5	1
New York.....	282.01	15.74	229.31	108.67	120.64	36.97	5	44	2	5	6	17
North Carolina.....	162.58	26.25	112.55	30.24	82.31	23.78	43	23	43	45	30	39
North Dakota.....	259.03	31.96	166.65	87.85	78.80	60.42	11	15	21	16	34	4
Ohio.....	200.41	15.99	152.98	73.67	79.31	31.43	31	43	32	27	33	23
Oklahoma.....	233.19	40.75	153.71	46.81	106.90	38.73	20	6	31	36	10	14
Oregon.....	277.56	38.53	200.68	85.26	115.42	38.35	6	9	6	18	7	15
Pennsylvania.....	197.13	12.70	160.98	53.48	107.50	23.45	34	47	25	35	9	41
Rhode Island.....	192.18	23.52	151.82	76.51	75.31	16.84	37	27	34	26	38	49
South Carolina.....	149.44	19.76	103.88	23.93	79.95	25.80	49	34	47	48	32	35
South Dakota.....	241.97	39.73	164.83	97.28	67.55	37.40	16	8	22	10	45	16
Tennessee.....	165.52	23.50	118.12	34.62	83.50	23.91	42	29	42	42	29	38
Texas.....	199.07	25.47	137.01	63.12	73.89	36.60	33	25	37	31	40	18
Utah.....	228.60	33.25	162.72	71.12	91.60	32.73	23	13	24	28	19	21
Vermont.....	228.62	29.72	177.38	80.89	96.49	21.52	24	19	15	21	15	45
Virginia.....	179.28	17.29	131.62	42.21	89.41	30.37	41	41	39	37	22	27
Washington.....	265.09	29.73	188.15	55.70	132.43	47.23	9	15	9	34	2	7
West Virginia.....	180.55	19.13	112.08	28.36	83.72	19.34	48	35	44	46	28	48
Wisconsin.....	229.60	16.24	184.47	95.69	88.51	29.15	21	42	11	13	25	31
Wyoming.....	341.85	84.88	191.79	98.66	93.13	65.18	2	1	7	9	16	3

NOTE.—Local government amounts are preliminary, in part representing estimates subject to sampling variation; see text. Because of rounding, detail may not add to total.

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census. "State and Local Government Finances in 1957." (G-CGA-No. 8). February 1959.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, this is in no sense just a New York problem. The present situation should be cause for concern among all those who still believe that the ends of democracy are best served by a government closest to the people.

In the early years of the 20th century, less than one-third of all governmental expenditures were made by the Federal Government, and two-thirds by the States and local governments. Now these proportions are almost reversed. While this trend may be attributed in considerable measure to the increasing needs of national defense, a substantial contributing factor is the constant extension of Federal domestic programs.

Federal aid to State and local governments now averages almost 20 percent of general expenditures at the State level. In four States—Arkansas, Missouri, Nevada, and Wyoming—Federal grants and shared revenue is equal to more than one-third of the State's total general expenditures. In Alabama, Federal grants and shared revenues constitute more than 26 percent of all State expenditures; in Kentucky, over 27 percent; in Mississippi, over 27 percent; in Texas, over 22 percent, and in West Virginia, over 24 percent. And, in New York, 14 percent. These figures show dramatically the extent to which the Federal Government has taken over financial responsibilities of the States.

The heavy dependence of the States of the Union on Federal funds is a matter of national concern, and dangerous to our Federal system. The dispersion of

power set forth in our fundamental law is seriously undermined when the Federal Government becomes involved in such a large financial investment in individual States. The trend is bound to encourage domination and control by the National Government and the weakening of State and local initiative. Moreover, the process is a mushrooming one, since the greater the drain on local tax sources by the Federal Government to pay for these grants, the less individual States will be able to meet their problems out of their own resources.

The drain on the resources of New York caused by Federal grant-in-aid programs would be a serious enough problem by itself, but it is compounded by other demands on the States made by the Federal Government. One of these is the result of the large property holdings of the United States. Particularly since World War II, the Federal Government has gone so far into the real estate business that a good many local communities have found their tax revenues seriously impaired by the exemption traditionally accorded Federal property. At the crux of this problem is the fact that much of this real property consists of valuable urban and suburban locations which would normally contribute generously in local taxes and which impose a proportionately high burden in local services and facilities.

This condition could be rectified by having the Federal Government make a payment in lieu of taxes to the local community with respect to such property. It has long been my opinion that

when any Federal property, excluding only property devoted exclusively to strictly governmental purposes, enjoys the benefit of local services, it should contribute its fair share of local taxes. Legislation to this end has been pending in Congress for more than a decade. Approval of such a principle would at least partially restore to the States ability to support local programs in accordance with their own needs and desires and out of their own revenues.

Serious consideration actually has been given during this session of Congress to legislation which would have just the reverse effect on New York by limiting its taxing powers even further. I refer to Senate Joint Resolutions 29 and 67 which would prohibit New York from collecting any tax on income earned in the State by nonresidents. The importance of this proposal is underscored by the fact that more than \$30 million annually is produced by such taxes on the approximately 190,000 persons affected.

The validity of such taxes was established in *Travis v. Yale & Towne Mfg. Co.*, 252 U.S. 60; and *Shaffer v. Carte*, 252 U.S. 37, both decided in 1920. The Court pointed out in those cases that the States assume and perform the duty of preserving all persons, property and business within their borders and, in consequence, must enjoy the power to resort to reasonable forms of taxation to require all such persons and interests to contribute to the expenses of government. In the recent case of *Goodwin v. State Tax Commission*, 1

N.Y. 2d 680, App. dismissed 352 U.S. 805, the Court specifically sustained the provisions of the New York law which grant to nonresidents less favorable deductions than those extended to residents on the ground that a classification of deductions based on residence was reasonable.

I do not contend that the existence of such a broad power necessarily requires or justifies its full exercise. It is my judgment, however, that the deprivation of this power by the Federal Government through a constitutional amendment would be an unconscionable interference with the taxing power of the respective States. Moreover, when it is considered that a substantial majority of the States have income tax laws, and that under all these laws the income within the State of nonresidents is taxed, it is evident that such action would benefit only a small minority of the country at the expense of the rest of the country.

Such examples of actual or threatened action by the Federal Government tending to undermine the fiscal independence and integrity of the States can be easily multiplied. Perhaps the most egregious of all in recent years is the so-called area redevelopment bill referred to here today, which I believe can more accurately be described as the area dislocation bill.

Every person is concerned over conditions which exist in the economically depressed areas of our Nation. One of the major causes of such distress in the Northeast has been the migration of industry to the South. It is incredible, under these circumstances, to propose legislation as a solution to such problems which would actually accelerate the further movement of industry from this part of the Nation. As if this were not enough, as is typical in such legislation, New York and other Northeastern States, the very States which stand to lose the most from this legislation, would be forced to pay their usual high share of the expense of the program. A better example of the conflict between New York's and the Federal Government's apparent economic interests could not be conceived.

Mr. President, I believe that a complete reevaluation by Congress of the economic relationship between the Federal and State Governments can no longer be delayed. Much spade-work has already been done. The National Study Commission on Intergovernmental Relations under the leadership of Meyer Kestenbaum submitted its report on the subject almost 4 years ago. The President, in an effort to carry forward this work, appointed former Gov. Howard Pyle, of Arizona, a Special Deputy for Intergovernmental Relations. President Eisenhower was instrumental also in creating a Joint Federal-State Action Committee composed of high ranking State and Federal officials. This Committee is now functioning, and has already made some recommendations for action in this field.

The time has come for positive steps by Congress. We must do our part in implementing the work of these special

commissions and executive agencies. There have been enough background studies and statistical reports. We should be ready now to come to grips with the specific legislative measures necessary to remove the discriminatory features of these programs and to curb their ever increasing scope.

It would be helpful to consider some of the basic considerations which must guide us in this job. We cannot hope successfully to cope with the far reaching problems in this area unless we first determine our objectives and standards.

I believe that any such undertaking must be premised first of all on the assumption that our Republic derives its strength from the bond of responsible State governments. This means that the Federal Government must avoid encroachment on the activities and resources of local governments. It means also that the States must be ready to fulfill pressing public needs demanded by our citizens. As was said in the First Progress Report of the Joint Federal-State Action Committee:

The degree to which the States satisfy the governmental needs of modern society determines in large measure the strength of the whole system.

We must also avoid any suggestion that reevaluation of Federal-State programs in this area is designed to encourage retrenchment. Much of the work on this problem can be accomplished without disturbing in any way the scope of the programs involved. Our primary goal should be a redistribution of responsibility, not a diminution of services. I do not say that all the programs involved are sacred. I do say, let us not confuse the merits of these programs with the fundamental problems involved in their proper administration.

A third assumption on which I believe we must proceed is that it is undesirable for any Federal program to be fashioned in a manner which takes undue advantage of the people of any one of the States. In my opinion, present policies require New York to contribute more than its fair share to support certain areas of the Nation favored under the present programs. It is doubtful whether the country as a whole will benefit in the long run from a continuation of this disparity. Any policies which curb or shackle the development of New York and impede its independent growth will harm not only the Empire State, but ultimately the entire Nation, which it serves as a commercial and industrial hub.

The operation of a Federal program in a way which penalizes any State because of the initiative it has taken to provide for the needs of its people should give us pause. I cannot believe that this is a necessary consequence of appropriate Federal action. It may be an inevitable consequence, however, of too much Federal control and participation in welfare programs which should be primarily State responsibilities. All the States of the Union, of course, must be prepared to contribute to the maintenance of certain national standards and goals. The danger point is reached,

however, when such contributions are forced at a rate or in a manner which undermines the fiscal soundness of some for the benefit of others. Any such trend has moral as well as economic consequences which deserve our most earnest consideration.

I believe it would be desirable to write into Federal laws in this field a definite statement of the purpose and duration of the particular program. This is necessary to avoid indefinite extension of such Federal activities as a result of legislative inertia and bureaucratic pressures. We all know from personal experience the tremendous difficulties which are faced whenever an effort is made to terminate any Federal activity once it is set in motion, no matter how limited and temporary the impetus for the program may have been originally.

It is therefore vitally important, as the Joint Federal-State Action Committee has recommended, that built-in mechanisms be included in all Federal grant-in-aid programs to prevent continuing operating responsibilities by the Federal Government in spheres properly State and local in scope. The Federal Government can and should stimulate State action necessary to meet national objectives and provide the people with needed services. But safeguards should be included whenever appropriate, to make certain that such grants retain their character as stimulants and do not become permanent operating responsibilities of a centralized bureaucracy.

It must be the objective of action in this area to restore to the States not only the desire but the ability to assume their burdens. Present Federal tax policies make it virtually impossible for the States to raise the necessary revenue to support these programs without subjecting their residents to onerous taxes. A definite adjustment in this situation, therefore, is a necessary condition to any effective measures.

Immediate attention should be given to determining tax sources which might be relinquished by the National Government and absorbed by State and local governments. Several possibilities already have been suggested. The most widely discussed involves the local telephone service tax now levied by the Federal Government. This tax is regarded as particularly appropriate for at least partial transfer to the States because of the wide and uniform distribution of tax source over the country and because of the unlikelihood of State differentials developing.

It is interesting to consider the effects of this proposal on the revenue of the State. Under the most conservative of the suggested alternatives, under which 3 percentage points of the present 10 percent tax would be uniformly distributed and an additional percentage distributed under the control of the Secretary of the Treasury, over \$147,500,000 would be yielded to the States. It has been suggested that this plan be combined with assumption by the States of the present Federal share for vocational education and waste treatment construc-

tion programs. If this were done it would mean that New York taxpayers would save more than \$11 million which they now contribute to the support of these programs, without any change in their scope. The incredible fact is that this is almost twice the amount which New York now receives in total from the Federal Government as its share of these programs.

Mr. President, it is time Congress did something to implement these considerations. While I have discussed a lot of figures in my remarks, much more than a matter of dollars and cents is involved here. The problems in this field go to the very core of our democratic system. They concern the fundamental concept of our country as a union of sovereign States joined together for their common welfare but forever retaining their separate identities and responsibilities. The strength of our body politic is derived from this diffusion of power and sovereignty. It will be preserved to the extent that we curb the tendency to follow the easy example of other nations toward more and more centralized control over the fate and fortune of our citizens.

The task before us is too great to be superimposed upon any congressional committee already weighted down with the consideration of problems within its jurisdiction. Moreover, this task must be approached from an overall point of view and not from a position already oriented in favor of or against any particular interest or program. Accordingly, I propose the creation of a new Joint Committee of Congress on Federal-State Relations with jurisdiction to conduct a comprehensive study of the problems in this area and with a mandate to recommend to the Congress within a prescribed period of time a definite program for action. I will introduce a specific resolution for this purpose in the very near future. I hope that before too long we can start on the vital work which needs to be done to restore a proper balance to Federal-State economic relations.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. YOUNG of Ohio in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, in executive session, I move that the Senate adjourn in accordance with the order previously entered.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 55 minutes p.m.) the Senate, in executive session, adjourned, under the order previously entered, until Monday, June 8, 1959, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate June 5, 1959:

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY

James Henry Wakelin, Jr., of New Jersey, to be Assistant Secretary of the Navy, vice Fred A. Bantz, elevated.

IN THE REGULAR ARMY

The following-named officers for promotion in the Regular Army of the United States, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3284 and 3299. All officers are subject to physical examination required by law.

TO BE LIEUTENANT COLONEL, MEDICAL CORPS

Pope, John J., O31214.

TO BE LIEUTENANT COLONELS, DENTAL CORPS

Bascom, Perry W., O25171.

Bunnell, James B., Jr., O31074.

Burke, Allyn D., O78039.

Burnett, George W., O39499.

Campbell, John L., O38863.

Enmeier, James M., O43168.

Fisher, William T., O43171.

Frank, Ogden M., O31101.

Jordan, John E., O38859.

Kirchoff, Arnold W., O31146.

Lang, Norbert S., O31062.

Mosgrove, Richard L., O38880.

Mosley, George W., O43175.

Olsen, Edmund S., Jr., O31071.

Rudisill, John W., Jr., O31128.

Sausier, Clare W., O26444.

Shaver, Robert C., Jr., O78614.

Weeks, Rubert A., O52011.

TO BE LIEUTENANT COLONELS, VETERINARY CORPS

Allison, Aaron F., O31016.

Anslow, Ralph O., O31093.

Coburn, George C., O31025.

Fechner, Walter W., O31033.

Gould, Clinton L., O40116.

Horn, Wiley H., O31078.

Manges, Joseph D., O31055.

Robertson, Harry J., O23683.

Rubin, Harvey L., O52006.

Sunderville, Edwin J., O23335.

TO BE LIEUTENANT COLONELS, MEDICAL SERVICE CORPS

Austin, William L., O37403.

Behrens, Donald H., O37400.

Bouton, Arthur G., O31306.

Brown, Eugene T., O37398.

Chapelle, Francis C., O37399.

Dean, James W., O31300.

Evans, Murray F., O31296.

Frick, Lyman P., O43239.

Gott, William E., O37405.

Hastings, Frederick W., O31313.

Helsel, Wilford P., O37391.

Jones, Herman A., Jr., O31312.

Leivovitz, Albert, O37407.

Marsh, Edwin S., O31307.

Mastrolia, Anthony C., O43244.

Meagher, Harvey E., Jr., O31305.

Nelson, Francis C., O31314.

Noe, Herbert A., O31299.

Olson, Clarence T., O39323.

Pacey, William A., O31323.

Quackenbush, Robert O., O31317.

Richek, Herbert G., O40139.

Wagnon, Glen B., O56201.

Zachar, Martin, Jr., O37388.

TO BE MAJORS, MEDICAL CORPS

Arzola, Asdrubal, O67785.

Barila, Timothy G., O64939.

Borski, Anthony A., O65443.

Bridgeford, Otis E., O65450.

Brown, Paul W., O64946.

Daniels, John R., O65460.

Delia, Claude W., O64952.

Dimond, Francis C., Jr., O65682.

Eaves, Charles C., O65577.

Eberlin, Eugene W., O67813.

Esses, Henry A., O69916.

Ewart, James A., O65449.

Grant, Arthur E., O64960.

Hamilton, Richard D., O65681.

Hopeman, Alan R., O65455.

Hudson, Heber S., O65446.

Kellenberger, Robert E., O64962.

Kleinmann, Mortimer V., Jr., O64975.

Kovaric, John J., O69965.

Langsjoen, Per H., O64949.

McLeod, Donald G., Jr., O65445.

Metzger, Joseph F., O64940.

Mueller, Harold W., O65451.

Nitz, Robert E., O70003.

Parrish, Matthew D., O65447.

Pope, James K., O64941.

Reeve, Arnold M., O65453.

Schanzer, Stephan N., O65465.

Schwamb, Halbert H., O67954.

Shafer, James A., O65464.

Sheffler, Paul W., O65459.

Silberman, Henry K., O66099.

Silverman, Leo H., O65435.

Simmons, John R., O64972.

Stalker, Daniel E., O64959.

Stelter, Grant D., O68052.

Sulak, Michael H., O64951.

Switzer, Walter E., O65442.

Syner, James C., O65462.

Tunberg, Clarence L., O65680.

Vineyard, William R., O64954.

Wright, Lloyd T., O65457.

TO BE MAJORS, VETERINARY CORPS

Bridenstine, William A., O63225.

Carter, Leland B., O69878.

Lampru, Paul D., O84818.

Meckstroth, Leslie E., O65538.

Mehner, Erich C., O68385.

Miller, Walter W., O65541.

Morgan, Richard B., O65540.

Nossov, Gabriel, O63223.

Ott, Bruce S., O66064.

Rothe, William E., O70031.

Vaninetti, Gus A., O65535.

Young, James B., O70071.

TO BE MAJORS, MEDICAL SERVICE CORPS

Adams, Raymond E., O79646.

Beakes, Francis C., O80283.

Ceve, Paul E., O80290.

Doran, Gerald J., O84315.

Fanning, William E., O80293.

Fellerman, Erwin K., O80294.

Gray, Irving, O58738.

Hinrichs, Herbert H., O79665.

Holtwick, Philip B., O80303.

Hooker, LaRay D., O80304.

Johnson, Andrew J., O81870.

Kammerer, William M., O79667.

Luban, Albert J., O79669.

Newman, Forest P., Jr., O80313.

O'Hern, Robert S., O79659.

Ostrom, Thomas R., O50576.

Poucher, Clyde R., O79673.

Rogers, O. B., O80322.

Rojo, Fernando S., O84833.

Ross, William E., O80324.

Shepard, Leonard G., O79660.

Tate, Robert W., O81872.

Thompson, Richard C., O84330.

Tsakonas, Charles T., O84809.

Weatherall, Richard T., O76804.

Winkler, Harry T., O80331.

TO BE MAJORS, ARMY NURSE CORPS

Connors, Amy L., N809.

Duc, Stella G., N1848.

Freese, Thelma U., N2838.

Hehn, Mary K., N2822.

Lachette, Mary C., N1707.

McCoy, Goldie M., N2520.

Piergallini, Anne R., N1937.

Witt, Rosemary, N1520.

TO BE MAJORS, ARMY MEDICAL SPECIALIST CORPS

Cook, Marion E., R10134.

Cotter, Anastatia, R10171.

Fraze, Mary E., M10107.

Hamlyn, Alvera E., M10099.

Hughes, Rosamond E., R10029.

Johnson, Frances J., M10031.

Kemske, Dorothy L., M10052.

Mahoney, Margaret E., M10017.
 Rader, Marjorie A., M10088.
 Strobel, Phyllis R., M10069.
 Torp, Mary J., M10113.

The following-named officers for promotion in the Regular Army of the United States, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3234 and 3304. All officers are subject to physical examination required by law.

TO BE LIEUTENANT COLONELS, ARMY NURSE CORPS

Archer, Rubye W., N1634.
 Ball, Katherine, N358.
 Bowen, Geneva N., N1966.
 Cindric, Rose H., N1983.
 Clarke, Gertrude R., N2387.
 Clarke, Margaret G., N745.
 Colyer, Betty L., N1206.
 Cully, Irene E., N614.
 Dennis, Anna K., N1965.
 Diekroeger, Luella E., N1861.
 Duley, Clara M., N1637.
 Edenfield, Ruth, N2061.
 Egan, Margaret M., N2058.
 Eidsaa, Alma O., N167.
 Elliott, Dorothy V., N2245.
 Ernst, Estelle T., N314.
 Feagans, Nellie I., N1547.
 Flavelle, Elizabeth L., N1896.
 Fuller, Anne L., N587.
 Garrard, Delzena E., N1890.
 Green, Josephine M., N2400.
 Greenfield, Ruth L., N873.
 Hayes, Katherine E., N688.
 Hollinger, Margaret A., N1962.
 Houston, Emma F., N1960.
 Jones, Peggy G., N363.
 Jordan, Mary C., N987.
 Jump, Katherine R., N341.
 Laggan, Mary M., N1028.
 Lewis, Luella R., N340.
 Lozinak, Mary M., N2291.
 Maita, Winifred Z., N2370.
 Micklick, Irene E., N388.
 Parker, Edna M., N271.
 Patterson, Evelyn M., N339.
 Perreault, Marciene A. B., N2396.
 Pfeffer, Henrietta H., N2413.
 Plemion, Evonne L., N1860.
 Reutenhauer, Marguerite C., N206.
 Rime, Mabel L., N1533.
 Sandberg, Wilma K., N248.
 Satterfield, Ruth P., N2168.
 Saulnier, Dorothy N., N249.
 Smith, Mary I., N1005.
 Taylor, Ruth P., N302.
 Thornton, Joyce A., N267.
 Tolleson, Margaret E., N329.
 Walker, Isabelle M., N148.
 Werley, Harriet H., N1241.
 Younger, Mary M., N288.

TO BE LIEUTENANT COLONELS, ARMY MEDICAL SPECIALIST CORPS

Davies, Elizabeth J., M10102.
 Forsythe, Lois M., R10039.
 Jones, Elizabeth C., M10114.
 Moseman, Martha E., R10031.
 Strain, Ruth G., R10070.
 Winslow, Ruby Z., R10006.

The following-named officers for promotion in the Regular Army of the United States, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 3284 and 3298. All officers are subject to physical examination required by law.

TO BE FIRST LIEUTENANTS

Adams, George B., O74038.
 Aicken, Larry B., O74042.
 Alexander, Joseph E., Jr., O79545.
 Allison, Robert H., O81573.
 Amerson, Hinton S., O74623.
 Amos, Julian E., O74047.
 Anderson, Duane F., O74624.
 Andrews, Robert H., O75052.
 Aschettino, Richard F., O78208.

Avera, Graham J., O79547.
 Bailey, Clarence A., O78212.
 Baird, Richard J., O78215.
 Balint, Barry T. J., O74631.
 Barrett, Jonathan R., 3d, O83636.
 Barry, John W., O74633.
 Bassett, Gordon C., O85290.
 Bird, Max R., O74077.
 Birdsong, Edward M., Jr., O74078.
 Blank, James N., O81587.
 Bonner, Benjamin J., 3d, O74088.
 Booth, John F., 3d, O74642.
 Bowden, John J., O84953.
 Bower, George L., O78234.
 Brister, Delano R., O74646.
 Bronson, Richard M., O85129.
 Brown, Charles H., O74103.
 Brown, Roy A., O74104.
 Bruner, Robert J., O81595.
 Bruskiewicz, Glenn L., O78248.
 Brylla, Charles W., O74107.
 Bue, Paul A. J., O78251.
 Burke, Francis J., Jr., O85132.
 Burton, Donald L., O85133.
 Bush, Emory W., O79560.
 Cahalane, Robert E., O79561.
 Campbell, Donald A., O74118.
 Campbell, Joseph R., O74657.
 Carucci, Raymond A., O74969.
 Castle, Edward R., Jr., O74971.
 Cento, Dahl J., O85307.
 Chesley, Arthur P., O74128.
 Clites, James E., Jr., O79566.
 Cockrell, William F., Jr., O81602.
 Coffee, Edwin P., Jr., O74130.
 Coffman, Richard L., O74664.
 Conroy, Robert E., O78265.
 Cook, James H., O80221.
 Cooper, Willis McL., O85143.
 Correll, Ralph T., O74667.
 Cox, Randall S., O74138.
 Craig, Joe H., O74668.
 Curran, Jan D., O74670.
 Dedrick, Warren F., O81617.
 Deel, Arlin, O79571.
 Deetjen, Roy F., O81618.
 Delandro, Donald J., O74942.
 Dilyard, Rex E., O83648.
 DiValentino, Leo E., O74164.
 Ditman, William D., O74163.
 Dowling, Donald J., O74170.
 Dreeben, Lionel, O74677.
 Druit, Clifford A., O74678.
 Dunn, James E., O74177.
 Dvorak, Philip J., O74178.
 Earlix, Richard L., O84523.
 Eastwood, Clifford A., Jr., O74180.
 Edward, Charles A., O85158.
 Ely, Sumner R., O78293.
 Epperson, Thomas A., O78295.
 Evans, Walter C., O81632.
 Fennell, George R., Jr., O74192.
 Flanagan, Carl P., Jr., O81636.
 Foard, John B., 3d, O74201.
 Ford, Wilbur E., Jr., O74202.
 Freitas, Louis H., O83651.
 Frobel, Martin C., O78310.
 Gately, Michael P., O74691.
 Gentry, Roy C., O74989.
 Gereau, Richard N., O75059.
 Gessner, Stephen C., O83654.
 Giles, George E., O74213.
 Gilmore, Joseph R., O74215.
 Givhan, Walter H., O74217.
 Glover, Richard R., O74219.
 Goetz, George W., O74699.
 Good, Robert E., O85172.
 Greenway, John R., O84994.
 Hallinan, James M., Jr., O74709.
 Hatch, Vernon L., O74242.
 Hatcher, Robert T., O85180.
 Hawkins, Richard S., O79582.
 Heckman, Richard T., O74245.
 Hemminger, Girard L., O74247.
 Herbert, Anthony B., O78348.
 Hickerson, Arville L., O74249.
 Hilmo, Orin R., O83655.
 Hilton, Jimmie L., O74251.
 Hinkleman, Robert S., O74252.
 Hinspeter, William LeR., O74253.
 Hobin, Raymond M., O85001.
 Hodges, Charles E., O74254.
 Hollister, Myron P., O74261.
 Hosmer, William, O75066.
 Houllis, Harry S., O74269.
 Houston, Joseph B., Jr., O74270.
 Huddle, Charles E., Jr., O74999.
 Humphrey, Paul W., O79586.
 Hunt, Byron W., O74275.
 Irwin, James T., O74732.
 Israel, Glenn A., O74233.
 James, William N., O74285.
 Jarrell, William J., O78466.
 Jenks, George V., O81668.
 Jeter, Munford S., O81670.
 Johanknecht, George P., O74734.
 Johnson, Gerald K., O74735.
 Johnson, James M., O84923.
 Johnson, Joseph M., O79588.
 Kantor, George W., O78376.
 Keith, Donald M., O78379.
 Kelly, Edward V., O78382.
 Kirk, John G., O85470.
 Kitay, Peter N., O78389.
 Kite, John C., O74310.
 Knapper, Aubrey L., O74312.
 Knipp, James D., O78391.
 Kramer, Bryce R., O74314.
 Krome, Alan, O74317.
 Lackey, Lyman A., Jr., O74321.
 Ladd, John P., O74322.
 Lake, Howard K., Jr., O74323.
 Larimer, Charles L., O74755.
 Laughbon, Richard W., O74328.
 Lehner, Scott J., O82282.
 Lenderman, William R., O79596.
 Lesko, Charles J., O84712.
 Lockwood, Willard E., O74342.
 Lofton, Marvin, O75013.
 Logan, Rodney W., O74343.
 Long, John E., O78405.
 Losik, Robert C., O74344.
 Lyons, Calvin G., O74349.
 Maass, Charles G., O74350.
 MacDonald, Donald L., O81691.
 MacHatton, Joseph G., O78411.
 Mapes, John B., O77556.
 Marguccio, Robert G., O74357.
 Marmor, John W., O83657.
 Massey, Oran A., O74365.
 May, Francis B., O83113.
 May, Richard L., O84092.
 McAden, Henry J., Jr., O74767.
 McCreery, John L., O74373.
 McCullough, James A., O74374.
 McKinney, Horatio W., O74384.
 Meaney, Edward J., Jr., O82287.
 Merritt, Hubert D., O78432.
 Milan, Richard L., O75022.
 Miller, Donald L., O84225.
 Miller, Spencer R., O74782.
 Milliron, Joseph F., O74395.
 Molinelli, Robert F., O79604.
 Montgomery, Ross D., O85217.
 Morrison, Kenneth L., O76444.
 Mudgett, John S., O84714.
 Mungovan, Robert W., O81706.
 Murphy, Clifton M., O74407.
 Murray, Jackson S., O74787.
 Nobriga, Gordon H., O74415.
 Norris, James B., O81711.
 Osa, Nelson, O74426.
 Owen, Thomas D., Jr., O74797.
 Padgett, David H., Jr., O74430.
 Parker, Murry E., O76493.
 Parr, Ivan W., 3d, O83660.
 Patte, Chris, O75121.
 Pearlman, James T., O81715.
 Perry, James R., O74804.
 Pertain, George H., Jr., O74806.
 Peterson, Walter R., Jr., O74808.
 Pharr, Joe B., O74810.
 Pickens, Homer C., Jr., O85361.
 Pierce, Isaiah B., Jr., O74812.
 Pinkston, William R., Jr., O74813.
 Pipkin, John R., O79610.
 Powers, Max L., O74448.
 Price, Roger J., O74815.

Proctor, Marvin P., O79613.
 Quinlan, Richard J., O74981.
 Raines, Fred B., O74451.
 Randolph, William M., O78517.
 Reedy, Henry J., O74459.
 Reese, Ronald R., O84531.
 Reeves, George E., O74823.
 Reichel, James E., O74824.
 Rembecki, Edward X., O83662.
 Reynolds, George P., O85076.
 Robinson, Thonius, Jr., O74468.
 Roddy, Robert E., O74470.
 Russell, George G., Jr., O78486.
 Sanches, Manuel L., O74483.
 Scherer, George H., O79617.
 Schessler, Donald R., O74488.
 Schober, Frank J., Jr., O74492.
 Schuler, James D., O74495.
 Scott, John R., O83663.
 Shuman, John N., O74843.
 Smith, John D., O79620.
 Snyder, Harold B., Jr., O74522.
 Snyder, Ronald E., O78511.
 Solley, Charles W., O74850.
 Spears, Joseph MacK., Jr., O75034.
 Stein, Edward J., Jr., O85265.
 Stipe, John W. M., Jr., O78518.
 Stockhammer, Gordon, F., O79621.
 Stoddard, Timothy D., O75039.
 Stone, Frank R., Jr., O74536.
 Stone, Gordon L., O79622.
 Storms, Robert N. Jr., O80230.
 Stotser, George R., O74540.
 Stringer, Paul G., O74542.
 Stuart, James R., O74545.
 Sullivan, Noel E., O77716.
 Swift, John B., O74551.
 Tengler, John A., O74867.
 Thomson, Robert W., O85272.
 Tieken, Richard V., O74564.
 Tindall, Asa W., Jr., O81752.
 Treat, Robert B., Jr., O78527.
 Tucker, Andrew L., O79623.
 Tyner, Robert O., O79625.
 Undercoffer, John T., O78530.
 Vandergrift, Kennard S., Jr., O82301.
 Ventzek, Robert E., O74877.
 Vetterling, John M., O74580.
 Wagner, Stanley G., O83668.
 Waite, Richard D., O78624.
 Wakefield, Donald Y., O74583.
 Ward, Jerry E., O74883.
 Watke, Frederic W., O74588.
 Watts, Ronald L., O74589.
 Welch, Larry L., O74936.
 West, Louis, O78544.
 Wetherington, Bernard J., O74885.
 White, Billy T., O85281.
 Whitt, Lawrence H., O74888.
 Wiersema, Kenneth E., O74594.
 Wilder, Allen S., Jr., O83670.
 Wiser, Bobbie M., O74895.
 Witt, Everett L., O85286.
 Wolff, John P., Jr., O84721.
 Woods, Robert D., O74608.
 Young, Charles De V., O74610.
 Zickel, Raymond E., O74614.
 Zychowski, Edward F., O79629.

TO BE FIRST LIEUTENANTS, WOMEN'S ARMY CORPS

Dee, Jean P., L521.
 Halbert, Mary J., L523.
 Hess, Anne M., L524.
 Shelton, Ellen J., L505.
 Sylvester, Suzanne E., L506.

TO BE FIRST LIEUTENANTS, MEDICAL SERVICE CORPS

Bethel, Howard D., O78161.
 Brown, George L., O79558.
 Bunce, George E., O78163.
 Cedola, Vincent J., O78678.
 Dacus, Lester H., O74149.
 Darnauer, Paul F., O80341.
 Gulevich, Wladimir, O79677.
 Heldmyer, Harry F., O78682.
 Jordan, France F., O81875.
 Kinchen, Robert P., O78683.
 Lupien, Earle E., O85205.

Maeder, Donald F., O81876.
 Murrell, Dan S., O80348.
 Neitzel, Richard F., O80349.
 Peterson, Charles W., O78686.
 Seeley, Sam T., O78169.

TO BE FIRST LIEUTENANTS, ARMY NURSE CORPS

Doucet, Eileen D., N2860.
 La Rock, Ethel B., N2884.

The following-named person for reappointment to the active list of the Regular Army of the United States, in the grade of second lieutenant, from temporary disability retired list, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 1211:

Tonda, Ricardo D., O75841.

The following-named persons for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, in the grades and corps specified, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3294, 3291, 3311, 3285, 3286, 3287, and 3288:

TO BE MAJORS

Glenn, James C., MC, AO830482.
 Kaisch, Kenneth R., MC.

TO BE CAPTAINS

Arnold, Vivian M., ANC, N792070.
 Bridges, Berly E., Jr., MC, AO2091772.
 Chunn, Van D., Jr., MC, O1873794.
 Farrelly, Robert L., MC, O2283260.
 Hale, Meredith S., MC, O1917779.
 Hall, Betty J., ANC, N792332.
 Harrison, Richard E., MC, O5407610.
 Hooks, Doris, ANC, N777728.
 Levine, Theodore, MC, O5003014.
 Louis, Winifred M., AMSC, J100124.
 Neale, Julia A., AMSC, R20201.
 Rock, Marjorie J., ANC, N723708.
 Stappenbeck, Edna F., ANC, N790864.
 Tisdale, Patrick D., MC, O2273957.
 Vinall, William H., DC, O4045663.
 Wigdahl, Luther O., MC, O4073865.
 Wilary, Lillian B., ANC, N901299.

TO BE FIRST LIEUTENANTS

Allison, Dorothy S., ANC, N901523.
 Bartelloni, Peter J., MC, O2273093.
 Berry, Sidney R., MC, O2295010.
 Bloom, Gerald E., MC, O2295014.
 Brascho, Donn J., MC, O2291442.
 Chamberlain, Eugene C., Jr., MC, O2291924.
 Decker, John T., MC, O2291355.
 Dell, Thomas A., MC, O2291440.
 DeMarco, Arnold R., MC.
 Fagan, Charles J., MC, O2289928.
 Fischgrund, Milton L., MC, O4038340.
 Fugelso, Peter D., MC, O2289699.
 Graham, John L., MC, O2295067.
 Gray, John H., MC, O2289701.
 Grisham, Richard S. C., MC, O1942230.
 Hall, Thomas M., MC, O2289684.
 Hamilton, Elizabeth J., AMSC, M3017.
 Hanson, James D., MC, O2289961.
 Haynes, Christine, WAC, L1010868.
 Hedges, James K., MC, O2289677.
 Hill, John E., Jr., MC, O2289922.
 Kabat, George J., Jr., MC, O4032571.
 Karshner, Paul H., MC, O2289816.
 Kerr, Barbara J., ANC, N901506.
 Paulsen, Carl A., MC, O4068156.
 Pippin, Alton J., ANC, N901886.
 Reed, William A., Jr., MC.
 Reyna, Consuelo T., ANC, N792369.
 Ritter, Richard R., MC, O4004943.
 Schleif, Mary E., ANC, N901621.
 Snyder, Lowell E., MC, O2295009.
 Stewart, James L., Jr., MC, O4044295.
 Stewart, Roland R., VC, O4069802.
 Thomassen, Robert W., VC, O5500707.
 Treasure, Robert L., MC, O2289714.
 Tucker, Walter E., Jr., VC, O4043905.
 Warnock, Gerald L., MC, O2295030.
 Wratten, Gary P., MC, O2295025.
 Wygmans, John E., MC, O2291739.

TO BE SECOND LIEUTENANTS

Clegg, George J., MSC, O4021890.
 Clifford, Margaret F., WAC, L2289165.

Gierhart, Jane E., AMSC, M3077.
 Matsumoto, Eleanor M., ANC, N2290031.
 O'Clare, Joyce W., WAC, L2291670.
 Raines, Ruth D., WAC, L1010875.
 Smith, Gary T., MSC, O4051350.

The following-named persons for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, in the grades specified under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3285, 3286, 3287, and 3288:

TO BE MAJORS

Boardman, Charles H., III, O393863.
 Chance, Donald W., O2236534.
 Cushing, John M., O1020294.
 Dey, Edward H., O1169484.
 Fisher, Charles M., O1546978.
 Gould, Howard J., O404889.
 Harris, William T., O1045570.
 Holland, Earl H., O1633281.
 Johnson, Glen R., O1103238.
 Johnson, Ivan H., O1036211.
 Keevan, Edward F., Jr., O1080383.
 Kirk, Raymond L., O1555708.
 Konopka, Wenceslaus F., O1109427.
 Ledbetter, William R., O389559.
 Pierson, Leslie E., O391152.
 Radcliff, Joseph A., O1309606.
 Roemer, Joseph, Jr., O1329750.
 Samborski, Henry J., O1832743.
 Shepard, George, O1062289.
 Trumps, Shirly R., O1293152.
 Zandy, Deno J., O576797.

TO BE CAPTAINS

Adams, Arlye D., O2204130.
 Angelini, Joseph, O1597980.
 Barker, Irving O., O1317138.
 Dalusky, George A., O964568.
 Ferguson, James W., O2203315.
 Fordyce, John W., O1061395.
 Godwin, Harold A., Jr., O2200105.
 Gray, John M., O2209645.
 Hayes, Donald R., Sr., O2016407.
 Henson, Virgil A., Jr., O2014633.
 Hodge, Harold B., Jr., O2201540.
 Jones, James W., O2204417.
 Kesler, Mac P., O2026784.
 Matteson, James S., O2210165.
 Moore, Gilbert F., O446357.
 Murphy, Henry B., Jr., O1879597.
 O'Neill, John J., O1889863.
 Peterson, Ralph J., O980126.
 Price, James R., O550225.
 Roy, Joseph E., O2020678.
 Russell, Dempsey R., O2033534.
 Schwartz, Jack J., O2203290.
 Speights, Duris, Jr., O1341914.
 Starr, Merle D., O2030534.
 Stenger, John E., O1535831.
 Utzman, Charles D., O1882641.
 Wayman, Elden E., O1885834.
 Wenneson, Richard M., O1884033.
 West, William I., O50732.
 Wilson, Thomas J., O1644233.
 Wolfe, Gerald P., O962942.

TO BE FIRST LIEUTENANTS

Adams, Basil R., Jr., O1875706.
 Bishop, John G., O4013869.
 Blandebugo, Gasper, O1878126.
 Branscum, Billy R., O1940931.
 Brock, Eldridge W., O4012541.
 Brown, Gene L., O4083757.
 Brown, James E., O4028978.
 Burch, Eugene L., Jr., O2277112.
 Carver, Charley A., O4025948.
 Clark, Alastair S., O4032045.
 Cochran, Jerry L., O1939794.
 Cook, Larry L., O4009844.
 Dextraze, William P., O4036666.
 Dolfi, Eugene, O4006234.
 Evans, Herbert C., O4000164.
 Farmer, Garry H., O4018893.
 Fleming, Lynne B., O4041843.
 Freeze, Richard S., O4030656.
 Green, Gilbert R., O4018194.
 Gunn, Ernest R., O1925918.
 Hance, Carl W., O4023670.
 Hawk, Robert T., O2033313.

Hogan, Charles E., O4059010.
 Jackson, William B., O1936122.
 Jackson, William S., O1872393.
 Jones, Beauford Z., O1876443.
 Keipp, Martin W., O4034924.
 Kelman, Manfred, O4005691.
 Klora, David J., O4009486.
 Lawley, Fred W., O4031325.
 Lytle, James H., O1891745.
 McDowell, Rowland F., O4020587.
 Miller, Royce D., O4057743.
 Payne, Lloyd A., O4042906.
 Ralls, Randall D., O4050046.
 Runge, James L., O4042650.
 Short, William L., O4050416.
 Simmons, Frank J., O2205195.
 Sisson, Paul S., Jr., O4005735.
 Soyster, Frank L., O2265640.
 Speicher, Vernon L., O4018430.
 Stewart, Roger A., O4063763.
 Stommel, Raymond R., O2295197.
 Tokarz, Walter P., O4062724.
 Tremper, Edwin O., O4037536.
 Watson, Ronald J., O4002594.
 Williams, Edwin H., O1881997.
 Willey, Burr M., O4004349.

TO BE SECOND LIEUTENANTS

Amend, William B., O5402487.
 Antaya, Michel R., O5301984.
 Ashley, Charles H., O4085008.
 Barkley, William A., O5201643.
 Beran, Joseph J., O5400679.
 Berman, Leo, O5405332.
 Billey, John J., O4045444.
 Biskup, Robert L., O5401618.
 Bledsoe, Edward P., O5300027.
 Blomstrom, Harold W., O5702341.
 Bowen, Richard M., O5400465.
 Bowman, Samuel S., III, O5503061.
 Bradley, John W., O4065760.
 Broome, James R., O4047692.
 Brown, Charles S., Jr., O5401580.
 Brown, Jerry R., O5401381.
 Canfield, James D., O5301844.
 Coates, George O., O5000047.
 Coulter, Richard V., O5300917.
 Crane, Kenneth C., O5300954.
 Cummings, George P., Jr., O4075880.
 Davenport, William H., O5502434.
 Davis, Hal W., O5400565.
 Decker, Gilbert F., O5204382.
 Delius, Robert D., III, O5303562.
 Dillon, Gregory P., O4083470.
 Dimeck, Philip A., O4065934.
 Fisher, Edward S., O2272669.
 Frattini, Joseph J., O4065295.
 Fulton, Lawrence P., Jr., O4071674.
 Gaebel, John L., O5502717.
 Geiger, Peter H., O5700556.
 Ginek, Thomas D., O5405242.
 Gleeson, William J., O4064815.
 Glynn, William T., O4085850.
 Greer, Robert B., O4025806.
 Groves, John E., Jr., O4047751.
 Guinn, Ollie R., O5702495.
 Gumbs, Selvin F., Jr., O4036539.
 Hardy, John D., O5206641.
 Harwell, James S., A4033681.
 Hehemann, George J., O4075231.
 Heidecker, Duane E., O4060095.
 Hering, Carroll H., O4048743.
 Hess, Carl E., O4052586.
 Hicks, David L., O5402471.
 Hilton, Thomas G., O5303638.
 Holcomb, Samuel A., O5400088.
 Holmes, Kenneth E., O4063776.
 Hood, George E., O4075815.
 Hoyle, Robert W., O4085423.
 Jenrette, Nathan P., III, O5300541.
 Johnston, Robert P., O4030596.
 Jones, Eddie H., O5401177.
 Jones, Robert P., O5304601.
 Keim, Carl D., O5200974.
 Kester, William R., O4062140.
 Kilpatrick, William A., O4071245.
 King, James H., Jr., O5201885.
 Klein, Alvin A., O5501031.
 Koehnke, Joseph A., O4074833.

Komer, James E., O5204564.
 Kramer, Walter B., Jr., O5405223.
 Kraus, John H., O4049150.
 Kuehn, Karl P., O5401125.
 LaGrassa, Joseph E., O5203421.
 Lax, Robert E., O5300546.
 Lester, Donald P., O5403350.
 Litwiller, Gavin D., O5504625.
 Lockwood, Edward D., O5002049.
 Love, Richard M., O5205669.
 Lynn, Ira L., O5303459.
 Manning, Norman G., O4063155.
 Matsuo, Herbert T., O4078081.
 Mays, Luama W., O4063781.
 Meadows, James S., O5405081.
 Moffitt, Robert B., O5303351.
 Morris, Alva J., O5300750.
 Muirhead, Thomas H., O5206621.
 Mullen, David A., O4052732.
 Mulvey, Richard F., O5002380.
 Munn, Jack E., O5300565.
 Musil, Louis F., O5303687.
 Myers, Read E., O4010172.
 Oneillion, Willard M., Jr., O4071669.
 Parker, Jerry S., O4071412.
 Parker, Raymond L., O5401638.
 Parker, Travis W., O4042931.
 Pearson, John L., O5507066.
 Pease, James W., O5300418.
 Peeps, Richard D. J., O5205163.
 Pista, Richard L., O5504931.
 Pollenz, Richard S., O5502092.
 Poole, Keith L., O5507067.
 Prentice, Charles C., O5001108.
 Proulx, Clovis B., O4064441.
 Puttkammer, Paul D., O4057310.
 Raynes, Troyce L., O4071190.
 Rehusch, Kenneth S., O5502362.
 Reinen, Robert H., O5205176.
 Renshaw, David A., O5204590.
 Sanders, Walter M., O4069479.
 Selby, Robert W., O5507548.
 Sharp, Percy A., III, O5411175.
 Shellabarger, Harold L., O4061980.
 Sprague, James D., O4072020.
 Starr, Luther J., Jr., O5400847.
 Steakley, David L., O5303914.
 Steel, Richard E., O4048827.
 Tait, Thomas H., O4036083.
 Tamer, Robert S., O2293137.
 Thompson, Robert A., O5303537.
 Thompson, Ross E. G., Jr., O4083671.
 Thovson, Paul W., O5503158.
 Tomaka, Karl S., O4064625.
 Torretto, Richard J., O5405273.
 Trombley, Joseph E., O4085546.
 Vaughn, Valentine W., O5401503.
 Victorson, William S., O5202182.
 Welch, Charles W., O1893374.
 Williams, Durward R., O5304745.
 Williams, Glen W., O5200162.
 Williams, Ross S., O1940640.
 Wolfe, Rodney D., O5506213.
 Wynd, William R., O4049651.
 Yancey, Thomas E., O5400122.

The following-named distinguished military students for appointment in the Medical Service Corps, Regular Army of the United States, in the grade of second lieutenant, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3285, 3286, 3287, and 3288:

Cohen, Meyer W. Sides, John P., Jr.
 Paul, C. Peter Yeatts, Frederick L.

The following-named distinguished military students for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States in the grade of second lieutenant, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3285, 3286, 3287, and 3288:

Acuff, Joseph D. Behannon, Hollis P.
 Alton, Howard W., Jr. Berg, Dwayne F.
 Arch, Walter J. Bergeron, Gary P.
 Arcuri, Francis W. Blickensmith, Lynn A.
 Baker, Larry A. Brown, George N., Jr.
 Barr, Grady W. Buff, Max L.
 Beal, William R., Jr. Castell, William T.

Chamberlin, Paul D. Milier, Joseph, Jr.
 Christy, William C., Jr. Morgan, Harold D.
 Cowden, Ronald R. Moulton, William E., Jr.
 Cox, David C. Nickelson, Richard L.
 Cox, Joe B. Page, Wayne J.
 Crawford, Vernon L. Parks, James D., Jr.
 Cromwell, George E., Jr. Pastella, Donald R.
 Cunningham, Patrick J. Plain, Ray S.
 Daly, William F., Jr. Pool, Robert C.
 Doubra, Roy G. Pope, John L.
 Duckworth, Charles H. Rask, Richard H.
 Emery, James S. Reid, Roger R.
 Estes, Glen A. Rousseau, Alfred W., Jr.
 Fortney, Kenneth R., Jr. Samilton, Lawrence B., Jr.
 Gilbertson, Clarence L. Schrader, Melvin A.
 Gunn, Lloyd R., Jr. Sears, Perry M.
 Hammons, James O. Shilling, Jack C.
 Hanzel, Richard D. Sommers, Robert A.
 Herrington, James R. Spanjers, Leonard J.
 Hurteau, Joseph C. Speck, Gerald E.
 Jones, Manley W., Jr. Speer, Richard L.
 Kratuse, Donald W. Spratt, David M.
 Kuncl, Pat Y. Springer, Anthony T.
 Leitz, Franklin W. St. Amant, Joseph F.
 Lindberg, Robert J. Steele, James H., Jr.
 Markham, John F. Stritter, Frank T.
 Mayhew, Jerald A. Tate, Edward S.
 McKisson, Raymond C. Taylor, James R.
 McLeod, Norman F. Taylor, Robert P.
 Merrill, William B., III Thompson, Neil H.
 Messer, Charles R. Traver, Donald J.
 Wilson, James R. Turner, George J.
 Wilson, John J. Walker, James M.
 Wood, Merrill F. Weaver, Charles R.
 Worthington, Wayne L.

IN THE REGULAR AIR FORCE

The following-named officers for promotion in the Regular Air Force under the appropriate provisions of chapter 835, title 10, United States Code, as amended. All officers are subject to physical examination required by law:

MAJOR TO LIEUTENANT COLONEL

Line of the Air Force

Adams, Charley J., 10281A.
 Adams, Lawrence A., Jr., 8935A.
 Agostinho, Robert J., 10204A.
 Anderson, Clarence E., Jr., 9725A.
 Anderson, John M., Jr., 6514A.
 Anderson, Joseph W., Jr., 9734A.
 Anderson, Louis J., 9742A.
 Anderson, Millard O., 10185A.
 Anderson, Richard C., 32878A.
 Andrews, George H., 10014A.
 Arcularius, Harry R., 32863A.
 Armstrong, John F., 9925A.
 Ashby, William K., 32871A.
 Ashton, Alfred J., Jr., 14661A.
 Askounis, Gust, 32890A.
 Aszman, Burton H., 7342A.
 Atkinson, Paul G., Jr., 10115A.
 Avery, James B., 10050A.
 Babb, Harold T., 6242A.
 Bachman, Lawrence F., 6896A.
 Bachtell, Robert C., 9891A.
 Baer, John W., 9820A.
 Bainer, John W., 6313A.
 Ball, Frank P., 10164A.
 Balliet, William E., 9683A.
 Barger, David H., 9851A.
 Barnes, Richard W., 9905A.
 Barrow, David C., 9751A.
 Barry, Billie J., 10001A.
 Barton, John R., 7450A.
 Barton, Richard E., 9910A.
 Bashant, Norman W., 10256A.
 Bass, Thomas E., 10060A.
 Bates, Elbridge C., 9741A.
 Bauer, Maurice H., 7534A.

Beck, Charles J., 10219A.
 Beckett, Thomas A., 10175A.
 Beckett, Walter R., Jr., 10161A.
 Bærli, Stanley W., 9875A.
 Beeson, Thomas H., 9767A.
 Behn, Milton A., 9766A.
 Behnke, William C., 10216A.
 Bell, Homer C., Jr., 9652A.
 Benbow, John W., 13369A.
 Benner, Stephen O., 9775A.
 Bennett, John M., 9926A.
 Benson, Morrie, 11318A.
 Bentley, Delwin D., 8528A.
 Beresford, Harry E., Jr., 7041A.
 Berg, William W., 9961A.
 Berger, Raymond J., 8392A.
 Berry, Kearie L., Jr., 9833A.
 Berry, Lon B., 6960A.
 Bæstervelt, Harold J., 9785A.
 Bevan, Wendell L., Jr., 9780A.
 Beveridge, McFate E., 32857A.
 Bickerstaff, Burt M., 9867A.
 Birbeck, Richard W., 6655A.
 Bishop, Cleo M., 9777A.
 Bishop, Edward L., 10047A.
 Black, Lee C., 9866A.
 Blakeslee, Donald J. M., 9362A.
 Blank, Jonas L., 10119A.
 Blehm, Harold E., 7566A.
 Boedeker, Charles W., 7418A.
 Bogan, John W., 10027A.
 Bondhus, John O., Jr., 6411A.
 Boone, Lewis P., Jr., 6524A.
 Booth, Joseph L., 10231A.
 Booth, Lionel R., 10235A.
 Borellis, William F., 9871A.
 Boreske, Andrew, Jr., 10121A.
 Bossardet, Charles W., 9612A.
 Bowden, Theodore W., 7467A.
 Bowers, William H., 9874A.
 Bowley, Albert J., 10101A.
 Bowlin, Roy L., Jr., 9806A.
 Bowman, George A., Jr., 9923A.
 Bozarth, Theodore W., 9994A.
 Bracy, Carroll H., 6741A.
 Bradford, James W., 10082A.
 Brady, William D., 9822A.
 Brannon, Cullen A., Jr., 10146A.
 Brazier, Harold W., 9932A.
 Brendle, George R., 9946A.
 Brennan, Gerald W., 10206A.
 Brennan, John J., Jr., 32869A.
 Brewer, Lonnie C., 9940A.
 Brewster, John H., 9113A.
 Brierty, William P., 10135A.
 Broach, Richard H., 9797A.
 Brooks, Charles L., 9886A.
 Brooks, Leo C., 10155A.
 Brooks, William K., 10240A.
 Brothers, James T., 10045A.
 Brown, John H., Jr., 7433A.
 Brown, Marshall C., Jr., 32911A.
 Brown, Ned H., 10293A.
 Brown, Robert D., 10061A.
 Brown, Thomas H., 10178A.
 Brownell, Gerald S., 6808A.
 Brubaker, Thomas F., 10024A.
 Bryan, William E., Jr., 9888A.
 Bucher, Oliver B., Jr., 10139A.
 Buckley, William A., 7998A.
 Buckner, John H., 9753A.
 Burky, Claude N., 32895A.
 Burdett, Edward B., 10188A.
 Burget, Carl E., 13393A.
 Burnor, Richard H., 9541A.
 Burson, Thomas L., 8773A.
 Bush, William K., 6588A.
 Bussey, Donald G., 9010A.
 Butcher, Chester J., 9846A.
 Butcher, William A., Jr., 7035A.
 Butler, Clifton L., Jr., 9799A.
 Butler, Henry F., 7008A.
 Byrd, Bacchus B., Jr., 6949A.
 Cabell, John K., 6555A.
 Cabral, William M., 6692A.
 Cadger, Edward J., 9492A.
 Caldcleugh, Clarence M., 10319A.
 Cammack, Vernon K., 10070A.

Camp, Clyde H., Jr., 9982A.
 Cantor, Al, 10257A.
 Carey, Max R., 32893A.
 Carruth, Francis S., 7341A.
 Carson, Charles W., Jr., 10113A.
 Carter, Charles R., 9748A.
 Carter, Clifford G., 8159A.
 Carter, John D., 8580A.
 Carwell, Ivan L., 6368A.
 Caselli, James L., 32891A.
 Cassady, Robert E., 9145A.
 Cassiday, Benjamin B., Jr., 10133A.
 Catledge, Richard C., 9951A.
 Champion, Patrick D., 10296A.
 Chandler, John S., Jr., 10102A.
 Chapman, Benjamin F., 7402A.
 Cherbak, Victor A., Jr., 9857A.
 Chessington, James B., Jr., 7002A.
 Childs, Marvin E., 10191A.
 Christensen, William R., 6545A.
 Clark, Robert H., 10154A.
 Cobb, James B., 9769A.
 Cobb, Melvin B., 7966A.
 Coburn, Blaine K., 6447A.
 Coffield, Peter L., 9150A.
 Coke, John D., 9711A.
 Cole, Heston C., 10197A.
 Colgan, William B., 9973A.
 Collett, Charles E., 9902A.
 Collins, Thomas E., Jr., 9904A.
 Comstock, Harold E., 9104A.
 Conard, Dean D., 32882A.
 Conley, Bruce R., 10292A.
 Conn, John F., 10226A.
 Connell, James S., 9922A.
 Connor, Edward H., 3d, 10157A.
 Coogan, Francis R., 48713A.
 Cook, Harry D., 10010A.
 Cook, William J., 9842A.
 Cooke, Sherman C., 6990A.
 Coonan, Daniel J., Jr., 8247A.
 Cooper, James H., 7004A.
 Coriell, Eugene F., 33988A.
 Cormany, William F., 9714A.
 Costello, Edward M., 9764A.
 Cotton, Joseph F., 10232A.
 Couch, Paul F., 10227A.
 Coursey, Richard R., Jr., 10118A.
 Courtney, John J., Jr., 9790A.
 Couts, Richard L., 8305A.
 Cox, Eugene W., 7803A.
 Craddock, Reynold C., 9328A.
 Cragg, Ernest T., 10152A.
 Crahen, Eugene J., 9954A.
 Crandall, Thomas O., 7460A.
 Crawford, Ben, 10028A.
 Crawford, William A., 10005A.
 Crick, James M., Jr., 9730A.
 Criss, George W., Jr., 9814A.
 Crocker, Gage H., 10091A.
 Crutchfield, Wilfred B., 9941A.
 Cummings, Earl W., 9299A.
 Cummings, Louis H., 9749A.
 Cutler, Edward W., 10189A.
 Cutler, John M., 9848A.
 Dale, Hugh W., 9966A.
 Damico, Robert H., 9733A.
 Daughtrey, Buddy R., 9984A.
 Davenport, Ellie E., 10238A.
 Davis, Green R., Jr., 7525A.
 Davis, Harvey M., 7642A.
 Davis, Jack T., 10142A.
 Davis, Jesse C., 6492A.
 Davis, John J., 9712A.
 Daye, John F., Jr., 9824A.
 Decker, Lynne E., 9720A.
 Delanoy, Charles W., 10277A.
 Della, Andrew, 6321A.
 Demelik, Andrew A., 6964A.
 Dennis, Charles G., 6515A.
 Denton, John H., 6433A.
 Denton, Velpeau C., 32872A.
 Dettre, Rexford H., Jr., 9768A.
 Detwiler, Donald A., 10130A.
 Devereaux, John M., 32876A.
 Doersch, George A., 9972A.
 Dolby, William F., 9856A.
 Dolk, Carl E., 9882A.

Donohue, Timothy W., 7995A.
 Dorff, Richard W., 9863A.
 Dougherty, Russell E., 9985A.
 Douma, Cyril R., 6910A.
 Douthwaite, William T., Jr., 10058A.
 Doyle, James L., 9813A.
 Dudley, William B., 10176A.
 Duin, Robert, 10035A.
 Duke, William F., 6521A.
 Duncan, Edward K., 7236A.
 Dunphy, Earl F., 9878A.
 Durner, Dwight E., 9881A.
 Dyser, Francis E., 9967A.
 Eades, William B., Jr., 12195A.
 Eads, Edwin M., 51696A.
 Easters, Robert D., 10043A.
 Ebert, Rembert A., 9917A.
 Edwards, Edmund B., 9787A.
 Eichner, Leonard, 19776A.
 Eickemeyer, Karl F., 9872A.
 Elam, Rhodes M., 10207A.
 Elliott, Gober O., 32874A.
 Ellis, Frank T., 9823A.
 Engels, Anthony M., 7033A.
 Erspamer, Curtis R., 10285A.
 Evans, John A., 10214A.
 Evdokimoff, Dmitri, 9896A.
 Eyres, William G., 6390A.
 Farrell, Frank J., 9988A.
 Farrell, John E., 2d, 10288A.
 Fava, James A., 7981A.
 Fealock, William J., 2d, 6358A.
 Ferrell, James P., 32896A.
 Fetters, Rolland F., 9916A.
 Filley, Oliver D., Jr., 9933A.
 Finan, George K., 7146A.
 Fishburn, James B., 7201A.
 Fishel, Robert R., 9757A.
 Fisher, Jack C., Jr., 9129A.
 Fisher, Lowell B., 9762A.
 Fitzgerald, Raymond L., 10236A.
 Fletcher, John F., 32862A.
 Floyd, Percy M., Jr., 10326A.
 Flynn, Charles J., Jr., 9945A.
 Folts, John L., 7387A.
 Foote, Edward P., 9798A.
 Ford, Ross C., 9969A.
 Ford, Wilson, 6878A.
 Forster, Bernard F., 9737A.
 Forster, Joseph M., 10213A.
 Fortner, John W., 10301A.
 Foulk, Tom B., Jr., 10183A.
 Founds, Joseph W., 7873A.
 Frakes, James F., 9821A.
 Frankosky, James C., 9758A.
 Freed, Lyle C., 10322A.
 Frink, Horace E., Jr., 9713A.
 Fry, Howard J., 9908A.
 Fry, Robert M., 10241A.
 Fulcher, Kenneth M., 9937A.
 Gaffney, George P., 6301A.
 Gallienne, Winfred H., 32873A.
 Gamage, Leonard A., 6888A.
 Gant, Eugene M., Jr., 48711A.
 Garland, William J., 6872A.
 Garner, Merritt G., 9928A.
 Garrett, Leslie F., 6725A.
 Garvin, Earl J., 9181A.
 Garvin, Loyd C., 10210A.
 Gaylord, Donald A., 10003A.
 Gaylord, Maurice B., 6299A.
 Gazzaniga, Louis A., 10064A.
 Gelwix, Joe M., 10051A.
 Gerhart, Quinter P., 7189A.
 Ghoudjian, Kevork, 32909A.
 Gibbons, John P., 10084A.
 Gibbons, William L., 10085A.
 Giffin, Charles W., Jr., 8854A.
 Gilbert, John H., Jr., 6463A.
 Gilchrist, William T., 9890A.
 Gillkerson, Harold R., 10265A.
 Gillmore, Lawrence J., 9859A.
 Glover, Donald S., 8547A.
 Gold, Morton J., 20034A.
 Goodrich, Earle A., 7837A.
 Gordon, Anyan A., 10290A.
 Gordon, Benjamin, 10320A.
 Gorman, John J., 9801A.

Goss, Quentin J., 9776A.
 Gourley, Theodore J., 10208A.
 Gradwell, Burgess, 10203A.
 Graham, Charles S., 6642A.
 Gray, Lewis H., 10018A.
 Gray, Richard L., 32877A.
 Gray, William L., 32865A.
 Greensides, Lawrence A., 8606A.
 Gresham, Walter V., Jr., 9738A.
 Griffin, Donald E., 9838A.
 Gulino, Vasco E., 9930A.
 Guthrie, Donald B., 51697A.
 Guzak, Francis W., 9870A.
 Hackler, James F., Jr., 9839A.
 Hagen, Alfred D., 10159A.
 Haist, Glade F., 6333A.
 Hale, Frederick N., Jr., 9727A.
 Hallenbeck, Ralph J., 10170A.
 Halsey, Fryer P., 6772A.
 Hambleton, Bertram L., Jr., 9865A.
 Hamel, Albert G., 9877A.
 Hamilton, George G., 10328A.
 Hamilton, Joseph C., Jr., 8273A.
 Hamilton, Joseph L., 9770A.
 Hamilton, William M., 9924A.
 Hamlyn, Raymond E., 9956A.
 Hansinger, Michael J., 9561A.
 Hargrove, Clifford W., 10038A.
 Harlow, Harold F., 9989A.
 Harrington, Robert E., 9818A.
 Harris, Bert S., 9938A.
 Harris, Teague G., Jr., 10150A.
 Harris, William F., 10049A.
 Harrold, Frank J., Jr., 10107A.
 Harvey, Luther R., 10325A.
 Hayden, James H., 9235A.
 Haynie, Frank M., 10221A.
 Hearn, James A., 9979A.
 Hehn, Earl L., Jr., 9778A.
 Heller, Edwin L., 9900A.
 Hellriegel, William C., 8643A.
 Hemsley, Richard T., 3d, 10094A.
 Henry, John G., 9903A.
 Herbert, John J., 10000A.
 Herman, Boyd, F., 8422A.
 Herrington, Russel M., Jr., 9791A.
 Hertel, Edward J., 10173A.
 Hickey, John J., 10220A.
 Higgins, Donald H., Jr., 9868A.
 Hoewing, Ralph C., 7198A.
 Hoffman, Robert W., 10126A.
 Hogan, Henry L., 3d, 10151A.
 Holbury, Robert J., 9893A.
 Holderness, Arthur W., Jr., 10095A.
 Holub, Richard C. A., 10022A.
 Horlick, Walter I., 23180A.
 Hoss, Robert J., 32860A.
 Hough, Luther W., Jr., 10193A.
 Hovatter, Elbert T., 9876A.
 Hovde, William J., 9836A.
 Howell, Sylvanus T., Jr., 9911A.
 Hoyt, Robert F., 10006A.
 Huau, Joseph H., Jr., 10140A.
 Hudson, Jerry H., 9983A.
 Hudson, John B., 10174A.
 Hudson, Ullin L., 10120A.
 Hughes, John D., 10168A.
 Huguley, Edward A., 10313A.
 Hull, Robert R., 8003A.
 Hunner, Paul C., 8350A.
 Hunt, Marvin L., 7951A.
 Huntley, James C., 9854A.
 Hurley, Paul J., 10186A.
 Hurr, Arthur P., 9850A.
 Husztek, William S., 6561A.
 Hutchens, David D., 9895A.
 Hutcheson, George W., Jr., 10212A.
 Hynes, Richard J., 9795A.
 Ireland, Clare T., Jr., 10123A.
 Irons, Stanley W., 9717A.
 Irwin, Robert B., 7474A.
 Isbell, Thomas W., Jr., 11956A.
 Jack, William A., 10074A.
 Jackson, Arthur V., 9817A.
 Jacobsen, William L., 9889A.
 Jamison, Eldon M., 9885A.
 Jarvie, William J., 7688A.
 Jens, Henry F., 10205A.

John, Ernest F., 10075A.
 Johnson, Joseph G., Jr., 9744A.
 Johnson, Merle, 9962A.
 Johnson, Ralph A., 9862A.
 Johnston, James E., 6827A.
 Jolly, Hoyt A., Jr., 7180A.
 Jones, David C., 9887A.
 Jones, Grafton K., 6931A.
 Jones, Oliver K., 32914A.
 Jones, Oval W., 9379A.
 Jordan, Hugh F., 9840A.
 Kahley, William F., 32897A.
 Kane, Francis X., 9774A.
 Kane, Raymond J., Jr., 8845A.
 Keating, Philip J., 9897A.
 Keck, James M., 10122A.
 Keefer, Norman J., 10198A.
 Keith, Benjamin M., Jr., 10276A.
 Kelley, Charles A., 13989A.
 Kelley, Edward G., 9716A.
 Kelly, Benjamin F., 32903A.
 Kelly, Thomas C., 7411A.
 Kendig, Robert L., 10291A.
 Kennedy, Elmore M., Jr., 6634A.
 Kenney, Paul H., 9728A.
 Kenney, William R., 14428A.
 Kerig, John A., Jr., 9786A.
 Kilness, Kenneth F., 10255A.
 Kilpatrick, William J., Jr., 10108A.
 King, Charles W., 32898A.
 King, William G., Jr., 8356A.
 Kinney, George R., 9844A.
 Kirby, Burton M., 9964A.
 Kirby, Frank E., 10330A.
 Klose, Benjamin B., 32887A.
 Knapp, Robert H., 9465A.
 Knauber, Leo V. M., 10312A.
 Knisely, James W., 10267A.
 Knox, Glen E., 9365A.
 Koger, Harlis R., 6393A.
 Kolody, Walter J., 9596A.
 Kommers, William W., 6414A.
 Krafka, Edward, 6783A.
 Kraft, Eugene J., 6490A.
 Kraus, James C., 9927A.
 Kreps, Conrad, 10269A.
 Kullman, John R., 10171A.
 Kunde, Clinton M., 10311A.
 Kyle, William D., Jr., 9845A.
 Ladner, Pat H., 10329A.
 Lamb, Hal W., 9344A.
 Laroche, John J., 32866A.
 Larson, James R., 10026A.
 Latson, Harvey H., Jr., 10110A.
 Lawley, William R., Jr., 10029A.
 Lawrence, Preston H., 9987A.
 Lawscn, Harold B., 32875A.
 Leclair, Charles A., 32868A.
 Lee, John W., 32883A.
 Lenfest, Charles W., 9760A.
 Lewis, Leo C., 9914A.
 Lilley, Earl A., 10228A.
 Lilliedoll, Jarrold D., 9948A.
 Lindell, Keith G., 9754A.
 Little, Edwin L., 9977A.
 Longacre, Earl, Jr., 32894A.
 Love, Thomas M., 10129A.
 Lovell, Carl E., 10237A.
 Lovett, John R., 9849A.
 Lowe, Jessup D., 9807A.
 Lozito, Vincent J., 10012A.
 Lucas, Lee R., 10071A.
 Lucas, Noel A., 6370A.
 Lundin, Robert L., 10217A.
 Lundquist, Gilmore J. P., 32858A.
 Lusby, Perry M., 9901A.
 Lynch, David M., 32870A.
 MacDonald, William R., 10019A.
 Machemer, Carl C., 10251A.
 MacNeill, Edward H., 9997A.
 Madison, Gayle E., 10153A.
 Madsen, Frank M., Jr., 9991A.
 Magee, William F., 10239A.
 Magrill, Arthur E., 6416A.
 Mahone, John R., 9943A.
 Malmgren, Victor P., 10263A.
 Maloney, Robert S., Jr., 9771A.
 Maloney, William R., 9708A.
 Manship, Joseph, 10309A.
 Markham, Peter J., 32864A.
 Markham, Theon E., 9180A.
 Markley, William C., Jr., 9993A.
 Marks, Robert J., 6927A.
 Marshall, Winton W., 9999A.
 Martin, Cecil S., 10223A.
 Martin, Maurice L., 10158A.
 Martin, Sherman F., 9963A.
 Martin, Stanley E., 6413A.
 Martin, Thomas E., 7142A.
 Mason, William H., 10030A.
 Masters, Elmer L., 9880A.
 Matelski, Erwin F., 32915A.
 Mathison, Charles G., 10218A.
 May, Britt S., 9843A.
 Mazur, Henry J., 9825A.
 McBride, William V., 10077A.
 McCabe, Thomas E., 10195A.
 McCall, David D., 32886A.
 McCarthy, Frank J., 32861A.
 McCarthy, Michael C., 9721A.
 McClain, Howard P., 9892A.
 McCloskey, Richard C., 9419A.
 McCormack, Lemuel H., Jr., 9978A.
 McCraw, Ruth, 21268W.
 McCulloch, Robert C., 9860A.
 McDonald, Joseph B., 32902A.
 McDonald, Paul R., 10280A.
 McElhone, James T., 7712A.
 McEvoy, Edwin W., 6506A.
 McFall, Dana F., Jr., 9959A.
 McGarity, William V., 10017A.
 McGee, Donald C., 8108A.
 McGonnell, Owen J., 10088A.
 McGough, Edward A., 3d, 9819A.
 McIlhaney, Sam F., 10264A.
 McKenny, Donald C., 10268A.
 McLean, Edward R., 9884A.
 McLean, Lawrence S., 10304A.
 McNamara, James F., 7167A.
 McNelly, Fred W., 6241A.
 Meadow, Harry W., 9710A.
 Mendelsohn, Irving P., 6224A.
 Mennell, Robert C., 10066A.
 Meppen, Robert C., 32879A.
 Mestemaker, Joseph E., 10081A.
 Metz, Robert C., 6769A.
 Middlebrook, Paul L., 6552A.
 Miles, Charles C., 6450A.
 Miller, Burdsall D., 9745A.
 Miller, George L., 7494A.
 Miller, Jessie M., 9739A.
 Miller, Robert, 10073A.
 Miller, Roger H., 14421A.
 Miller, Thomas B., 10036A.
 Miller, Vaughan, Jr., 9899A.
 Millin, John A., Jr., 8722A.
 Millson, Edwin H., 10211A.
 Milowski, Walter J., 9111A.
 Miotkowski, Henry F., 10973A.
 Moler, John E., 10011A.
 Monroe, Thomas G., Jr., 10229A.
 Monsell, Charles F., 6706A.
 Moore, Clifford J., Jr., 9794A.
 Moore, George B., 9968A.
 Moore, William C., 10125A.
 Morrison, Bruce L., 8672A.
 Morse, Raymond J., 32859A.
 Mortensen, Fred N., 10233A.
 Moxon, George W., 32913A.
 Mulcahy, Donald M., 9934A.
 Muldrow, Robert, 9788A.
 Muller, James L., 7774A.
 Mullis, Roy W., 7687A.
 Munch, Christopher H., 10117A.
 Murphy, Benjamin S., 9421A.
 Murrah, Idas T., 6979A.
 Murray, David H., 7700A.
 Murray, Francis P., 21437A.
 Murray, Norman L., 6513A.
 Mustain, Ivan F., 9942A.
 Myers, Joseph R., 9992A.
 Nacy, William P., 9436A.
 Nesselbush, Louis K., 10131A.
 Neuer, John J., 10100A.
 Newbury, Edward S. E., 8144A.
 Newsum, Fitzroy, 32867A.

Nicholson, William S., 10279A.
 Noble, Daniel J., 10332A.
 Noel Frederick J., Jr., 32906A.
 Noonan, Stephen F., 6380A.
 Noriega, Virgil, 7507A.
 Norley, Louis H., 9974A.
 Norton, William J., 10008A.
 Nunn, John W., 8245A.
 Nuthall, Alfred J., 6939A.
 O'Brien, Gilbert M., 10331A.
 O'Connell, John F., 9747A.
 O'Connor, Edmund F., 10200A.
 O'Day, Helen E., 21261A.
 Odren, Harry M., 8492A.
 Ogletree, Robert C., Jr., 9981A.
 Ohlendorf, Gene F., 10057A.
 Olds, Robin, 10128A.
 Olmstead, Earl O., Jr., 10141A.
 O'Reagan, John P., 9912A.
 Osborne, Earle L., 9715A.
 Oswald, Norbert J., 10149A.
 Overbey, George D., 10230A.
 Park, Lionel O., 10286A.
 Parker, Dan M., 9779A.
 Parks, Merton L., 32830A.
 Parris, Harry N., 9487A.
 Paulsen, Daniel H., 8823A.
 Paulson, Myhre E., 8319A.
 Paxton, Heyward A., Jr., 9980A.
 Pearson, Harvey A., 6969A.
 Pengue, Marcy L., 6713A.
 Perron, Gregory H., 9970A.
 Perry, Joseph H., 10004A.
 Peters, Charles K., 10068A.
 Pezda, Edwin F., 8888A.
 Platnitzka, Michael J., 32912A.
 Pitts, William F., 9796A.
 Pitts, Younger A., Jr., 9805A.
 Pletcher, Gaylord L., 9378A.
 Poore, Green B., 9508A.
 Porter, George W., 9793A.
 Portrum, Peter, 19778A.
 Potter, Waldo F., 10165A.
 Poulsen, Ernest L., 9952A.
 Powell, Charles E., 32904A.
 Powell, Ellsworth A., 32907A.
 Prather, Philip B., 10037A.
 Pratt, Jean G., 7151A.
 Pratt, Odgen N., 6359A.
 Pratt, William C., 9722A.
 Proudlove, Lloyd E., 9735A.
 Pryor, Roger C., 32892A.
 Puskar, Steven, Jr., 10015A.
 Ramsey, J. W., 10092A.
 Randall, Robert D. M., 10181A.
 Rankin, Robert J., 9996A.
 Rawlings, John W., Jr., 10172A.
 Raymond, William H., Jr., 6476A.
 Reed, Lawrence B., 32910A.
 Renaud, Louis C., 9213A.
 Rhodfarmer, Roger K., 9921A.
 Richard, Anthony H., Jr., 10202A.
 Ridgell, James M., Jr., 6319A.
 Reipe, Quenten A., 9883A.
 Riley, Lewis R., 7537A.
 Robbs, Charles E., 8928A.
 Roberts, Joe E., 6499A.
 Robertson, Lawrence R., 9367A.
 Robinson, John W., 8415A.
 Rogers, Felix M., 10067A.
 Rogers, Robert C., 10284A.
 Romaine, Owen W., 6614A.
 Root, George R., 6326A.
 Rose, Howard C., 10016A.
 Rosenthal, Herbert, 7484A.
 Rosness, Joseph H., 10192A.
 Ross, Amos H., Jr., 10023A.
 Rowland, Dwight R., 20023A.
 Rule, Richard I., 10087A.
 Rundell, Francis E., 2d, 10114A.
 Russell, Leroy G., 10127A.
 Ryan, William G., 9555A.
 Sagert, Stanley A., 10065A.
 Salter, Richard D., 7536A.
 Sanctuary, Robert H., 10031A.
 Sansone, Philip, 9936A.
 Sargent, Hubert E., Jr., 9746A.
 Sarte, Victor J., 6214A.

Savage, Cary L., 9913A.
 Schaefer, Chris J. H., Jr., 10056A.
 Schaffer, Louis, 10078A.
 Schamber, Stanley Q., 32899A.
 Schenk, Norbert R., 6950A.
 Schilke, James F., 9986A.
 Schlosberg, Richard T., Jr., 9816A.
 Schlukbier, Alvin G., 6909A.
 Schmidt, Herman J., 8962A.
 Schmoldt, Harold D. L., 7697A.
 Schutten, Bernard J., Jr., 9995A.
 Schwartz, David G., 10194A.
 Schwengels, Forrest V., 6485A.
 Scott, George E., 8820A.
 Scott, Travis M., 6352A.
 Scott, William F., 10179A.
 Searles, Dewitt R., 9907A.
 Seiler, James R., 8429A.
 Seith, Louis T., 9756A.
 Sewell, Virgil R., 10083A.
 Shadell, Kenneth L., 7959A.
 Shaefer, Richard F., 10096A.
 Shambreck, Clarence H., 9949A.
 Shea, Daniel F., 10143A.
 Sheley, Edward L., Jr., 9752A.
 Sherrill, Stephen H., Jr., 10196A.
 Shieh, Albert R., Jr., 10106A.
 Shirk, Harley O., 6556A.
 Shockley, Thomas L., 10002A.
 Shomo, William A., 8509A.
 Shook, Carmel M., 10063A.
 Shotwell, William B., 6915A.
 Showalter, Roy R., Jr., 9976A.
 Silvester, Lindsey M., 10156A.
 Simmons, William B., 8966A.
 Skeldon, Joseph L., 32881A.
 Slusher, John T., 9614A.
 Smith, Charles C., 9354A.
 Smith, Earl O., Jr., 8607A.
 Smith, Francis H., 32908A.
 Smith, Harold V., 10295A.
 Smith, Kenneth B., 10112A.
 Smith, Lowell B., 10103A.
 Smith, Ralph L., 10089A.
 Smith, Richard E., 6998A.
 Smith, Russell J., 9811A.
 Smith, William K., 6895A.
 Smith, William K., 8002A.
 Snavely, William W., 10177A.
 Snodgrass, James P., 10318A.
 Snyder, Wayne K., 9898A.
 Sorrell, Larue S., 6958A.
 Souleyret, Kenneth, 10009A.
 Souris, Robert J., 9179A.
 Spieth, Charles, Jr., 10199A.
 Spitzer, Lee W., 10052A.
 Stafford, Gordon H., 6454A.
 Stein, Frederick P., 9500A.
 Steinle, Paul L., 10169A.
 Stevens, Charles J., 32884A.
 Stevenson, John T., 9448A.
 Stevenson, Robert J., 7209A.
 Stewart, James P., 32885A.
 Stewart, Raymond R., 10314A.
 Stewart, Tom B., 7854A.
 Stewart, William R., Jr., 9835A.
 Stoddard, Richard W., 10138A.
 Stokely, Joe E., 6396A.
 Strang, Charles F., 9935A.
 Stuart, Joseph A., Jr., 9828A.
 Sturdevant, Donald E., 10093A.
 Suehr, Richard C., 7886A.
 Suggs, John J., 6570A.
 Sullivan, Roy M., Jr., 13942A.
 Sullivan, William C., 10079A.
 Summers, Clifford L., 48709A.
 Swan, Clinton D., 10224A.
 Swan, Frederic F., 10271A.
 Swanson, Darwin E., 7498A.
 Sweat, Dale S., 10190A.
 Sykes, George K., 9763A.
 Talbott, Carlos M., 9853A.
 Taliaferro, Walter R., 9792A.
 Tapscott, Wilbur A., 10076A.
 Tarbutton, Paul R., 48712A.
 Taylor, Charles M., 6651A.
 Taylor, Emery D., 10033A.
 Taylor, Lester G., Jr., 9802A.
 Teller, J. Craig, 10184A.
 Thomas, William K., 10307A.
 Thomasson, Samuel M., Jr., 20025A.
 Thompson, Donn G., 10082A.
 Thompson, William M., 9841A.
 Tillman, Herman G., Jr., 9990A.
 Trimble, Harry W., 7127A.
 Truesdell, Carlyle L., 32905A.
 Tucker, Albert S. J., Jr., 10182A.
 Tucker, Janna, 21234W.
 Turk, Wilbert, 9740A.
 Turner, Hiram G., Jr., 9784A.
 Turner, Vernon R., 10145A.
 Tyminski, Edward F., 32889A.
 Tyrrell, Robert L. F., 10020A.
 Umoff, Alexis P., 9919A.
 Vague, Harold R., 22991A.
 Vanden Dries, William P., 9873A.
 Vanduyn, John E., 9827A.
 Vaughn, William E., Jr., 6261A.
 Verbeck, Peter, 6300A.
 Verdel, Thomas H., 48710A.
 Vetter, Fred W., Jr., 9719A.
 Vignetti, John L., 6410A.
 Vlcek, Donald H., 9783A.
 Wade, William G., 10215A.
 Walker, James H., 10116A.
 Walker, William A., 6586A.
 Wallace, Duane G., 10222A.
 Wallace, Robert D., 7757A.
 Wallach, John A., 9931A.
 Wallen, Francis L., 7528A.
 Waller, Walter R., Jr., 9549A.
 Walling, Robert J., 9829A.
 Wambold, William H., 10025A.
 Watkins, James H., 10104A.
 Watson, Lawrence M., 10109A.
 Watson, Richard C., 6455A.
 Watson, Warren K., 32901A.
 Watson, William B., 7011A.
 Watts, Ralph K., 7844A.
 Wayne, Byron M., 10234A.
 Weart, George S., 9789A.
 Weber, John L., Jr., 9772A.
 Well, August E., 9736A.
 Weir, Robert A., 10225A.
 Weller, Russell K., 8865A.
 Wenk, Walter R., 8000A.
 West, Howard F., 6529A.
 Westbrook, Marston T., 10148A.
 Whitaker, Keith A., 10163A.
 White, Andrew M., 6991A.
 Whitescarver, John T., 10327A.
 Whitlow, Robert V., 9837A.
 Whitson, Jack H., 10105A.
 Whittington, Riley N., 6193A.
 Wickham, Wallace, 9718A.
 Wigbels, Lawrence G., 8586A.
 Wight, Carroll H., 7555A.
 Wilfong, John J., 8983A.
 Williams, Coleman O., Jr., 9709A.
 Williams, Owen J., 10261A.
 Williams, Philip Y., 49131A.
 Williams, Richard A., 6498A.
 Williams, Todd G., 10059A.
 Willis, Lloyd C., 6828A.
 Wilson, Campbell P. M., 6229A.
 Wilson, Louis L., Jr., 9803A.
 Wilson, William M., 9920A.
 Winget, Francis E., 6296A.
 Winkler, John M., 8283A.
 Winn, Otis E., 10013A.
 Wiseman, Joseph L., 10041A.
 Wolda, Joseph A., 7215A.
 Wojdyla, Henry E., 10289A.
 Wolfe, Gerald, 9939A.
 Wood, Willis H., 10297A.
 Woodruff, Laymont V., 9971A.
 Woodward, Valin R., 32900A.
 Woolee, Marcellus R., 6271A.
 Workman, Bryant A., 8201A.
 Worrell, Rowland H., Jr., 32888A.
 Wright, Edmund A., Jr., 10180A.
 Wright, Robert J., 9953A.
 Wright, Robert L., 10048A.
 Wright, Wallace A., 7015A.
 Wydner, Clarence S., 9975A.

Yopchick, Michael P., 9732A.
Yount, Barton K., Jr., 9834A.
Zubon, Michael, 10134A.

Medical Corps

Bell, Horace S., 24650A.
Borah, William N., 19274A.
Campbell, Daniel C., Jr., 19290A.
Condit, Norman I., 19956A.
Connor, Joseph A., Jr., 19279A.
Cook, Charles E., Jr., 26629A.
Everett, William F., 27583A.
Kurland, Anthony M., 19277A.
Leiter, Eugene R. K., 26691A.
Lifton, Solomon E., 19318A.
Parish, Herman S., Jr., 24109A.
Peters, Don P., Jr., 19248A.
Prior, Bradley W., 19249A.
Rudolph, Stephen J., Jr., 26350A.
Thomas, Herrick M., 19566A.
Tirman, Robert M., 19255A.
Troxell, John R., 21682A.
Willmarth, Charles L., 29612A.

Dental Corps

Brandt, Alfred E., 18933A.
Doran, Arthur S., 19960A.
Jameson, John R., 18955A.
McMahon, Charles A., 25731A.
Merrill, Bob K., 23120A.
Rudd, Kenneth D., 27487A.
Weber, Carl E., 21426A.
Wolfe, Rowland D., Jr., 18924A.

Veterinary Corps

Beadner, Harold F., 18997A.
Hempy, Jack H., 19003A.
Lasher, Norbert A., 18998A.
Maceachern, Neil G., 19004A.
Nichols, Wilbert C., 19920A.
Taylor, Albert A., 22461A.

Medical Service Corps

Bassoff, William, 48897A.
Edwards, Gerald, 48898A.
Eledge, William W., Jr., 19465A.
Fulton, John D., 19452A.
Gfeller, Walter F., 48896A.
Jarboe, Wallace E., 19470A.
Johnson, William M., 19469A.
King, Paul W., 19457A.
Liles, Ben C., 19456A.
Meyer, Alvin F. Jr., 19463A.
Moore, David L., 19458A.
Rogers, John M., 19455A.
Sangster, Maynard A., 19471A.
Shanahan, Eugene L., 19466A.
Thompson, Ralph E., 19464A.
Turnipseed, Lawrence L., Jr., 19468A.
Wagner, Owen B., 19454A.
Westra, Donald F., 19467A.
Wood, Ross A., 19451A.

Nurse Corps

Bedard, Evelyn M., 21107W.
Brimmer, Aileen E., 20947W.
Coffman, Catherine A., 21927W.
Echols, Hilda R., 21037W.
Fill, Wanda I., 21096W.
Finkak, Florence F., 21983W.
Kelly, Evelyn A., 20950W.
Krieble, Alice R., 21956W.
Price, Margaret M., 20948W.
Skinner, Alice L., 20994W.
Thorp, Frances P., 20902W.
Tregea, Ruth E., 20949W.

Medical Specialist Corps

Larue, Jack, 22057W.
Laughlin, Mary M., 22058W.

Chaplain

Blatz, Roman T., 18793A.
Brennan, George J., 18795A.
Clasby, William J., 48563A.
Daniels, John F., 48559A.
Gardner, Marvin O., 48562A.
Guiler, Horace A., 48561A.
Hepner, Thomas G., 18794A.

Johnston, Alfred T., 55096A.
Murphy, Francis X., 48560A.
Northrop, Albert H., 55097A.
Tomasovic, Paul, 48564A.
Whitlock, Harold T., 18797A.

(NOTE.—Dates of rank of all officers nominated for promotion will be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force.)

APPOINTMENTS IN THE AIR FORCE

The following persons for appointment as permanent professors of the U.S. Air Force Academy, under the provisions of section 933(b), title 10, United States Code:

Col. Christopher H. Munch, 10117A.
Col. James V. G. Wilson, 1112A.

The following persons for appointment in the Regular Air Force, in the grades indicated, under section 8284 of title 10, United States Code, with a view to designation under the provisions of section 8067, title 10, United States Code, to perform the duties indicated, and with dates of rank to be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force:

TO BE MAJORS, USAF (MEDICAL)

Harvey W. Hertz, AO2241170.
Myron J. Woltjen, AO3076978.

TO BE MAJOR, USAF (DENTAL)

Harcourt M. Stebbins, AO3043741.

TO BE CAPTAINS, USAF (MEDICAL)

Joseph H. Coleman, AO3041899.
Harold A. Holtman, AO3045953.
Chester W. Peebles, Jr., AO2261989.
Donald R. Seidel, AO3074788.
John T. Whitley, AO3076701.

TO BE CAPTAINS, USAF (DENTAL)

Arnold A. Angelici.
Donald E. Barnhill, AO840055.
Robert L. Jensen, O4050791.

TO BE CAPTAINS, USAF (JUDGE ADVOCATE)

Paul V. Dixon, AO842789.
James C. Hancock, AO2216004.
Robert A. Zellers, AO1554501.

TO BE CAPTAIN, USAF (NURSE)

Mary J. Schuelke, AN792464.

TO BE FIRST LIEUTENANTS, USAF (MEDICAL)

John A. DeBruin, Jr., AO3074952.
William F. Deverell, AO3075577.

Dennis C. Drake, AO3045273.

George E. Hanson.

David L. Hegg, AO3075024.

Alan G. Herrington, AO3075084.

William E. Painter.

Carlton J. Peterson, AO3075008.

Samuel C. Petrie, AO2217404.

Herbert B. Spencer, AO3075141.

Ed L. Stevens, AO3078055.

Stewart A. Vernooy, Jr., AO3075300.

Bruce H. Warren, AO3088650.

James F. Wittmer, AO3079264.

TO BE FIRST LIEUTENANTS, USAF (JUDGE ADVOCATE)

Arthur E. Arnow, AO3050087.

Richard M. Bayus, AO3060614.

Kenneth B. Knowles, AO3051761.

John J. Stirk, AO3060822.

TO BE FIRST LIEUTENANTS, USAF (NURSE)

Mary L. McLaughlin, AN3078247.

Twila M. Wills, AN2243489.

TO BE SECOND LIEUTENANT, USAF (NURSE)

Sally A. Souder, AN3078713.

The following persons for appointment in the Regular Air Force, in the grades indicated, under section 8284 of title 10, United States Code, with dates of rank to be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force:

TO BE MAJORS

Paul M. Callahan, AO581479.
Henry L. Dailey, AO649175.

Clyde D. Douglass, AO663875.

Charles B. Findley, AO746523.

Glenferd E. Funk, AO735563.

Marvin W. Glasgow, AO746091.

Clarence H. Hagins, Jr., AO522304.

Burnie P. Hayes, Jr., AO729625.

Earl L. Holcomb, AO2061382.

Robert L. Hunt, AO568737.

George W. MacSparran, AO659820.

Peter S. Marioles, AO801185.

Leon W. Moline, AO833177.

Matthew E. Perry, Jr., AO569738.

Jesse G. Pickering III, AO564040.

Alfred J. Rumburg, AO726484.

Thomas G. Sams, AO710185.

Meredith H. Shade, AO407127.

John C. Shumate, AO1534145.

Herschell E. Simmons, AO556895.

Emanuel N. Stevens, AO2040711.

Harry S. Waller, AO772922.

Perry P. Wells, AO726864.

TO BE CAPTAINS

Raymond D. Anderson, AO1860938.

Narsh D. Benson, AO2223819.

Edward P. Burrus, Jr., AO2216512.

Luther M. Hawkins, AO1910979.

Donald R. Hayes, AO2223627.

Bernard R. Hazelbaker, AO784154.

Robert S. Johnson, AO2223854.

Hilton P. Jones, Jr., AO2236371.

Edwin H. Kohlhepp, Jr., AO830621.

William F. Loyd, Jr., AO2223760.

Milton W. McRae, AO2236308.

Donald L. Olson, AO2223885.

Joseph J. Student, AO1854790.

TO BE FIRST LIEUTENANTS

Willard C. Bachli, AO3064453.

William F. Baird, Jr., AO3052505.

Billy W. Batson, AO3046455.

Hugh G. Blocker, AO3052584.

Thomas G. Bonser, AO3052535.

John J. Christensen, AO3053793.

Robert B. Clayton, AO3053789.

William B. Crockett, AO3026753.

Jay B. Day, AO3064632.

James H. Frogge, AO3052771.

Clarence C. Gay, Jr., AO3052392.

John R. Gilchrist, AO3053177.

William J. Gorman, AO3064504.

Leonard E. Haskovec, AO3053795.

Norman E. Hermes, AO3064508.

George M. Jarvis, AO3064679.

James D. Jefferson, AO3052266.

Claude J. Johns, Jr., AO3051691.

Frederic A. Kay, AO3052267.

Warren F. Klima, AO3053322.

Clifford L. Lee, AO3052809.

Robert F. Loken, AO3064494.

Leland M. Martin, AO3064654.

William C. Maxwell, AO3064656.

Roger E. McClure, AO3053043.

John N. McCormack, AO3064686.

Danilo B. Medigovich, AO3028274.

Rolland W. Moore, Jr., AO3048097.

Stephen E. Pettko, AO3052544.

Philip M. Pillar, AO3064694.

Victor G. Ramage, AO3053676.

Dean D. Roelle, AO3064569.

James L. Russell, AO3053203.

Thomas V. Soitys, AO3064524.

Jeremy C. Thomas, AO3058531.

William E. Thomas, AO3064700.

Donald R. Vallance, AO3053550.

Robert W. Weaver, AO3051508.

Charles L. Wilmot, Jr., AO3051056.

TO BE SECOND LIEUTENANTS—DISTINGUISHED OFFICER CANDIDATE GRADUATES

Donald B. Button, AO3101426.

Wayne L. Christison, AO3101386.

Brian D. Cornett, AO3101487.

Robert W. Farland, AO3101257.

Mylan A. Haugen, AO3087904.

Sheila M. Henry, AL3101602.

Gary J. Holliman, AO3101214.

Robert K. Kelly, AO3101265.

Darrell D. Lynch, AO3101307.

Reynolds W. McCabe, AO3101326.
 Gene E. Perkins, AO3101538.
 Joseph A. Schmitt, AO3101557.
 Harry Sexton, AO3101563.
 William J. Soltis, AO3101572.
 Cedric D. M. Viggers, AO3101587.
 James W. Wassall, AO3101588.
 Bryan T. Woods, AO3101597.

Subject to medical qualification and subject to designation as distinguished military graduates, the following distinguished military students of the Air Force Reserve Officers' Training Corps for appointment in the Regular Air Force, in the grade of second lieutenant, under section 8284 of title 10, United States Code, with dates of rank to be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force:

William S. Kinkead
 Robert C. Lorenzetti

CONFIRMATION

Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate June 5, 1959:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE
 J. Graham Parsons, of New York, to be an Assistant Secretary of State.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FRIDAY, JUNE 5, 1959

The House met at 12 o'clock noon. The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Psalm 145: 18: *The Lord is nigh unto all them that call upon Him, to all that call upon Him in truth.*

Eternal and ever-blessed God, we are again assembling in this Chamber, grateful for the manifold manifestation of Thy might and Thy mercy.

May the kind and gentle Spirit of our blessed Lord possess and permeate our souls more completely, making them fragrant with Thy grace and fruitful in service for needy humanity.

We beseech Thee to illuminate our minds with a clearer vision and a deeper experience of Thyself, for Thou alone art the source of the true, the good, and the beautiful and the only hope for peace and good will in a discordant and distracted world.

Grant that all the barriers of rancor among the nations and the prejudice and bigotry, which blind the heart of mankind to brotherhood, may be taken away.

Hear us in the name of the Prince of Peace. Amen.

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

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

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

H.R. 7007. An act 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 message also announced that the Senate insists on its amendments to the foregoing bill, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. STENNIS, Mr. YOUNG of Ohio, Mr. DODD, Mr. CANNON, Mr. BRIDGES, Mrs. SMITH, and Mr. MARTIN to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with an amendment in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 7120. An act to amend certain laws of the United States in light of the admission of the State of Alaska into the Union, and for other purposes.

BRETTON WOODS AGREEMENTS ACT

THE SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SPENCE].

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (S. 1094) to amend the Bretton Woods Agreements Act, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House may be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

THE SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

BRETTON WOODS AGREEMENTS ACT (H. Rept. No. 435)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 1094) to amend the Bretton Woods Agreements Act, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the House amendment insert the following: "That the Bretton Woods Agreements Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"Sec. 16. (a) The United States Governor of the Fund is authorized to request and consent to an increase of \$1,375,000,000 in the quota of the United States under article III, section 2, of the articles of agreement of the Fund, as proposed in the resolution of the Board of Governors of the Fund dated February 2, 1959.

"(b) The United States Governor of the Bank is authorized (1) to vote for increases in the capital stock of the Bank under article II, section 2, of the articles of agreement of the Bank, as recommended in the resolution of the Board of Governors of the Bank dated February 2, 1959, and (2) if such increases become effective, to subscribe on behalf of the United States to thirty-one thousand seven hundred and fifty additional shares of stock under article II, section 3, of the articles of agreement of the Bank."

"Sec. 2. Section 7(b) of the Bretton Woods Agreements Act is amended by striking out 'of \$950,000,000', and by striking out 'not to

exceed \$4,125,000,000' and inserting in lieu thereof '\$8,675,000,000'."

And the House agree to the same.

BRENT SPENCE,
 PAUL BROWN,
 WRIGHT PATMAN,
 ALBERT RAINS,
 CLARENCE E. KILBURN,
 WILLIAM B. WIDNALL,
 EDGAR W. HIESTAND,

Managers on the Part of the House.

J. W. FULBRIGHT,
 JOHN SPARKMAN,
 HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
 MIKE MANSFIELD,
 ALEXANDER WILEY,
 BURKE B. HICKENLOOPER,
 WILLIAM LANGER,

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT OF THE MANAGERS ON THE PART OF THE HOUSE

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 1094) to amend the Bretton Woods Agreements Act submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

The Senate bill amended the Bretton Woods Agreements Act to increase by \$4,550 million (from \$4,125 million to \$8,675 million) the amount authorized to be made available through public debt transactions for the payment by the United States of its subscriptions to the International Monetary Fund and the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development. The corresponding provision of the House amendment eliminated the figure of \$8,675 million, substituting an authorization of "such amounts as may be necessary" to implement the existing agreements. The House recedes. The managers on the part of the House agreed with the Senate conferees that the phraseology in the House amendment without any clearly apparent monetary limitation might be misunderstood.

The Senate bill contained a provision under which the amendments made by the bill would not become effective until July 1, 1959. This provision was deleted by the House amendment. The committee of conference agreed to the House amendment in this respect, so that the bill as agreed to in conference will take effect on enactment. This will permit the United States to take a position of leadership in putting the authorized increases into effect.

BRENT SPENCE,
 PAUL BROWN,
 WRIGHT PATMAN,
 ALBERT RAINS,
 CLARENCE E. KILBURN,
 WILLIAM B. WIDNALL,
 EDGAR W. HIESTAND,

Managers on the Part of the House.

THE SPEAKER. The question is on the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SOVIET SUBMARINES AND BASES

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

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

There was no objection.