

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

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

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

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

Sincerely,

VICTOR L. ANFUSO,
Member of Congress.

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, December 17, 1959.

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

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

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

With kind regards,

Sincerely yours,

JACK Z. ANDERSON,
Administrative Assistant to the President.

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

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

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

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

Kindest personal regards and best wishes for the holiday season.

Sincerely,

T. KEITH GLENNAN,
Administrator.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, December 31, 1959.

The Honorable VICTOR L. ANFUSO,
House of Representatives.

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

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM B. MACOMBER, JR.,
Assistant Secretary.

UNOFFICIAL TRANSLATION
DECEMBER 31, 1959.

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

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

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

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

Sincerely,

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

With warm regards, I am,

Sincerely yours,

VICTOR L. ANFUSO,
Member of Congress.

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

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

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

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

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

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

With warm regards, I am,

Sincerely yours,

VICTOR L. ANFUSO,
Member of Congress.

SENATE

MONDAY, JANUARY 11, 1960

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

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

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

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

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

Breathe on us, breath of God,

Fill us with life anew,

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

Amen.

ATTENDANCE OF A SENATOR

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

THE JOURNAL

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

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

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

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

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

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

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

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

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

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

DEATH OF REPRESENTATIVE SIMPSON OF PENNSYLVANIA

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

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

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

LIMITATION OF DEBATE DURING MORNING HOUR

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

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

ORDER DISPENSING WITH THE CALL OF THE CALENDAR

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

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

AMENDMENT OF ACT RELATING TO IMPORTATION OF ADULT HONEY BEES

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

REPORT ON OVEROBLIGATION OF AN APPROPRIATION

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

REPORT ON PROPERTY ACQUISITION, OFFICE OF CIVIL AND DEFENSE MOBILIZATION

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

REPORT OF SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

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

AMENDMENT OF LIFE INSURANCE ACT OF DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

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

REPORT OF PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

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

EXAMINATION OF CERTAIN CONTRACTS WITH BIRDSBORO ARMORCAST, INC.

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

REPORT OF INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION

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

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

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

REPORT OF POSTMASTER GENERAL

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

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

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

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

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

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. AIKEN:

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

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

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

By Mr. MURRAY:

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

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

By Mr. BUSH:

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

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina:

S. 2770. A bill for the relief of Borinquen Home Corp.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEFAUVER:

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

By Mr. ALLOTT:

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

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

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

By Mr. MONRONEY:

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

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

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

By Mr. NEUBERGER:

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

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

By Mr. DIRKSEN:

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

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

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

By Mr. HENNINGS:

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

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

By Mr. BYRD of Virginia:

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

By Mr. HENNINGS:

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

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

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

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

By Mr. JAVITS:

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

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

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

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

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

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

By Mr. JAVITS for himself and Mr. KEATING:

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

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

By Mr. NEUBERGER:

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

By Mr. BEALL:

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

By Mr. KEFAUVER:

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

By Mr. DIRKSEN (by request):

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

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

By Mr. FULBRIGHT:

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

RESOLUTIONS

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

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

ADDITIONAL FUNDS FOR COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

DEATH OF THE LATE REPRESENTATIVE STEVEN V. CARTER

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

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

DEATH OF THE LATE REPRESENTATIVE ALVIN R. BUSH

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

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

DEATH OF THE LATE REPRESENTATIVE CHARLES A. BOYLE

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

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

AIR CARGO TRANSPORTATION

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Sec. 2. As used in this Act—

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

(b) No guaranty shall be made:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

RED CROSS COULD HELP PROMOTE PEACE

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

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

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

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

RED CROSS HIGHLY INFLUENTIAL

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

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

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

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

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

MRS. ELEANOR ROOSEVELT SUPPORTS PROPOSAL

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

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

NEED IS NOW IMMEDIATE

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

AN OPEN LETTER TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Respectfully,

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

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

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

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

A PETITION TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Respectfully,

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

NEW TASK

Is peace attainable?

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

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

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

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

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

Why not? What harm could come of it?

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

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

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

RAYMOND THOMASON, JR.

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

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

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

GEORGE E. WILLIAMS AND WILLIAM L. JOHNSON

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

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

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

FREEDOM OF INFORMATION

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

PROPOSED CIVIL RIGHTS LEGISLATION

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

To quote the President again from his message last Thursday:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

To the Committee on the Judiciary:

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

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

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

To the Committee on Rules and Administration:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

"Sec. 3. Any individual who—

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

To the Committee on the Judiciary:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

To the Committee on Rules and Administration:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

To the Committee on the Judiciary:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

"(f) For the purposes of this section—

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

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

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

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

The statement submitted by Mr. JAVITS is as follows:

MEMORANDUM

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

THE MARIGOLD AS OUR NATIONAL FLORAL EMBLEM

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

EXTENSION OF LIBRARY SERVICES ACT—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

By Mr. DIRKSEN:

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

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

By Mr. RUSSELL:

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

By Mr. NEUBERGER:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. HAYDEN. That is correct.

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

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

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

TERMS OF SENATE PAGES

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

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

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

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

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

EDUCATION IN RUSSIA

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

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

[From the Journal of Arkansas Education]

NOTES FROM RUSSIA

(By Forrest Rozzell)

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

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

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

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

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

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

RATIONAL KNOWLEDGE, FREEDOM'S FOUNDATION

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

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

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

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

POLICY OF SELECTIVE IGNORANCE

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

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

PROPAGANDA AS A TECHNIQUE

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

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

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

BATTLE FOR LOYALTIES OF YOUTH

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

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

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

CONTRASTS IN EAST AND WEST BERLIN

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

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

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

THE YOUTH ORGANIZATIONS

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

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

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

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

POLAND AND THE U.S.S.R.

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

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

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

PSYCHOLOGICAL MOTIVATIONS

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

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

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

HUMAN FREEDOM FOR HUMAN WELFARE

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

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

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

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

EDUCATION AS KEY FACTOR

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

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

INFORMAL EDUCATION

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

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

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

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

CHANGING EMPHASIS IN EDUCATION

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

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

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

EDUCATION FOR MANPOWER NEEDS

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

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

INSTRUMENT OF NATIONAL POLICY

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

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

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

RUSSIAN SYSTEM AND ETHICAL VALUES

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

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

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

POSITIVE MOTIVATIONS

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

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

HOW TO COUNTERACT SOVIET POWER

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

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

UNIVERSAL FREE EDUCATION, MAN'S HOPE

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

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

DEDICATION TO DEMOCRATIC PROCESSES

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

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

NO INSURMOUNTABLE PROBLEMS

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

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

OUR MISSILE AND SPACE PROGRAM

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

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

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

(By Edward Gamarekian)

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

AN UNSPOKEN REPLY

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

QUESTIONS OF BALANCE

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

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

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

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

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

(By John G. Norris)

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

GENERAL TAYLOR'S WARNING

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

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

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

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

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

RUSSIA ALSO IMPROVES

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

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

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

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

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

The administration has—

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

POLARIS A YEAR AWAY

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

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

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

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

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

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

CRASH PROGRAM OUT

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

(By John G. Norris)

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

mize air power and minimize the foot soldier."

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

ARMY RELIES ON TAC

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

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

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

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

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

PENTAGON'S POLICY

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

STORY OF A FAILURE

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

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

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

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

EFFECTIVE BUT TOO HEAVY

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

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

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

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

RUSSIAN GAINS IN AIR

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

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

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

CONVENTIONAL FORCES

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

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

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

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

[From the Washington Post, Jan. 6, 1960]
U.S. IMAGE ABROAD—WE CAN STILL RIGHT UN-

HAPPY BALANCE

(By Chalmers M. Roberts)

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

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

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

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

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

SKILL NOT LACKING

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

PRESIDENT'S COMMENT

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

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

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

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

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

AMERICANS UNEASY

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

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

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

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

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

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

CRITICISM OF SETTLEMENT OF THE STEEL STRIKE

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

TO MR. TRUMAN IT MUST SEEM
LIKE YESTERDAY

(By Arthur Krock)

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

STEEL PRICES AND WAGES

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

Year	Strike length	Minimum pay	Hourly increase	Steel price increase per ton
	Days			
1937	-----	\$0.625	\$0.10	-----
1941	-----	.725	.10	\$11.00
1942	-----	.78	.055	-----
1946	26	.965	.185	5.00
1947	-----	1.09	1.16	5.00
1948	-----	1.185	1.13	9.34
1950	-----	1.36	1.16	5.50
1952	59	1.435	1.16	5.00
1953	-----	1.52	.085	4.00
1954	-----	1.57	.05	3.00
1955	112	1.685	1.15	7.35
1956	34	1.82	1.105	8.50
1957	-----	1.89	.21	6.00
1958	-----	1.96	.07	4.50
1959	116	-----	-----	-----
1960	-----	\$2.03	4.07	-----

¹ Denotes hourly increase which was included in "package" spread over the various job classifications, and not exactly matched in the minimum pay rates.

² Hours.

³ The strike lasted from July 15 until Nov. 7, 1959, when workers returned to the mills under a Taft-Hartley injunction. But the labor settlement was not reached until Jan. 4, 1960.

⁴ Includes reported but unannounced wage increase of 7 cents an hour effective Dec. 1, 1960.

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

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

STEEL UNION REAL VICTOR (By Peter Edson)

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

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

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

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

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

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

He said this repeatedly but it did no good.

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

There wasn't and it wasn't.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

INGLORIOUS ENDING
(By Walter Lippmann)

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

RESOLUTION 59-25

Resolution supporting establishment of Wisconsin Moraine National Park

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

STEPS TAKEN BY SECRETARY OF DEFENSE GATES TO PREVENT INTERSERVICE DISPUTES

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

RETURNS FROM MEETING

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

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

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

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

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

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

PROPOSED BUDGET CRITICIZED

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

CONSULTATIONS URGED

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

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

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

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

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

THE GATES' MEMORANDUM: SECRETARY CLEARS WAY FOR DEFENSE REORGANIZATION

(By Hanson W. Baldwin)

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

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

The memorandum, which requires that the Defense Secretary or his deputy sit with the Joint Chiefs whenever differences develop among them, will tend simultaneously to strengthen the Joint Chief and civilian control.

URGED FOR SOME TIME

The simple procedure ordered by Mr. Gates had been urged for some time by high-ranking officers in the Pentagon and other experts on defense organization.

Neil H. McElroy, former Secretary of Defense, who retired last month, occasionally attended meetings of the Joint Chiefs during the last part of his regime. But the procedure was not regular, either in his case or in that of any other Secretary of Defense.

Some observers believe that Mr. McElroy and other Secretaries postponed or compromised decisions when there were divergencies between the services, or made decisions on the basis of inadequate firsthand knowledge of the problems involved.

The procedure that Mr. Gates has now required, that he is known as a hard worker, and the importance he attaches to intimate face-to-face meetings with the military chiefs would seem to insure that the new Secretary will have all the facts necessary to make decisions.

MAKES IMPRESSION

This, in itself, represents a strengthening of civilian control at the top level. Moreover, Mr. Gates' implicit recognition of the desirability of some divergencies in strategic thought sets him squarely in opposition to those who advocate a single military "party line," or a single military chief for all the services.

Some officers were particularly impressed by the Secretary's emphasis on his accessibility to all the service chiefs at any time.

Thus, the memorandum is being hailed by some officers as a milestone for the immediate future in the evolution of Defense Department organization.

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

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield to the distinguished Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I merely wish to concur in the observations which have been made by the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts, and to say I think a most progressive, forward step has been taken by a very

capable Secretary of Defense in determining that he will sit in on decisions when controversies develop, because it emphasizes civilian control over the Military Establishment, for one thing, and it will have a rather chastening effect when differences may arise from time to time. I noted with great satisfaction that this step was taken.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I thank the Senator from Illinois for his contribution. I may add that as the Senator knows and I know, when a fire starts it is much easier to put it out when it is small, and before it gets too big and spreads; and I hope the action the Secretary has announced he will take will have a comparably salutary effect.

ROCKET TESTS IN THE PACIFIC

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, we shall not improve our position in world opinion by protesting to the Russians against their making rocket tests over lonely spaces in the Pacific while we do the same thing.

If my understanding of the situation is correct, what the Russians propose to do is what we have done. Moreover, it is what we have asserted our right to do even when the Japanese protested. The area involved, as I understand, does not embrace any islands mandated under the United Nations. It is open, uninhabited ocean. The notices Russia has given are similar to those we have given to guard ships and planes against accidents.

I have just returned, Mr. President, from a 31-day trip around the world, during which I made 18 stops at over-sea points. If travel does anything for a man, it exposes him to as many tides of world opinion as wash the shores of the places he visits. Moreover, it makes him realize that there are many people in the world, and that the United States is not the only country with pride and honor.

Nor can we be indifferent to what happens elsewhere. I visited the lower house of the parliamentary body in India the day Prime Minister Nehru replied to critics of his China policy.

He reminded them that China and India are big powers and that a military conflict between them would hardly be a police action; that a little war between them would not stay little; that war between India and China would engulf the world.

We sometimes forget that India, with 400 million people, and China, with more than 650 million, comprise half the population of the world. Aroused, modernized, mobilized, their manpower and their resources would be impressive and would be complicating for every major power on earth. It gave this member of the U.S. Senate pause for reflection to hear parliamentarians in New Delhi debate issues on the basis of war involvement for the United States.

Mr. President, at a later date I hope to review some of the matters which came to my attention in countries visited, where I went over both military and economic aid programs to the extent that time permitted. At this time, however, I merely wish to point out that

there are many people in this world, and we do not impress them by seeking to deny for other countries privileges we assert for ourselves.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I was interested in what the distinguished Senator from South Dakota had to say about the freedom of the seas. It is true, of course, that the high seas are free to all nations, but the use of that freedom in an arbitrary fashion to the detriment of other nations is irresponsible and provocative.

The recent Russian announcement of the intention to use the Pacific for a missile testing range is arbitrary. Hence, it is both irresponsible and provocative.

It is arbitrary because—

First. No known prior consultation was taken with nations whose interests are deeply involved in the Pacific.

Second. A large section of the ocean was set apart, close by missile-measurement, to islands which are the property of or the responsibility of other nations.

Third. The nations of the world were brusquely advised to stay out of the area.

Fourth. No ships or planes have been provided to patrol the area in order to warn the unwary away from the danger zone.

Fifth. No consideration has been given to nations whose fishing and transportation industries may be damaged by the arbitrary interference.

Sixth. Other areas—the Arctic, for example—are available for testing. These are remote areas of little economic importance, areas of minimal interference with the rights of others.

Seventh. The test, coming as it does at this time in an ocean of great significance to American security and commerce, is bound to be interpreted as casting doubt on the peaceful professions of Mr. Khrushchev. It is, to say the least, to use a Russian phrase, not in the spirit of Camp David.

Eighth. The arbitrary setting aside of an unpatrolled area in the Central Pacific by the Russians is not in the same category as our use of similar areas for testing. In those cases, we acted only after attempting to get agreement on international control of weapons. Moreover, we used areas for the tests close to territories under our control, and we patrolled them. And when damage was done to others, we paid for the damage. These tests, finally, have not been resumed for 18 months. We are trying now to obtain a multilateral ban not only on such tests but on all nuclear tests.

Ninth. Nor is the Russian-announced missile test similar to the Canaveral range tests. The latter are far from the vital interests of the other missile powers. These tests can, in no way, be considered provocative. They were in process long before the spirit of Camp David came into being. Moreover, the Canaveral range operates with the approval and cooperation of nations whose territories neighbor upon it.

I have before me a magazine entitled "Aviation Week," containing an article entitled "Space Technology," in which is shown the location of the tracking stations in the Caribbean and the South Atlantic. It is my understanding that

agreements have been reached with every foreign country having a direct interest in the matter. The area has been placed in little danger, although there have been, if my memory serves me, test missiles which have gone off their course. Those countries did not receive a notice only 8 days before the missile tests were supposed to start. There was no arbitrary action.

No consideration is given to the feelings of this country; to others who have regular navigation routes; to the feelings of the Japanese, who have fishing rights. No consideration is given to the feelings of the people who occupy the general area of that vast expanse of the South Pacific.

If international law is deficient in this respect, I think it ought to be corrected, so that regulation can be applied to all nations which have a vested interest in international law, in the waters of the world.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I simply wish to say to the Senator from Montana, I did not know until after I had prepared a part of my statement this morning that the Senator had made any statement on this subject. My remarks were prompted by the statement which I saw the other day which was attributed to former President Truman.

After reading the morning newspaper, I called the State Department earlier today to find out the facts. I was told that so far as they had been able to determine the facts, what the Russians are proposing is what we did in the Pacific—what we did and asserted our right to do after the Japanese had protested.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BUSH in the chair). The time of the Senator has elapsed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for an additional minute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, we are not conducting any experiments of this nature of which I am aware in the vicinity of the Kamchatka Peninsula or the Bering Sea.

So far as this particular incident is concerned, I would have hoped that the Soviet Union would have discussed it with the nations which have a vital interest in that area of the world. It appears to me that what the Soviet Union is doing is setting aside something on the order of 27,000 square miles—an area in extent, I believe, approximately 200 miles wide and 300 miles long—and saying, in effect, "This is Mare Nostrum. This is our sea; and here we are going to carry on these tests."

If we are to have international comity, and if we are to have summit meetings to consider these matters, then I think we ought to get together ahead of time and, if need be, call a special meeting of the United Nations, at which meeting there could be devised some means of working out an agreement to regulate and to control international waters, except for the littoral of the countries

concerned. Or, if there is to be a summit meeting, we could make this one of the top items on the agenda for consideration at that time.

There is obviously a need for some international regulation of the use of the high seas by all nations for any purpose of this kind; that is, the testing not only of nuclear devices but of missiles as well.

The rights of all nations become involved in this matter. The destruction of fish, the inconvenience to transportation affects all, however limited or indirect the effect may be on some. If these tests are to go on, the need is for them to proceed in a regularized fashion so as to minimize the inconvenience to others, so as to reduce their provocativeness, so as to avoid damage to others and to provide compensation for it when it occurs by accident.

SCHEENECTADY UNEMPLOYMENT HEARINGS

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I have just returned from Schenectady, N.Y., where on Friday the Senate special Committee on Unemployment Problems held hearings on economic conditions in the Mohawk Valley area. These hearings were highly successful, and I am hopeful that they will provide guidelines for Congress in dealing with unemployment problem areas throughout our land.

The Mohawk Valley is a fine area, with a proud cultural and historic heritage. Its economy is diversified. There is found there an excellent and highly skilled labor force. The valley has a pleasant climate, and many wonderful recreational and cultural assets. At the moment, unemployment in the area is high, but certainly not critical.

The people of the Mohawk Valley are by no means discouraged. They are working hard to solve their present difficulties. Cities throughout the valley have cooperated closely with the New York State Department of Commerce in the Department's efforts to attract new industries to the State. Furthermore, they themselves have organized intensive programs of self-help to revitalize their economy and to attract new industry into the area. Their efforts are meeting with heartening success. The economy of the valley is moving forward. Employment is on the rise. Optimism is the spirit of the day. Although much hard work remains to be done, I am confident that the people of this area will be fully successful.

As an illustration of the worthy efforts being made on the part of the people of the Mohawk Valley, I call attention to the work of the Schenectady industrial development program. This program has a very unique and certainly appropriate name—GUTS, Inc. Spelled out in action, GUTS means "Gear Up for Tomorrow in Schenectady." This is an attitude which I greatly admire. It allows no room for defeat or lethargy.

Mr. President, I salute the leaders of GUTS and the many men of action from other communities throughout the valley for the fine work they have devoted

to the strengthening and rebuilding of the economy of the Mohawk Valley.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a statement made by Mr. Lewis B. Harris, its general chairman, describing the work of GUTS, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

GUTS, INC.—"Gear Up for Tomorrow in Schenectady" is a communitywide self-help movement with the objective of creating economic opportunity for Schenectady citizens by—

(a) Making existing businesses so outstandingly effective that they capture a share of America's growing markets.

(b) Attracting new businesses to Schenectady.

A specific GUTS goal is 10,000 new jobs by 1963.

GUTS is different from efforts of thousands of competing communities in that the responsibility for creating economic opportunity is not relegated to a few affluent citizens or institutions but is in fact a cause being vigorously pursued by business, government, clergy, labor, education—everybody, demonstrating the truth of the GUTS slogan "150,000 people with a purpose."

GUTS is carefully organized with specific responsibility assignments and thorough orientation of all individuals assigned to GUTS positions so that they precisely know their own responsibilities, the overall organization objectives, and the relation of their own assignments to the other positions in the organization.

The community spirit and purpose is seen in the fact that in the traditional American spirit of community "barn raising," all local services, materials, facilities, and human effort required by GUTS are being provided at no charge. The GUTS office pays no rent. Its staff are all volunteers. Ads and commercials are run free by local newspapers and broadcasters. Its brochures are prepared and printed free. Prospective employers, when in Schenectady, pay no hotel fees. Their meals, transportation, and entertainment are provided at no charge, and so on.

GUTS believes and Schenectady County intends to demonstrate that in the final analysis the success of a business depends not on technology or location, but on people—skilled, intelligent, outstanding people who are enthusiastic about their jobs and their employers—people who expect to be well paid and intend to be worth it.

In a country in which the traditions which made it great are all but forgotten, GUTS represents a return to the old values; 150,000 people are reaffirming their belief in making their own opportunities; in working skillfully, intelligently, enthusiastically in preparing themselves and their community to make the maximum contribution to businesses who see their opportunity in the community's energy.

Many businesses apparently have been finding newer, industrially speaking, sections of the United States more attractive than the older sections of which Schenectady is an example. We believe that in such action they will find themselves on the same road they are hoping to avoid but simply at an earlier place in time—a road characterized by self-seeking groups who will relentlessly pursue their partisan interests without concern for others or the total system of which they are a part.

What is needed is a new road entirely different from the one habitually followed of late. This new road is characterized by co-operation and a demonstration that individuals and groups can find a way to develop and pursue a common purpose without sub-

ordinating individual and group purposes and losing individual and group freedoms.

All new roads must begin somewhere. It is GUTS' contention that the start of a new road which emphasizes America's treasured values is to be found in Schenectady.

GOOD NEWS ON CANCER RESEARCH

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, an article written by William L. Laurence and published in the New York Times of Sunday, January 10, 1960, contains heartening news on the progress of research on cancer being conducted by the Sloan-Kettering Institute of Cancer Research. In his excellent analysis of a report published by the institute, Mr. Laurence states:

The evidence so far suggests that the Sloan-Kettering scientists are on the road to an anticancer vaccine.

Mr. President, this is wonderful news. The American people can be proud of the fine work being done by scientists of the Sloan-Kettering Institute, and of many other similar research organizations, to find a means of curing and preventing one of man's most dreaded diseases. Undoubtedly, a great deal of hard work lies ahead in the battle against cancer. In this light, we must consider the good news from Sloan-Kettering as an indication of the need to dedicate our maximum effort and the fullest possible resources to this great battle.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Laurence's article be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

SLOAN-KETTERING INSTITUTE REPORTS ON 2 YEARS OF CANCER RESEARCH (By William L. Laurence)

The Sloan-Kettering Institute for Cancer Research, one of the world's major centers dedicated to the search for means to control mankind's second greatest killer, made public its biennial report last week. It contains a general picture of research in progress, based on more than 700 scientific reports published by the institute's staff during the 2-year period from July 1, 1957, to June 30, 1959.

Among the liveliest projects in current cancer research is the quest for means to stimulate the body's natural defenses against invading cancer cells.

When bacteria or viruses attack the body a multitude of defenses are summoned. All of the known forces that the body calls into action in its own defense are components or products of a group of related cells found in the spleen, liver, bone marrow, and lymph nodes, known collectively as the reticuloendothelial system, or RES.

ANTIBODY REACTION

The best known products of this system are antibodies, special protein molecules shaped specifically by the body to react with a particular foreign material and immobilize it. Other defensive elements include white blood cells with various functions, such as the phagocytes which eat up offending particles and the fibroblasts which wall them off, and defense-promoting chemicals such as complement and properdin.

Scientists in the solid tumor section of the institute's experimental chemotherapy division have been studying the effects of cancer growth on the vital defense network of the RES.

The test subjects are mice implanted with sarcoma 180, a vigorous, rapidly growing, readily transplantable mouse cancer. During the first few days of the cancer's growth, the report states, RES cells multiply in visible numbers, "apparently responding to the threat of the growing cancer." Other invaders, however, are handled more swiftly and efficiently during this period. Then, as the aggressive tumor continues to grow, the tide turns. The defense system, exhausted by the unequal struggle, begins to break down and finally fails completely. Bacteria, always present in the body, but ordinarily held in check, begin to multiply and finally take over. In these animals, as in cancer patients, infection is often the direct cause of death.

If, before the RES is exhausted, it is given a sudden boost, "it may be able to overcome the cancer implant," the report says.

The most effective booster tried so far is *Bacillus Calmette-Guérin* (BCG), which has been used for years to stimulate resistance in children exposed to tuberculosis. BCG injections, the report states, "have produced 100 percent recovery from sarcoma 180 implanted in laboratory mice." Studies are now in progress of animals with spontaneous cancers, to discover whether these have the same effect on the defense system and whether stimulation of the defenses can slow or stop their growth.

PLANTED IN EGGS

A technique has been developed in the embryology section of the experimental chemotherapy division for planting fragments of human cancer on the membrane of the fertilized egg. Depending on the type of cancer, the cells may spread throughout the embryo and young chicks may be hatched with widespread human cancer. Most of the chicks die within a few weeks, but some survive; as these mature "something within their bodies begins to destroy the cancer."

Similar studies are being carried out on cancer defenses in the rat. When untreated rats are injected with minced human cancer, the foreign cells are rapidly destroyed in the rats' bodies. Blood and tissue samples were taken from the animals 7 days after an injection with a type of human cancer now grown widely in laboratory animals and test tubes by methods developed at Sloan-Kettering. Fresh human cancer tissue was exposed to these blood and tissue samples for 1 hour and then implanted into rats pretreated with cortisone and X-ray.

"Ordinarily, in rats so treated," the report states, "injected human cancers will grow—hundreds are grown this way every week—but these human cancers do not. They had been killed by antibodies manufactured in the body of the rat."

BROKEN CELLS

In a second group of experiments, the human cancer cells were broken by grinding and then separated into five fractions containing different cell components by whirling in the ultracentrifuge. Each of the five fractions was injected into a different group of animals, but blood samples from only two of the five groups were toxic to the cancer cells. These blood samples not only killed cells in the test tube but, when injected into animals, killed cancer cells planted in them 2 or 3 days previously.

These two active anticancer fractions are the only two containing fragments of a canal-like system known as the endoplasmic reticulum, a network believed to connect the cell's outer membrane with the nucleus and other key chemical control points. "Do these canals, and perhaps the membrane itself, contain some specific substance that spells 'foreign' or 'cancer' to the body and signals it to mobilize its defenses?" the report asks.

What may turn out to be the most significant studies of all are those of cancer defenses in man, which in many ways parallel those going forward on laboratory animals. Human cancer cells were implanted in two groups of volunteers: healthy inmates of the Ohio State Penitentiary; and advanced cancer patients from the James Ewing Hospital of the city of New York.

"In the healthy men," the report states, "the cancer implants promptly evoked a strong defense reaction. There was some initial growth but within 4 weeks all the cancer had been destroyed. In contrast, in the patients with advanced cancer, the implanted cancer cells grew vigorously. Clearly, healthy persons have a resistance to implanted cancer that is weak or lacking in patients with advanced cancer."

"Second implants of cancer cells were made in both groups of volunteers. In both, the cells were rejected with greatly increased vigor. Thus, additional resistance could be induced to implanted cancer, just as it can to a viral or bacterial invader."

SECOND IMPLANT

"When cancer cells of different types were used for the second implant, the reaction was less vigorous than with the same type, but more than that seen on the initial implant of cells. This was particularly interesting and important information; it meant that the resistance is partly specific for the particular type of cancer, but all cancers so far tested (the total is now seven) do share some common resistance-evoking factors."

"Even when killed, the cancer cells retain these factors, just as killed or inactivated virus particles, as in the Salk polio vaccine, may evoke resistance to disease carried by the live virus. Injection of the killed cancer cells produces no characteristic nodule under the skin and no inflammation, but when a second implant is given, the rejection response is as prompt and vigorous as if the first had been made up of living material."

The defense-evoking factors shared by the cancer cells were "clearly not present in the normal cells the investigators were able to study, but the studies are not yet adequate to permit generalization," the report states. The evidence so far suggests that the Sloan-Kettering scientists are on the road to an anticancer vaccine.

ADDITIONAL FEDERAL JUDGE FOR THE DISTRICT OF KANSAS

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, during the adjournment of Congress a number of citizens of my home State of Kansas conferred with me regarding the matter of an additional Federal judge for the district of Kansas.

There is pending on the Senate Calendar an omnibus judgeship bill which includes an additional judge for our district, and I sincerely hope that we may get early action on it.

The U.S. District Court for the District of Kansas for many years was presided over by a single district judge. Authorization in 1945 for an additional temporary judicial position expired within a year, because of the death of Judge Helvering. An additional permanent judgeship was finally authorized in 1949. However, the business of the district has continued to expand, and in April 1954 the Judicial Conference of the United States recommended the creation of a third judgeship for the State. This recommendation has been renewed annually for the last 5 years.

Since 1941, the number of civil cases commenced annually in the district of Kansas has tripled. In that year 291 civil cases were filed compared with 954 in 1959, as is shown in the table from which I shall presently quote. For the last 9 fiscal years the civil caseload has risen almost steadily, and the backlog has also increased, but at a somewhat lesser rate. This is due not only to the hard work of the resident judges, but also to the use of visiting judges from other districts who have been sent in to handle the large volume of business. The civil cases filed, terminated, and pending at the end of each year for the last 9 fiscal years has been as follows:

Fiscal year	Commenced	Terminated	Pending on June 30
1951.....	554	578	336
1952.....	555	505	386
1953.....	661	584	463
1954.....	792	665	590
1955.....	736	798	528
1956.....	800	787	541
1957.....	727	775	493
1958.....	940	880	553
1959.....	954	948	559

The civil caseload of 477 cases per judge commenced in this district in the fiscal year 1959 was the second largest nationally, and compares with the national average of 215 such cases. Diversity of citizenship cases and habeas corpus proceedings instituted by petitioners in the Leavenworth Penitentiary are important factors in the business of the district. Habeas corpus cases on the average do not require much time for hearing, but often the decision of the constitutional questions involved and the writing of opinions are burdensome. On the other hand, the diversity cases weigh heavily upon the time of the judge because a considerable proportion of these cases reach trial.

In addition to this heavy civil caseload the district has a slightly heavier than average load of criminal cases. Excluding the immigration cases which occur only in volume in the 5 districts touching the Mexican border, and which by and large require very little time per case for disposition, the criminal caseload per judgeship of 139 cases in Kansas is larger than the national average of 108 criminal cases. The criminal caseload has remained at approximately the same level for the past 3 years.

While population per judge is by itself not the sole criterion of the number of judges needed in a particular district, it is a factor which should be taken into consideration. Kansas, with 2 district judges, had an estimated population in 1959 of 2,140,000. The population of other States having three judges is as follows:

Estimated population, July 1, 1959

State:	
Wisconsin.....	4,010,000
South Carolina.....	2,417,000
West Virginia.....	1,965,000
Oregon.....	1,766,000
Arkansas.....	1,744,000
Delaware.....	454,000

The population of Kansas was less than that of two of the States listed and larger than that of four of these States.

The State of Washington, with a population of 2,823,000, has 4 judges; and Oklahoma, with a population of 2,276,000, has 5 judges.

There can be no question in my mind that the workload in the Kansas Federal court district is such that in the interest of those who have suits pending before that Federal district court and who are entitled to early decision of their cases an additional district judge should be provided.

PROPOSAL THAT THE SECRETARIES OF THE ARMY, NAVY, AND AIR FORCE BE MADE UNDER SECRETARIES OF DEFENSE

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I am informed that yesterday my colleague, the distinguished junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON], said on the TV program "Meet the Press" that the Secretaries of the Departments of the Army, Navy, and Air Force should be made Under Secretaries of Defense—to strengthen the organization of the Department of Defense, and to contribute to the security of our country.

I call to the attention of my colleague and old college classmate, Senator SYMINGTON, and to the attention of the Senate the fact that on February 3, 1958, and again on September 15, 1959, I introduced in the Senate bills to accomplish what he proposed yesterday; that is, to make the Secretaries of the Army, Navy, and Air Force Under Secretaries of the Department of Defense. Senate bill 2728 is now before the Senate Committee on Armed Services, and I am hopeful that the interest of the Senator from Missouri will be shared by other members of the committee, and that they will seriously consider it. I must say that the proposal has attracted interest in many quarters, as evidenced by editorials previously placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

In the Congress and throughout the country, there is much talk about the inadequacy of our defense structure. Many seem to be looking for some magic solution, or rely solely on the expenditure of billions of dollars. I point out that the bipartisan Hoover Commission report of February 28, 1949, on the Organization of the Department of Defense, and the letter of former Secretary of Defense Robert A. Lovett to President Truman on November 18, 1952, as he went out of office, and the reports of the Rockefeller Commission in 1953 and 1958 pointed out the divided authority between the Secretary of Defense and the three Department Secretaries, and stated that unified authority of the Secretary of Defense should be assured.

The Hoover Commission recommended, as my bill proposes, that the service Secretaries be made Under Secretaries of Defense for the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force.

I recall that there served on that Commission, in addition to Mr. Hoover, former Secretary of State Acheson; the Commission was truly a bipartisan one. In addition, Senate bill 2728 would give authority to the Department of Defense to centralize procurement now divided

wastefully between the departments. More important, it would give authority to the Director of Defense Research and Engineering, now Dr. York, to take charge authoritatively of the functions of research and development, now split between the three Departments, with resulting duplication and waste.

The present organization has been described as a "federation," with the Departments exercising autonomous power, and with the Secretary of Defense often limited to the function of coordination—when he ought to be in charge. It is obvious that the Secretaries of the Army, Navy, and Air Force, although patriotic and able men, must be champions of their services, if they are to have their support; and, as civilians, they must rely in great part on the information supplied by the military services they represent. This division of authority might have been tolerated years ago; but today, when the defense budget approximates \$40 billion and may go higher, and when, more important, the very security of our Nation and the prospect of peace depend in great measure upon an effective defense structure and upon rapid progress in research, the people of the Nation cannot tolerate duplication in research, waste in procurement, and the split interests of the military departments.

I welcome the support of the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON]; and again, I ask the Committee on Armed Services to consider seriously this proposal, which I have advanced now for 3 years.

Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky.

DR. OMER CARMICHAEL

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, on September 11 a little over 3 years ago, President Eisenhower said:

I think Mr. Carmichael must be a very wise man. I hope to get some advice from him because he pursued the policy that I believe will finally bring success.

The President did meet a few days later with Dr. Omer Carmichael, then serving in his 11th year as superintendent of the Louisville, Ky., city school system. While this recognition of his work was one of the highest honors bestowed on Dr. Carmichael, it was typical of him that he had said: "I've never sought honors nor do I want them. I just want to do a good job."

In his quiet but firm and supremely able way, Dr. Omer Carmichael did an outstanding job in whatever tasks lay before him—of which the desegregation of our schools was but one among his efforts to provide the best education possible for the children in his charge.

Now Dr. Carmichael is dead. But the life of the community he helped to shape will continue to do honor to his perseverance and resolution of character, to his sense of duty, and to his calm nobility—just as his work will go on in the finest of living memorials, the daily work of the hundreds of men and women who owe, in part, their education to him.

At this time, I know the people of Kentucky extend their sympathy to Mrs. Carmichael, and to their three children. I wish to pay my own respects to a man whom I knew as a conscientious, thoroughly professional, and warmly human educator—a man of spirit and purpose.

Dr. Carmichael was born on a cotton farm at Hollins, Ala., in 1890, and financed his own education at the University of Alabama, where a cousin, Dr. Oliver C. Carmichael, later served as president. His degree in mathematics, his knowledge of Latin and Greek, his experience as a teacher, his work as a superintendent of schools in Alabama, Florida, and Virginia, gave him broad background for his 14 years of service as superintendent of the Louisville schools.

On the day the Supreme Court announced its decision in the Brown case in 1954, Omer Carmichael said:

It will be my purpose to implement that decision with no effort to sidestep—no effort by subterfuge or sharp practice to defeat the purpose of the Court.

And while his accomplishment of quiet desegregation of the Louisville public schools may be recognized by the Nation as his crowning achievement, Kentuckians will also mourn a fine educator, a valued adviser, and a good friend—a man of principle who held the respect of his city, his State, and his country.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point an editorial regarding Dr. Carmichael, from today's Louisville Courier-Journal.

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

[From the Louisville (Ky.) Courier-Journal, Jan. 11, 1960]

OMER CARMICHAEL: A DEDICATED ORDINARY MAN

Omer Carmichael would have been the last person to wish to hear himself described as an extraordinary man. Indeed, he typified the ordinary man at his best; the decent, unassuming, conscientious American who so often confounds the skeptics by rising to meet a challenge, moral or physical, with bravery and an unswerving instinct for the right thing to do.

It was thus that Mr. Carmichael, until 1954 a good but unremarkable superintendent of a good but unremarkable public school system, rose to meet the challenge of integrating the white and Negro schools of Louisville. Most of his fellow superintendents, many of them, it is true, lacking the consciousness of public approval and support that Mr. Carmichael knew could be counted upon here, retreated in confusion and postponed the inevitable day of reckoning.

Omer Carmichael met the challenge simply and directly. Immediately the Court's decision was made known, he announced: "It will be my purpose to implement that decision with no effort to sidestep, no effort by subterfuge or sharp practices to defeat the purpose of the Court."

For 2 years thereafter, he talked, explained, listened, and prepared. The result was that Louisville's integration of schools, when it came, was a model for the Nation. It was quiet, dignified, without ugly incident. And the one man to whom most credit accrued was the superintendent of schools.

This was not the only accomplishment of Omer Carmichael's career in Louisville. Our school system steadily improved under him.

The lot of the teacher, the education of the student, have advanced in the years he spent here. But the story of school integration in Louisville will remain his accolade. Here was a southerner by birth and upbringing, who realized at once that the habits and prejudices of a lifetime could not be allowed to stand against the law of the land. A good man has left us, and he is sincerely mourned.

PRESERVING PADRE ISLAND AS A NATIONAL SEASHORE: A PLACE OF TRANQUILLITY AND NATURAL BEAUTY

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, an excellent editorial in the New York Times of Sunday January 10, 1960, serves to remind us that soon the Senate and the House will have an opportunity to act on legislation designed to preserve several national seashore and park areas, and that the time in which to preserve these areas is short—the need critical.

Among the projects under consideration is S. 4, a proposal to establish a national seashore area on Padre Island—a 117-mile-long island with a beautiful sand beach stretching along the coast of Texas in the Gulf of Mexico.

Last month in considering the Padre Island Park proposal, Texans from all walks of life were highly pleased to have the distinguished Senator from Utah [Mr. Moss] and members of the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs subcommittee staff, hold public hearings in Corpus Christi. They did an unusually outstanding job of gathering the facts. They inspected the island from the air and heard testimony from more than 40 witnesses.

Among those who testified was the Honorable Conrad L. Wirth, Director of the National Park Service. He has since informed me that the hearings constituted one of the most overwhelming endorsements for a park project he ever has attended.

The editorial in yesterday's New York Times correctly points out that "only legislative action can assure the preservation of the best such areas—like Padre Island—which still exist." The editorial also states the challenge to us as a people. Are we to be less mindful of our natural heritage than were those of the boss-and-corruption-ridden 1870's and 1880's, when the park system was started and Yellowstone preserved?

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the editorial from the New York Times of January 10, 1960, entitled "Room To Breathe."

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

ROOM TO BREATHE

When Yellowstone was established as the first national park in a remarkable burst of prescience by the 42d Congress in the unlikely year 1872, the American domain seemed to be limitless, stretching over thousands of uninhabited miles and untouched country. Yet in the decades since then almost all of the great wilderness has disappeared, the forests have been cut, the rivers polluted, the mountains defaced, the grasses burnt, the game decimated, the long, clean, white miles of ocean beach contaminated and exploited.

This has been the sorry story of our country's physical development—inevitable, perhaps, but nonetheless destructive of so much of the natural beauty and inherent recreational and spiritual values that belong to the American land. Now the forces of expansion and destruction are increasing their pressures with spectacular speed and intensity on the little that remains of untouched tranquillity and natural peace in the open spaces of America.

Only legislative action can assure the preservation of the best of such areas that still exist. Years of investigative and survey work by public and private agencies have determined where they are: the upper Potomac, Cape Cod, several places on the Great Lakes, an island off Texas, two or three spots on the Pacific coast, the Cascade Mountains of Washington, the Great Basin of Nevada, and so on. The National Park system must be expanded to include such areas, and a national wilderness system must be established by law to insure their permanent preservation. The legislation is prepared; we are confident that public sentiment is behind it.

The exploiters are, as usual, a major stumbling block. Will the 86th Congress of 1960 be more timorous, more subject to pressures of special interests, more reluctant to take bold affirmative steps for the public good than that old Congress in the corruption-ridden, exploitative days of 1872?

RAVENSWOOD, W. VA., POSTAL FACILITY IS DEDICATED; AUTOMATION AND POLITICAL PATRONAGE DISCUSSED

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, it was my privilege on Saturday, January 9, 1960, to participate in dedication ceremonies for the new U.S. post office facility at Ravenswood, W. Va. The gathering was presided over by the Honorable John D. Hoblitzell, Jr., a former U.S. Senator from West Virginia, and chairman of the Greater Ravenswood Chamber of Commerce dedication committee. Also present was another former U.S. Senator from West Virginia, the Honorable Chapman Revercomb. These West Virginians are, of course, well known to many of my colleagues.

Walter J. Purdy, a member of the chamber of commerce dedication committee, delivered the address of welcome in the stead of Mayor Pearl O. Milhoan, of Ravenswood, who was unable to attend. The program chairman was introduced by Ravenswood's acting postmaster, W. James Blackburn.

Kenneth L. Rabidoux, Assistant Director of the Post Office Department's Real Estate Division, spoke as the official representative of the Department, and told those who attended the dedication event that the new Ravenswood Post Office "is one of approximately 3,000 built by private enterprise and leased to the Department under the unique commercial leasing program initiated by the Postmaster General, Mr. Summerfield." And he said that "12,000 more of the Nation's 35,000 post offices must be replaced because of obsolescence and deterioration, in order to make this Nation's postal service fully adequate to meet the future postal requirements of its citizens."

Mr. Rabidoux had earlier pointed out that "last year Americans mailed 61 billion pieces of letter mail and over one

billion parcels. Combined, these figures represent two-thirds of the world's mail and represent an increase in volume of 120 percent in 20 years," he said, and remarked that, in order to keep ahead of this continuing growth, a gigantic overhauling of postal facilities has been initiated. Then he pointed out that in "the massive overhauling" are provisions for mechanizing the handling and distribution of mail in the so-called "gateway" post offices. Mr. Rabidoux called the "metro-mail" coordinated program still another breakthrough in mail handling.

Representative KEN HECHLER, of the Fourth West Virginia District, the other scheduled speaker on the dedication program, declared that "political patronage, political jobs, and political influence ought to be cleaned out at all levels of government, and I'm going to do my best to see that it is done, whether in the post office or the taking of the census or anywhere else."

Stating that "the only place where political appointments should be made is at the very highest level of government, where policymaking positions should be filled by those who are in accord with the program of the elected executive," the diligent and capable Representative further asserted:

Postmasters ought to be taken out of politics, postal employees should be promoted on merit, and if I have anything to say about it I'm going to put a stop to these political hacks running around with pieces of political litmus paper to stick in the mouths of Government employees.

I also advocate that in West Virginia the 1960 census be taken by unemployed West Virginians instead of by "political hangers-on." At a time when West Virginia has the highest rate of unemployment in the Nation and thousands are suffering, it would make a lot of sense to award these census jobs to those in need, instead of based upon "political pull" dictated by a political boss (the Republican State chairman) in Clarksburg, W. Va.

What large business would survive today, Representative HECHLER asked, "if its president insisted all employees belong to his own lodge or graduated from his own school and belonged to his church? Honestly, ability, and efficiency are not confined to one political party. America was founded as a land of equal opportunity and if we forget that fact we may become a second-rate power."

The Ravenswood High School Band, under Director James F. Porter, provided music for the event, while Reverend Walter Elwood, pastor of the Ravenswood First Presbyterian Church, and Rev. Paul Bell, pastor of the Ravenswood First Baptist Church, prayed the invocation and benediction. The color guard for flag-raising ceremonies was furnished by Ables-Rayburn Post No. 118 of the American Legion.

Ravenswood, situated along the beautiful Ohio River—one of our country's most important inland navigable streams—is a progressive and rapidly developing community, the principal industry of which is the large Kaiser aluminum facility nearby. Kaiser's Ravenswood Reduction Works and Rolling Mill afford employment for more than 3,000 in the production of primary aluminum sheet, plate, circles, foil and building products. This enterprising

organization has brought growth and stability to the economy of the Ravenswood community, and has been a most timely and welcomed addition to the West Virginia industrial complex.

The Greater Ravenswood Chamber of Commerce has been aggressive and diligent in developing the potential of its area of influence and representation, and Ravenswood's interests are likewise well represented in the State legislature by State Senator Paul R. Moore of that city, and Delegate Wayne W. Hughes. Both Senator Moore and Delegate Hughes were present for the post office dedication ceremonies.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

WE MUST HAVE THE B-70 WEAPONS SYSTEM

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, within recent weeks, while Congress was in the adjournment period, the Department of Defense announced that in response to a Presidential budgetary directive, the development program for the B-70 bomber has been "stretched out" and "cut back" to the point where it no longer represents any serious attempt to develop and produce this bomber as a weapons system.

I rise to question the wisdom of this decision, to suggest in fact that it is a blunder which may have the gravest consequences to our national security, and to urge that the decision be reversed.

At the present time, and throughout the first half of the next decade, the Soviet Union possesses and will possess a commanding superiority in operational ICBM's, the intercontinental ballistic missiles.

Last winter, the then Secretary of Defense, Mr. McElroy, admitted that if the Soviets produce missiles at what we believe their capability to be, and we produce those we now plan to, the Soviets will maintain a lead of approximately three to one throughout the early 1960's.

In addition to this, we know from the accuracies we have achieved with our present ICBM, the Atlas, that it is possible to pinpoint a target many thousands of miles away with almost incredible precision.

The President of the United States mentioned that the other day in his state of the Union message. It is a fact that we have even greater precision than the President stated in his state of the Union message.

We have absolutely no reason to believe that the Soviets are behind us in this field. We must assume that it is possible for them to achieve a circular error probability at least as good as that which we can achieve.

This accuracy, without revealing any classified materials, is such as to convince me that the Soviets soon could pinpoint an attack on Vandenberg and the other missile bases we have built and are building and completely obliterate them all in the first strike, leaving us without any retaliatory strike force in the missile category after that first blow.

What I am saying is that while the President of the United States was calling attention to our accuracy in the missile field, we have to assume that the Russians have the same accuracy. If the Russians have the same accuracy they can knock out the Vandenberg Base on the first strike, and they can knock out the missile bases being built in Wyoming and in other places, because the Atlas sticks up like a church on fire.

Until we develop and have operational a large force of ICBM's which either are mobile, or can be hidden, we will not have that indestructible missile retaliatory strike force which is the keystone of our security.

We are working on such missiles now, but they are not yet perfected.

And until the time when we have an operational force of sufficient Minuteman missiles in service with a number of them operating from mobile bases, and until we also have a fleet of nuclear submarines fitted with operational Polaris missiles at their stations, we must depend upon the manned bomber capable of delivering nuclear bombs to potential enemy targets as a major part of our deterrent force. In fact, many authorities believe we will always need to maintain manned aircraft as part of our total deterrent force.

Currently we depend on the B-47 and the B-52, and we may count on their capabilities being improved in the years ahead by such advances as air-to-surface missiles and improved electronic countermeasures. We are building a handful of B-58s.

But we also know that a large portion of Soviet scientific and military effort is devoted to defense against the manned bomber. We have every reason to suspect that such are and will be the improvements in their defenses that year-by-year effective penetration by these aircraft will become more and more difficult, until at some point they will cease altogether to be an effective deterrent.

I have reason to believe that our present bombers are becoming less and less useful because of the greater perfection in the Soviet defenses.

If we are to maintain the manned bomber as part of our deterrent force, we must have a long range supersonic bomber with cruise and target speeds of at least mach 2.5 and a range of more than 7,000 miles. We must have the B-70.

The B-70 will have a cruise and target speed of mach 3, triple that of the B-52, cutting target time from continental U.S. bases from 8 to 12 hours to 2 to 3 hours, at an altitude of 80,000 feet, compared to only 50,000 for the B-52. A B-70, or a squadron of B-70s in the air over the North Pole could deliver payloads to Soviet targets, such as Moscow, in 20 minutes. The B-70, according to the most reliable information which I can gather, would be at least four times as effective in penetrating defenses as the B-52, can be operated from existing B-52 bases with an equal reaction time, and can be employed on airborne alert.

The B-70 will make obsolete Soviet defenses designed to counter present subsonic aircraft. The very knowledge that

we are seriously developing such a weapons system will enormously complicate the Soviet defense problem. It will complicate it in at least two ways—by forcing diversion of scientific manpower to a new and presently unnecessary task, and by forcing an expenditure of rubles to defend against the B-70 far larger than the amount it will cost us to develop and build it.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from California yield?

Mr. ENGLE. I am delighted to yield to my distinguished friend from Missouri, who has a very broad fund of information on this subject.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I congratulate the Senator from California for his remarks with respect to the B-70 airplane. I had hoped to stay and listen to all of the Senator's address, but unfortunately have an engagement up-town. However, I did want to listen to as much of his discourse today as possible.

It is true, is it not, that if this B-70 program goes through as now planned by the administration, in effect the plane is being written off?

Mr. ENGLE. I should say that the B-70 is being "scrubbed" as a weapons system. I shall point out later in my remarks that it is intended to build a prototype, but that that project will be stretched out. What I am saying is that we need the B-70 now, because we shall need it during the period of time when we shall not have an indestructible retaliatory missile capability.

The President said the other day in his state of the Union message that we can hit within a 2-mile circle. We can do a little better than that. So can the Russians—now or soon. That would knock Vandenberg Air Force Base flatter than a flitter. Anyone who knows anything about intercontinental ballistic missiles must be aware that after the first strike we would have nothing left in missiles.

Mr. SYMINGTON. It is true therefore, is it not, that today the U.S. Air Force does not have under research or development a single airplane?

Mr. ENGLE. I think that is correct.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I never thought I would see the day when that statement would be made on the floor of the Senate.

I congratulate the Senator upon his address and hope our colleagues will carefully read the able exposition he is giving today of this serious problem.

Mr. ENGLE. I thank my distinguished colleague from Missouri.

Let me say to the Senator from Missouri that I wholly concur in the statement which he made on a television program last night, with respect to the reorganization of the Defense Department.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I am very grateful to my friend for saying that.

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

Mr. ENGLE. I am delighted to yield to my friend and colleague from Tennessee.

Mr. GORE. The answer which the junior Senator from California has just given to the junior Senator from Missouri must be measured, it seems to me, beside the fact that, as I understand, not one plane was flown in World War II which was not already on the drawing boards when World War II broke out. I ask the former Secretary of the Air Force if that is not true, if the Senator from California will yield for that purpose.

Mr. ENGLE. I am glad to yield for that purpose.

Mr. SYMINGTON. To my knowledge, the statement of the able Senator from Tennessee is entirely correct.

Mr. GORE. The timelag, then, between the actual effectiveness of a plane and its completion on the drawing board raises a very serious question for the early 1960's, so far as modern, efficient, comparable air power is concerned. Is that true?

Mr. SYMINGTON. There can be no question about it.

Mr. ENGLE. Let me say to my distinguished friend from Tennessee that if we went to work on the B-70 we could have it in inventory and in operation by 1964. That is about when we shall need it.

What I am saying is that today we do not have a bomber which can be sure of penetrating the Soviet defenses. The capability of the B-52 and the other bombers to get through is limited. So the President of the United States says to us, "We can drop an intercontinental ballistic missile into your hip pocket." We certainly can; and so can the Soviets. The Atlas, sitting like church steeples on Vandenberg Base and in Wyoming, or wherever else they may be, would be knocked as flat as the country around them; and we would not have a thing to strike back with that we can depend upon to get through. We are scrapping the B-70.

I referred to some of the assets of the B-70. I said it would complicate the problems of the Soviets in two particulars. It would require them to divert some of their scientific manpower into that field. It would require them to divert money to perfect their defenses against the B-70, which would make obsolete their present defenses against the present type of manned bomber.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. ENGLE. I am delighted to yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. I understood the Senator from California to say that at the present time we do not have an American bomber that can penetrate the Russian defenses.

Mr. ENGLE. No. What I said was that it is becoming more and more difficult for our bombers to get through, that they are becoming less and less useful. Within a very short time the competence of present bombers to reach their targets will be under very grave question.

Mr. MORSE. I am glad I raised the question, for two reasons. I think the statement I made is the statement of a correct impression which I believe the Senator's language left in the Record.

I am glad to raise the question for that reason.

I raise a second question. Do we know whether or not Russia at the present time has bombers which can penetrate our defenses?

Mr. ENGLE. I think we do; and I think we know that some of them could get through. But I will say also that some of us believe that the Russians have spent more time and money on air defense than we have. There is no defense now against an ICBM. No one has designed a defense against the intercontinental ballistic missile. There is no way to stop it.

Mr. MORSE. I wish to express my appreciation to the Senator from California for this speech, because I think we find ourselves in a somewhat paradoxical situation, in which we, as Senators, owe a duty to educate the American public.

We all know that the ultimate goal is the goal of disarmament. But the paradox, I think, is that in order to assure our best chances for disarmament, we shall have to put ourselves in such a position that Russia will recognize that she has everything to lose and nothing to gain by a continuation of the mad armament race. I have taken that position for several years in the Senate. Not so many years ago the Senator from Missouri and I were 2 of 11 Senators who voted for defense expenditures which we insisted were necessary. Subsequent events proved us to be right.

So I think the American people need to face up to the fact that we have the responsibility for placing our air defenses in such a situation that they will be conducive to a real foolproof, inspection-proof, complete disarmament, a program which in my judgment is the only hope for peace.

The paradox in this situation is that if we continue the kind of armament race in which we are now engaged in we shall end up in a nuclear war.

The text is, Where is the stopping point? I happen to think that we cannot reach the stopping point until we can first demonstrate that we have missiles that can penetrate the Russian defenses, and until Russia understands—as I believe we had better understand, too—that if two great powers continue in this mad nuclear armament race, we may lead mankind to disaster.

Mr. ENGLE. I agree with the senior Senator from Oregon. A further paradox is the citation of the accuracy we have with our missiles, by the President in his state of the Union message, as an evidence of our strength, when actually, if we turn the case around, and realize that the Soviets must have the same kind of accuracy, what it boils down to is that until we can harden the bases for the Atlas—and that will be attempted—or until we can get the Minuteman, which can be put on a railroad train and shuttled around, so that there will be no way to catch it, the Russians have the capability of knocking out our missile bases. We have wondered why it would not be possible to keep secret the location of the missile bases. In a country like ours it is not possible, because too many

people are working on them. Everyone knows where the Vandenberg Base is. Everyone knows where excavation is in progress for the bases in Wyoming. All the Russians would have to do would be to zero one or two of their continental ballistic missiles on several of our bases, and the retaliatory force of America, so far as the ICBM is concerned, would be wiped out. That is why I am saying, with respect to the B-70, that with the decreasing capability of the present bombers, it is necessary to the defense of America to have a supersonic bomber.

It is true that an ICBM, even though it cannot be recalled, may be destroyed in flight, provided that the gear to accomplish this does not malfunction, but at least the missile and its warhead are gone forever. A series of planned false alarms preceding a real attack could conceivably find us without missiles because, substantially they had been expended in vain.

The B-70, unlike an ICBM, is recallable. Its mission can be aborted. This characteristic permits us to launch the B-70 on less than conclusive information, but still withhold the ultimate decision pending the receipt and evaluation of additional information. The presence of B-70's at 80,000 feet on airborne alert over the Arctic, only minutes away from enemy targets at mach 3 speed, would make it possible for us to evaluate more carefully actions taken by the Soviets, while still remaining poised to strike an almost instantaneous retaliatory blow in the event of attack.

Moreover, the B-70, as a manned aircraft, is a recoverable weapon, which a missile is not, and can be used over and over again in subsequent strikes against residual targets. Furthermore, a manned aircraft has the power to discriminate between targets; to seek alternate targets in the event primary targets have already been destroyed; and can be employed in the role of reconnaissance to assess the effectiveness of initial strikes and provide the essential data for planning subsequent operations.

Even this is not the full story of why we need the B-70.

The B-70 could also be employed in low-level attacks at nearly mach 1; it could be used as a satellite interceptor; it could be used as a recoverable booster for launching high payload space vehicles.

The B-70 could be a first-rate military transport, capable of delivering material to any point on earth in only a few hours.

The B-70 could be the prototype, and the experimental design which will pave the way for the 2,000-mile-an-hour commercial transport.

If the United Nations ever acquires a world police force, the force to put out the brush fire wars before they become major conflagrations, the B-70 would be the ideal global police cruiser.

Now where do we stand at this moment with regard to the development and production of this remarkable aircraft?

The brief announcement made by the Air Force on November 30, while Congress was in adjournment, spoke of the B-70 program "being reoriented to a

prototype aircraft program" and that this so-called reorientation involved "deferral of major subsystem development."

What this means in plain English is that the program to develop the B-70 as a weapons system has been gutted.

When I talk about a weapons system, I refer to the composite, that is, the airframe—the bird itself—plus the necessary electronic equipment for bombing, navigation, and any other activities.

What is now proposed is that we build exactly two "bare bone" vehicles, and absolutely no matched subsystems involving radar, navigation and bombing, air data, electronic countermeasures, mission and traffic control, and power pods.

In other words, we propose to build two airplanes and then fit them out with gear designed for planes of only one-third their speed, which will cut the B-70's capability practically to the point where we might as well not have it at all.

In my opinion, this decision is one more example of how this administration is willing to gamble our very national survival in an attempt to balance its budget. In the fiscal year 1961, this decision will save about one-fiftieth of 1 percent of our defense spending. In return for this relative pittance, we are trading away at least one, perhaps several, year's development time on a weapons system which might well be the critical factor in our deterrent force, years of precious time which all the money in the world cannot buy back for us once they are gone.

No one hopes more fervently than I that the day will never come when it will be necessary to use a nuclear warhead, whether via missile or manned bomber.

But we do not advance the cause of world peace, nor the cause of successfully negotiating with the Soviet Union on steps toward that peace by refusing the advantages which our technology offers us.

Mr. President, I say this decision virtually to eliminate the B-70 as a weapons system is absolutely wrong. I call upon the Congress to make it clear to the administration that full-scale development of the B-70 and all its essential subsystems be continued full speed, properly funded, even if this involves some reorientation of priorities by this administration.

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

Mr. ENGLE. I am delighted to yield to the distinguished Senator from Idaho.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, I should like to commend the Senator from California for the fine comments he has made on the floor of the Senate this afternoon.

Ironically, I am about to make an address pertaining to the subject of disarmament, which I believe is the most important problem that faces the world today.

I could not concur more heartily with the Senator from California when he points out, as he has so ably done on the floor of the Senate today, that, so long as peace rests on a balance of de-

terrents, we must maintain an adequate retaliatory force. I believe that the case he has made for the B-70 bomber is one that makes it incumbent upon the administration to come forward to justify, if it can, the decision it has made to scrap this weapon.

I should like to say also that, in addition to the serious situation which may confront this country in the next 2 or 3 years, the Senator from California has made a case for the B-70 bomber as a supplementary weapon which could be useful in the United States even after the missile gap has been closed.

Mr. ENGLE. That is correct; because there is still need for reconnaissance; it is still necessary to go forth to see what the situation is. We will have to have airplanes with which to do it. The B-70 could do it.

The F-108 was scrapped. I regretted that action very much. It too could have been used for reconnaissance as well as a fighter. The B-70 certainly can be used for reconnaissance. And the B-70 would still be a very useful airplane, with which America could maintain its lead in the field of aviation. We initiated that field, not the Russians. I certainly hope that we will not see the Soviets produce the first supersonic commercial airplane. One of these days there will be commercial airplanes which will fly at 2,000 miles an hour. We are likely to have subsonic commercial airplanes when that time comes, if we are not careful. Therefore, the building of the B-70 is necessary and beneficial to America beyond the point in time that I have made, in the decade of the 1960's.

Mr. CHURCH. I should like to add one other comment, which seems to me to be very important. It is this: One of the greatest dangers, it seems to me, confronting the world is the possibility of an atomic war being started by accident. The Senator from California in his address has alluded to this possibility.

It seems to me that the B-70 airplane might contribute to a lessening of this possibility if it were available in numbers to be used as the first arm of American retaliation. As the Senator has so well pointed out, such an airplane could be recalled from its mission, whereas missiles could not be recalled. Thus a miscalculation, which led to the use of missiles, in the absence of an alternative, could very well cause an atomic war by accident, which would be the ultimate folly.

So I commend, again, the fine statement which the Senator from California has made. I think it has contributed much to our understanding of this very sensitive, important problem.

Mr. ENGLE. I appreciate the remarks of the Senator from Idaho. I would say, in concluding, that the problem of whether we ought to build a B-70 weapons system is a question of priority inside the Defense budget. What I am asserting today is that that weapons system does have the priority which warrants its building, because for a while we will have nothing else to initiate a retaliatory strike if war starts.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

JUVENILE DELINQUENCY CONTROL PROBLEMS

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BARTLETT in the chair). The hour of 2 o'clock having arrived, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 694) to provide Federal assistance for projects which will demonstrate or develop techniques and practices leading to a solution of the Nation's juvenile delinquency control problems.

NEW PROPOSAL TO PREVENT A DEADLOCK IN THE GENEVA NEGOTIATIONS

Mr. CHURCH obtained the floor.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHURCH. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. With the Senator's permission, I should like to suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. CHURCH. I yield for that purpose.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, tomorrow in Geneva, Switzerland, representatives of the United States, the United Kingdom, and the Soviet Union will resume their negotiations for a treaty covering the controlled cessation of nuclear weapons tests. These negotiations have been going on with brief recesses for some 14 months. A treaty has not been signed, but significant advances toward a treaty have been achieved.

My purpose in speaking today is to assess the possibilities for a test ban agreement. I also wish to inform the Senate of a proposal I have made to the Secretary of State regarding a possible way to prevent a deadlock in the negotiations.

We must recall, before discussing the details of the nuclear test ban negotiations, what is their purpose. Why have we been laboring so long and so patiently for an agreement?

First and foremost, I believe it is because of the desire of the United States to make concrete progress toward the goal of controlling and reducing the world's armaments. We know that another world war would be fought with weapons of hideous destructiveness. The possibility is extremely slim that any nation could survive a nuclear war without large portions of its population dead, maimed, or otherwise afflicted with the scourge resulting from high doses of radioactivity.

Knowing what another war would be like, the major nations of the world, nevertheless, continue to invest something over a hundred billion dollars each year in producing, developing, designing,

and testing weapons of war. They continue to produce these weapons because the world is divided into rival blocs separated by distrust, suspicion, and fear. No nation wishes to reduce its arms unless it is convinced that its rivals are also reducing theirs. The test ban negotiations, therefore, represent an effort to make a significant start toward the eventual but cherished goal that man may live in peace, relieved from the burden of expending vast sums and devoting enormous energies upon massive and unproductive armaments.

Another vitally important reason exists why negotiations continue for an agreement to end tests of nuclear weapons. This is apart from the need to progress toward effective arms control measures. As all of us are well aware, nuclear weapons tests produce radioactive fallout which can result in a serious health hazard. We know, at the very least, that past tests have already inflicted genetic damage upon a part of the living. Morally we have no right to bequeath disfigurement upon future generations, if this can be avoided. Moreover, the hazard from fallout will grow as newcomers, like France, add their part to the spread of nuclear tests.

The Geneva test ban negotiations, in short, have a dual function. If successful, they start the world a first step along the road toward reducing the burdens and the dangers of heavy armaments, while at the same time they free the world from the health hazard posed by further contamination from radioactive fallout.

STATUS OF THE GENEVA TALKS

The extent of progress in the Geneva test ban negotiations may be measured by looking at what has been accomplished and what remains undone. What are the points of agreement and what are the points of difference?

The three nuclear powers have agreed to 18 parts of a treaty. Many of these are purely procedural. Others, however, represent solid substantive accomplishments toward the drafting of a successful and adequate treaty.

But we must frankly admit that the issues that remain constitute the toughest obstacles to the completion of a treaty. These issues are primarily political, although some important ones are technical.

Last February, in a letter to the Secretary of State, I listed the three main roadblocks the Soviets were then placing in the path of a treaty:

First. They were demanding a veto power over the operations of the proposed international control commission.

Second. They were insisting that the requisite control posts be self-operated; that is, dominated by nationals of the countries within which the posts are located.

Third. They were calling for complicated procedures that would easily frustrate prompt action by the commission in dispatching inspection teams to make necessary on-the-spot investigations of subterranean disturbances suspected of being nuclear in nature, or of preventing these essential at-site investigations from occurring at all.

It is gratifying that the Soviets have come a long way since that time toward removing the first two of these roadblocks. On a number of items, they have receded from their demands for a veto; on others, they have made contingent offers to withdraw the veto demand.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Idaho yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BARTLETT in the chair). Does the Senator from Idaho yield to the Senator from Tennessee?

Mr. CHURCH. I am happy to yield.

Mr. GORE. I was not aware that the Soviets had come a long way in that respect. It seems to me that their suggestions have more form than substance. Would the able Senator from Idaho mind spelling out just how the Russians have come a long way?

Mr. CHURCH. Yes; I shall be happy to indicate to what extent the earlier roadblocks have been eliminated or reduced during the months between the time when I last spoke on this subject and the present time.

A year ago the Russians were demanding the right of a veto on a broad spectrum, in regard to different matters. For example, the Russians demanded the right of veto on any revision of the treaty or its annexes or the adoption of amendments thereto. If the Senator from Tennessee will permit me to do so, I should like to go down through the whole list and compare the Russians' position then with their apparent position now.

As to the first item—namely, revision of the treaty or its annexes or the adoption of amendments thereto—the Russians have now indicated their willingness to rescind their demand for a veto. Accordingly, the proposed International Control Commission could recommend treaty revisions or amendments, not subject to any veto, although any actual revision of the treaty or amendment to the treaty could not be placed into effect without the full concurrence of the three contracting powers. This is not a matter of major importance, but it is one place where a previous demand for a veto on the part of the Soviets has been rescinded.

Second, a year ago the Russians demanded the right of veto against any accusation which might be made by the Commission against any nation, for a violation of the treaty. Now the Russians have removed their demand for such a veto; and I take it that their new position is that such accusations can be made whenever it is felt they are warranted, and that they can be made without being subject to veto on the part of any of the signatory powers.

Moreover, it has been established by the negotiations that any signatory to the agreement has the right to withdraw unilaterally from the agreement upon the detection of any violation. That is one of the grounds for rescinding the agreement.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Idaho yield further to me?

Mr. CHURCH. I am glad to yield.

Mr. GORE. That would then vitiate the agreement. So in one respect I say that, as I have followed the development

of the negotiations, I find some difficulty in measuring the so-called concessions which the Russians advertise they are going to make with what they have actually said and the positions they have actually taken.

I will not impose further upon the Senator. I know he is making an important speech to which I am listening with great interest; but I did want to indicate that, as I have followed these negotiations carefully, I have noticed the pattern of a press statement by Mr. Tsarapkin, the chief Soviet delegate, suggesting great concessions. But when one reads the fine print of the actual position taken in the negotiations, it is a little difficult to find the two meaning the same thing.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, I should like to go on with the fine print, because I think it is important to read now into the Record, inasmuch as the question has been raised, the extent to which the position of the negotiating parties seems to have changed on the matter of a veto during the past year.

To continue, a year ago the Russians were demanding the right of veto over the appointment of the administrator. I will say with respect to this matter that their position has not changed, though ours has. In the interim, we have indicated that we feel that the matter of the appointment of the administrator is one upon which all three of the negotiating powers ought to agree, and that the administrator should be selected unanimously, provided the incumbent administrator remains until a new administrator has been selected.

A year ago the Soviets were demanding a veto with respect to the adoption of a decision to dispatch inspection groups for onsite investigation of any event suspected of being a nuclear explosion. This went to the heart of the reliability of the inspection control system. At the time of my speech to the Senate last year, this was the main reason why it appeared that the negotiations were deadlocked, and that we would soon have to abandon our efforts to reach agreement.

Since that time, however, the Russians have made a contingent offer. They have indicated that if the nuclear powers could agree upon a quota of onsite inspections that could be made in a given year, which would furnish them with some assurance that they would not be overrun with inspection teams—and now I am expressing this proposition in terms of their argument, not mine—then they, in turn, would withdraw their demand for a veto over the right to dispatch inspection teams into Russian territory.

A year ago, the Russians were demanding a veto over revision of existing methods, and approval of new methods, for observation and for types of apparatus to be placed at control stations.

The Soviets have since receded from that demand, contingent upon whether an agreement can be reached in later negotiations with respect to such new equipment as should be installed.

So I think that in these matters important changes have occurred in the course of negotiations.

Since I have gone this far into the list of particulars, I think I should add the final two particulars with respect to which significant changes have been made.

On January 30 last year, the Soviets were demanding a veto with respect to the determination of location sites of the control posts and of the routes for control aircraft flights. From this position they have now indicated they will recede if the location can be predetermined by the governments, while, on our part, we believe any such determination must be subject to review and approval by the control commission.

Finally, last year the Soviets were demanding a veto over budgetary, financial, administrative, and economic matters connected with the control organization's activities, including matter relating to the recruitment and dismissal of the supporting and auxiliary personnel.

Now, with respect to the budgetary matter, the Soviets have receded from that position and have agreed to withdraw their demand for veto if the nuclear powers in turn will agree on the composition of the control Commission and budget adoption by a two-thirds vote. This becomes very complicated and I think, in this particular, their change of position is not so great as one might be led to believe.

But I do think the total list does indicate that a significant change of position on matters of importance has occurred in our negotiations during the last year.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHURCH. Yes.

Mr. GORE. As I understand, the proposal which the Russians advertise as a great concession, and which they wish the world to interpret as a great concession, is that, instead of a veto, the Commission be composed of three Iron Curtain members, three members from the free world, and a neutral member, but that all decisions be subject to a two-thirds majority vote. If the Senator will use his mental arithmetic and find that a two-thirds majority of 7 is 5, he will see that what the Soviets propose is not a matter of substance, but of form; they still would retain a veto.

Mr. CHURCH. I could not agree more fully with the Senator; but I want to point out this relates only to the matter of budget determination of a control Commission, and not to all the activities of the control Commission. My understanding of the present position of the Russians is that, in determining the amount of the budget, they want to have adoption by two-thirds vote, which I concede gives them a veto power. However, that veto power relates to only one function of the Commission, namely, the determination of the annual budget. Therefore, the point ought not to be extended to the other matters and powers of the Commission which go to the heart of the Commission's reason for existence.

So, although I agree with the distinguished Senator from Tennessee when he raises this question I also wish to emphasize that it relates only to the establishment of the Commission's budget.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHURCH. Yes.

Mr. GORE. I concede that, but I also wish to suggest to the able Senator that it is typical of the clever moves of the Soviets to advertise a concession and claim they have made a concession when in fact what they suggest is no concession at all.

Mr. CHURCH. I will say to the distinguished Senator from Tennessee that I am fully mindful of the wily ways of the Russians. I think our negotiators at Geneva are mindful of them, too.

I would be the last ever to propose that the United States should become a party to any treaty which did not give us full assurance of protection. I am sure that we will not enter into a treaty which contains pitfalls of that kind.

In the course of my address this afternoon I expect to look at the present status of our negotiations in an objective way, and appraise very carefully the Soviet position. My purpose is to suggest a possible proposal which the United States might make should all else fail at Geneva, in the hope that we can accomplish at least a part of the objective we had in mind when we went to Geneva.

So, Mr. President, if I were to summarize the changes which have occurred in the position of the Soviet Union in the course of the past year, I would do it in this way: It seems to me that on a number of items the Russians have receded from their demands for a veto, while on others they have made contingent offers to withdraw the veto demand.

On the question of staffing the control posts, the Soviets have offered to accept our proposal, in the main, provided that we accept their offer on the budget and the composition of the control Commission.

On the third roadblock, that of the need for a certain amount of onsite inspection, little progress has been made. It was in this area of the negotiations that the hope for rapid progress toward the drafting of a comprehensive treaty, that is, a treaty covering the cessation of tests in all environments, received a setback last month. A technical working group of scientists from the U.S.S.R., United States, and United Kingdom, which met to discuss the question of the detection and identification of underground tests, failed to reach agreement on all the items on its agenda. The purpose of the technical working groups was threefold:

First. To review all new data regarding the detection and identification of underground events;

Second. To consider possible improvements in techniques and instrumentation in the control system; and

Third. To determine the criteria by which an unidentified event might be selected by the control Commission for onsite inspection.

Although the scientists did reach agreement on possible improvements in techniques and instrumentation, they did not reach agreement on the other important questions. The scientists, for

example, could not agree on the criteria to distinguish earthquakes from explosions for the purpose of eliminating the former as being subject to inspection. Without such criteria it is difficult to see how an agreement with respect to onsite inspections can be reached.

Unfortunately, it was not only the lack of technical agreement that hurt the prospects for a treaty. The Soviet scientists accused their American colleagues of bad faith and questioned their integrity. These unwarranted accusations have added to the difficulty of reaching reasonable solutions to these vexing problems.

PROPOSALS FOR CONSIDERATION

If the scientists and the diplomats of the three nuclear powers fail to reach agreement on the question of inspection for possible underground nuclear tests, what course should the negotiations then follow?

Of one thing I am sure. The United States cannot pack up its bags and go home without first exhausting all reasonable possibilities for agreement. We must be certain that if failure comes the guilt must rest with the Soviet Union.

Accordingly, I have written to the Secretary of State, outlining my views as to the course the United States might follow if the failure to reach agreement on the problem of inspection produces a deadlock.

Last February, when it looked as though the conference was deadlocked, I urged the United States to attempt to salvage something of value from the negotiations by calling for a suspension of all further nuclear tests in the earth's atmosphere, enforced through an international control system sufficient to detect any violations.

I wish to say at this point, Mr. President, that the distinguished Senator from Tennessee had previously made a proposal calling for our unilateral suspension of atmospheric tests. This proposal was very similar to mine, except that I hoped such an atmospheric ban could be reached by agreement among the three nuclear powers, and could be enforced by an international control system.

Last year it was my pleasure to discuss at length on the floor of the Senate with the distinguished Senator from Tennessee his proposal and mine, and, with respect to the position we then took, we found ourselves very much in accord.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHURCH. I am happy to yield.

Mr. GORE. I thank the able Senator for his generous reference.

I would hope that any stoppage of tests made by the United States would be concurred in by other countries.

In view of the fact that the United States was the first nation to conduct nuclear tests, was the only power to use a nuclear weapon, and conducted more tests than any other nation, I thought that our moral and political position in the world would be strengthened by a forthright, dramatic act on the part of the President of the United States, taking the position that, whatever other powers did, the United States was not

only willing to stop contaminating the world atmosphere but had stopped doing so, and by inviting other powers to join for a given but extended period of time.

I still think there is great merit to this position, and I suggested it to the President by telegram only a few days ago when the subject was under consideration at Augusta. I think it has merit now because of the propaganda "pitch" of Mr. Khrushchev for total disarmament, which everyone desires but which all reasonable men know, in the context of the world tension today, is unachievable and, therefore, impractical and political.

I learned in a recent visit to many countries that the Russian leader had achieved an image of peace of which I was unprepared to learn. I think there would be a great merit in having the President of the United States take the initiative in a dramatic way, by calling a halt for an extended period of time to the kinds of tests which contaminate the world's atmosphere and the kinds of tests which can be detected no matter by what power conducted.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, I wish to say that I was very much impressed by the arguments advanced by the distinguished Senator from Tennessee last year, as I continue to be impressed by those arguments.

It was for that reason that I proposed last year that the United States take the initiative at Geneva to seek a ban on atmospheric tests in the hope that we could salvage that much out of the negotiations, and in the hope that the Soviet Union might agree to such a ban on the tests which contribute most to the contamination of the air, and which could be policed by control stations already in existence on either side of the Iron Curtain.

Such a ban, I then said, would curtail further poisoning of the air, while we continued to seek acceptable ways to police a ban on tests in other environments.

Moreover, I wrote to Mr. Herter, who was then Acting Secretary, that the commencement of an international control system to detect atmospheric nuclear explosions is the sine qua non of man's progress toward any feasible disarmament. This is so, even though a control system for such tests is much less complicated than a control system for a comprehensive ban.

On April 13th, the President, by letter to Chairman Khrushchev, said that the United States was prepared to consider a ban on atmospheric tests. He said:

Could we not, Mr. Chairman, put the agreement into effect in phases beginning with a prohibition of nuclear weapons tests in the atmosphere? A simplified control system for atmospheric tests up to 50 kilometers could be readily derived from the Geneva experts' report, and would not require the automatic onsite inspection which has created the major stumbling block in the negotiations so far.

This, of course, was essentially the proposal I had made in February. I was gratified that this was so, and, although the Soviets rejected the proposal, that they reacted to it by making

the important concessions I have previously mentioned.

Notwithstanding that progress was made in the remaining months of 1959, we find the conference again in a position very similar to that which existed 11 months ago. Once more, the prospect is for failure or stalemate at Geneva, unless something is done.

The same concern, which caused me to make the proposal I did in February, has moved me to write once again to the Secretary of State. In a letter which I sent to him Friday, January 8, I broadened my proposal for a staged test ban agreement. I added two important modifications which I felt were dictated by the present status of the negotiations.

We must continue, I told the Secretary in my letter, to strive for an agreement which would end all nuclear weapons tests, not only those in the air, in the water, and above the air, but those underground as well.

However, should it develop, upon the resumption of the conference, that this objective cannot now be achieved, owing to continued Russian refusal to accept our new criteria for a control and inspection system upon which all might safely rely for the detection of underground tests, and the conference is deadlocked thereby, I urged that the United States make the following two-part proposal:

(1) That the three powers agree to a suspension of all further nuclear weapons tests in the air, in space, and in the water, to be enforced by an international control system sufficient to detect and report any violation; and

(2) That the three powers concurrently agree to jointly conduct a series of underground nuclear explosions, which will add no further contamination to the air, but which may form the basis for fashioning a mutually acceptable detection and inspection system with which to police a subsequent ban on underground nuclear weapons tests.

I suggested that such joint underground tests might well be conducted under the auspices of the United Nations, and that qualified observers from all interested countries might be invited to participate.

As I wrote the Secretary, I think such a proposal would have great advantage for the United States and the world. First and foremost, by immediately banning the tests which poison the air and the water, we would erase a grave anxiety.

Additionally, we would establish the first international control apparatus for the enforcement of the suspension agreement. Although the system would be simpler than that required to detect underground tests, and the onsite inspections to which the Russians object so strongly would not be necessary, nevertheless we would have, as to the air, space, and water ban, a functioning harness within which to bind not only the present members of the nuclear club, but also the oncoming nations developing atomic technologies of their own. In this the negotiating parties would seem to share a common interest.

I believe, moreover, that the series of joint underground tests could represent

the best hope for solid progress in achieving a ban on underground nuclear weapons tests, with a workable international control system to enforce it. The proposal for a ban limited to air, water, and space tests, while this joint exploration on the nature of underground test detection proceeds, could prove to be a mutually acceptable forward step toward our goal.

My suggestion for joint tests stems from the realization that in the science of seismology areas of uncertainty exist. The tests to be jointly conducted would advance the general knowledge about the problems of identification and detection of underground tests. I cannot help but feel that the lack of ample data concerning underground tests might well be the underlying reason for the inability of the scientists to reach agreement now upon the requirements for a reliable detection system. We have conducted only four or five underground nuclear tests, and the Soviets have never indicated that they have conducted any. A heavily instrumented series of underground tests, in the Soviet Union and in the United States, and at other points on the globe, would certainly yield resulting data of significant importance.

It may be that the Russian negotiators will rebuff the suggestion for joint underground tests. But it is well to remember that the Russians were a suspicious people long before the Communists came to power. The czars maintained their own Iron Curtain. The distinguished chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], rightly said, following my mention of this fact to the Senate last March, that an understanding of this puts the matter in perspective and gives us more hope for the future than if we attribute all difficulties simply to the present regime. We cannot know, in any case, that the Soviets would rebuff the proposal unless we make it.

The United States has always been dedicated to the cause of peace. We are answerable to our own trust. We ought not anticipate failure as a reason for abandonment of new proposals even before making them.

My proposal, I repeat, is an alternative to stalemate and deadlock. Perhaps some unexpected move by the Soviets will change the situation. But there is little that can change the fundamentals of the situation—the need to make a start toward disarmament, to end the threat of further contamination by fallout, and the desirability of extending knowledge in the matter of identifying underground disturbances.

Mr. President, good conscience commands that we do our utmost at Geneva.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of my letter to Secretary Herter be included in the Record at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

JANUARY 8, 1960.

HON. CHRISTIAN HERTER,
Secretary of State,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: On Tuesday next, January 12, the Geneva negotiations for a

treaty to end nuclear weapons tests will resume. Although the resumption is not auspicious, and prospects for success seem gloomy indeed, there is cause for hope in the progress already made, and more reason than ever for not permitting impatience or frustration to jeopardize continued efforts toward agreement.

The unresolved issue remains inspection. The inability of the recent technical conference of scientists from our country, the United Kingdom, and the Soviet Union to reach agreement on such matters as the significance of the Hardtack data for the detection of underground nuclear tests, and the criteria to determine when the source of a signal registered at a control post can be investigated by a mobile inspection team is, of course, a formidable obstacle to successful negotiations.

Last February, I wrote to you urging that the United States, without slackening its efforts for an end to all nuclear tests, seek a limited ban on atmospheric tests to stop pollution of the air.

Such a proposal was made to the conference at Geneva following the Easter recess. Although the suggestion was rejected, the Soviet Union made significant new concessions which enabled the conference to continue to move forward.

I still believe that the United States must do everything in its power to prevent the test ban negotiations from ending in a stalemate. They are not only important in themselves. Their outcome has significance for the entire future of disarmament. If the United States and the Soviet Union cannot agree to end their tests of nuclear weapons under effective inspection safeguards, then upon what can they agree? Surely almost any other disarmament proposal would have even less likelihood of acceptance than a ban on tests of nuclear weapons.

Therefore, it seems to me that we must continue to strive for an agreement which would end all nuclear weapons tests, not only those in the air, in the water, and above the air, but those underground as well.

However, should it develop, upon the resumption of the conference, that this objective cannot now be achieved, owing to continued Russian refusal to accept our new criteria for a control and inspection system upon which all might safely rely for the detection of underground tests, and the conference is deadlocked thereby, I would urge that the United States make the following two-part proposal:

(1) That the three powers agree to a suspension of all further nuclear weapons tests in the air, in space, and in the water, to be enforced by an international control system sufficient to detect and report any violation; and

(2) That the three powers concurrently agree to jointly conduct a series of underground nuclear explosions, which will add no further contamination to the air, but which may form the basis for fashioning a mutually acceptable detection and inspection system with which to police a subsequent ban on underground nuclear weapons tests.

I think such a proposal would have great advantage for the United States and the world. First and foremost, by immediately banning the tests which poison the air and the water, we would erase the grave anxiety.

Additionally, we would establish the first international control apparatus for the enforcement of the suspension agreement. Although the system would be simpler than that required to detect underground tests, and the on-site inspections to which the Russians object so strongly would not be necessary, nevertheless we would have, as to the air, space, and water ban, a functioning harness within which to bind not only the present members of the "nuclear club,"

but also the oncoming nations developing atomic technologies of their own. In this, the negotiating parties would seem to share a common interest.

I believe, however, that the series of joint underground tests, which might well be conducted under the auspices of the United Nations, and to which qualified observers from all interested countries might be invited, could represent the best hope for solid progress in achieving a ban on underground nuclear weapons tests, with a workable international control system to enforce it. The proposal for a ban limited to air, water, and space tests, while this joint exploration of the nature of underground test detection proceeds, could prove to be a mutually acceptable forward step toward our goal.

I cannot help but feel that the lack of ample data concerning underground tests might well be the underlying reason for the inability of the scientists to reach agreement now upon the requirements for a reliable detection system. We have conducted only four or five underground nuclear tests, and the Soviets have never indicated that they have conducted any. A heavily instrumented series of underground tests, in the Soviet Union and in the United States, and at other points on the globe, would certainly yield resulting data of significant importance.

I respectfully submit these suggestions to you, Mr. Secretary, as a possible proposal to present to the Russian negotiators. I do so with the conviction that we must continue to demonstrate to the world that if the test ban talks fail, the Soviet Union must bear the guilt.

Sincerely,

FRANK CHURCH.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHURCH. I am happy to yield to my good friend the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. GORE. I wish to congratulate the able Senator upon his learned address and upon his dedication to the cause of peace, which must be based upon international understanding and confidence.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, I thank the Senator very much. I wish to say that in the matter of the Geneva negotiations we have shared a common interest, and that the counsel and thinking in this matter of the Senator from Tennessee have always been of great importance to me.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT FOR BOULDER CITY, NEV.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, January 4, 1960, is a date of lasting significance to Nevada, for it marks the emergence of Boulder City as a municipality within the framework of our State, and its severance as a federally controlled city.

Laid out by the Bureau of Reclamation as a model American community, Boulder City owed its existence to the construction of the great dam on the Colorado River.

Since 1932, it was administered by the Federal Government; yet there was a growing demand upon the part of the residents for home rule. Along with my colleagues in Congress, I was privileged to assist in legislation which paved the way for the transfer of the city from its Federal status to local control.

Mr. President, I wish to pay tribute to the many outstanding citizens of Boulder City who worked long and faithfully for the goal of municipal freedom. At the same time, I believe it only fitting and proper to commend the Bureau of Reclamation for the outstanding job it did both in administering the affairs of the bustling community of 4,000, and in co-operating wholeheartedly in the orderly transition of government.

At this juncture, in my remarks, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record the remarks made at Boulder City's inaugural ceremonies by the Honorable Grant Sawyer, Governor of Nevada, and Robert Broadbent, mayor of the new city, along with appropriate editorials which appeared in the Boulder City News and the Las Vegas Review-Journal, and a news story published in the Las Vegas Sun.

There being no objection, the remarks, editorials, and article were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

REMARKS BY GOV. GRANT SAWYER

Mayor Broadbent of Boulder City, Acting Regional Director West, Federal, State, county and city officials, and Mayor Broadbent of Ely, I welcome this opportunity of celebrating with you this long awaited moment—as Boulder City takes her place alongside her sister cities in Nevada.

Also I bring warm greetings from one of you who shared the difficulties and long wait involved in bringing home rule to Boulder City. I am speaking of Dick Ham, who is now executive director of the department of employment security and is busy in Carson City preparing his department's legislative program for the coming session and, therefore, unable to be here with you tonight.

Too many people in this Nation take the right of self-government as a matter of course. There can be no danger of this in Boulder City. This day marks the end of a 20-year effort to remove this city from Federal control and give it incorporate status. And this day marks the beginning of a bright future for this city, as you yourselves guide its destiny. The story of this transitional period is well known to you here, but permit me to trace the progress of this effort.

Boulder City started as a tent community in 1931 with the beginning of construction on Boulder Dam. Growth was rapid but controlled and the guiding hand of the Bureau of Reclamation is evident in the modern, well-planned community in which you live today.

It was some 20 years ago that Government officials realized Boulder City had outgrown its role as a construction and operating camp. It was agreed that the city should be turned over to the people for self-government. The machinery was put in motion with the approval for studies of the transitional problem.

In 1949, Dr. Henry Reining, Jr., then professor of public administration and political science at the University of Southern California, was engaged to make a survey and submit specific recommendations for a solution. His report a year later was the basis of an order issued by the Secretary of the Interior in 1951 which administratively separated Boulder City from the Boulder Canyon project. The Boulder City Act of 1958, under which incorporation has been achieved, generally followed Dr. Reining's recommendations.

That act provided an orderly method for the Federal Government to relinquish ownership and control of certain properties in the community not required for continuing Federal activities in the area and permitted you to establish self-government under Nevada law.

Director West has informed me that the Bureau has disposed of all its residential properties within the city, totaling 179 housing units. These units, appraised by FHA at \$1,225,000, were sold to Federal employees who were priority purchasers. This property is being placed on the Clark County tax rolls.

He also told me the Bureau of Reclamation is transferring ownership of the 33 square miles of land provided by the Boulder City Act to the incorporated city. This land also will be placed on the Clark County tax rolls.

I note also that Boulder City has been the recipient of nearly \$3 million worth of electrical, water, and sewerage systems, municipal buildings, streets, sidewalks, and curbs, parks and parkways.

In short, Boulder City is ready to do business. It begins, not as a municipal infant crying for recognition and struggling for success, but as a community that has added much to the lore of Nevada and whose citizens have helped make the State what it is today.

With your incorporation, you hold a trust and a duty—to yourselves, your city, your State and your Nation. Some may think it absurd that Boulder City, a community of less than 4,000 persons, has any great part to play in national or world affairs.

But our freedom is not based on the masses, it has its roots in the individual. If America cannot solve its problems on a community level, how can it hope to solve the problems of the world.

From the individual's faith in his own worth, to his voluntary role in his own free community, to his own community's service to his nation, and to his nation's dedication to the common cause of all free men—thus is the force of the faith of freedom steadily raised to a higher power.

We can serve freedom elsewhere only as we practice it in our own lives.

We cannot speak of a common law for all nations of the world, unless our own laws faithfully serve the needs, and guard the rights, of our own citizens.

We cannot speak of equality, both of men and nations, unless we advance the flag of social equality in our own community. We cannot be aghast at poverty in distant lands, if our own citizens are in want.

We cannot hope to spur economic progress and prosperity in the world unless such a State as Nevada can itself help to lead America toward new horizons of equal opportunity for all our citizens.

We cannot pretend to help inspire new nations in the way of freedom if our own schools do not give our own youths the chance to become enlightened citizens.

We are called upon to conduct ourselves like free men with the will and the wisdom to make freedom work. We do this not simply by what we say—but by how we live. This is your challenge. I know you can meet it.

I mentioned education, the value of which cannot be overemphasized. America must work, perhaps hardest of all, on the field where the future can be won or lost: in our schoolrooms. We must attack the problems of juvenile delinquency.

Perhaps in this field the rest of the Nation can look to Boulder City for guidance. The rate of juvenile delinquency here is one of the lowest in the Nation. In Boulder City, youth is not hidden or apologized for, it is proudly displayed.

A crash-emphasis on education hit the country following the Soviet Union's achievements in rocketry. We heard a spate of alarms calling for more mathematics, scientists, and technicians.

But Boulder City didn't wait for sputnik to call for emphasis on education for its young people.

Mr. Elbert B. Edwards, your widely known high school principal, reports the percentage of Boulder City High School graduates going on to college tops 70 percent.

Nevada has seven young men in the selective Air Force Academy. Four of them are from Boulder City—Mike Hyde, David Lyon, Scott Wood, and Roger Likens.

In any National Merit Board or National College Board test, Boulder City is sure to be represented at the top levels. And in the area of education, all eyes will be on Boulder City with the construction of the new experimental educational facility—a multipurpose building designed to meet the needs of all school districts. It will be the only one in the country. Now in the hands of the architects, the building is the result of millions of dollars put into research and engineering by the Ford Foundation, and contributions by the New York and Stanford educational facilities laboratories.

From education in the schools, we proceed to education in government. In this your city officials are the instructors and the pupils. I could take the time to point out the good qualities of your new officials and how the future of the city is safe in their hands, but I won't. One of the blessings of a small community is that you intimately know your candidates and have a solid basis for their election. You know what kind of a performance to expect from them.

To Mayor Broadbent, City Manager Curtis Blyth, Assistant Mayor Dr. Thomas White, Councilmen Morgan Sweeney, Albert Franklin, and Joe Manix, City Attorney Alvin Wartman, and all the others, I offer as advice, in a purely nonpartisan way, the words of Franklin D. Roosevelt. He said:

"New ideas cannot be administered successfully by men with old ideas, for the first essential of doing a job well is the wish to see the job done at all." I know these men have the wish to see the job done and I feel sure new ideas will always find a welcome at city hall.

This is a happy time in Boulder City. It's a new year for a city with a new look. Right now things look rosy and the future's problems are faint. You've won a long, hard struggle for independence, but the time for rest is far distant. Your real struggle lies ahead. Things which are minor and a matter of routine will present problems here because you'll be encountering them for the first time.

Your municipal path won't always be smooth. Mistakes will be made in the natural course of things. Lack of mistakes too often means lack of progress.

You are fortunate in that many of the mistakes open to you have been made before and you will have the chance to profit by the missteps of others.

There will probably be times when you wish you had never heard of home rule. When this time arrives, I advise a look at the words of James Gould Gozzens, who said:

"Every day is a miracle. The world gets up in the morning and is fed and goes to work, and in the evening it comes home and is fed again and perhaps has a little amusement and goes to sleep. To make that possible, so much has to be done by so many people that, on the face of it, it is impossible. Well, every day we do it; and every day, come hell, come high water, we're going to have to keep on doing it as well as we can."

On behalf of the rest of the citizens of the State, I bid Boulder City welcome to its rightful place. Congratulations to Nevada's newest city.

REMARKS BY ROBERT BROADBENT, MAYOR

It is an honor, as mayor of Boulder City, to be privileged to accept the contract to effectuate the Boulder City Act of 1958, on

behalf of the city council and citizens of Boulder City, Nev.

By accepting this contract, we, the citizens of Boulder City, are embarking on the challenging road to self-government. The responsibilities and duties and operation of local self-government we accept under the laws of the State of Nevada, the county of Clark and the Boulder City charter.

Many have contributed greatly to bring about the realization of Boulder City, incorporated. Our appreciation and sincere thanks are extended to the Department of the Interior, Bureau of Reclamation, and Mr. Arleigh West, the acting regional director of region 3, for their fine cooperation, assistance, and the advice they have given in the months in which we have been so diligently working on the transfer of Boulder City.

Our city manager, city attorney, city clerk, and the members of the many boards and commissions appointed by the city council have worked hard—with untiring effort—to help make it possible for us to take over the operation of our city today.

Each individual in Boulder City has contributed toward our goal. It is they who make our city what it is and what we hope it will be.

Digressing briefly, I should like to personally and publicly thank my wife and family, and the wives and families of all who have been required to be away from the responsibilities of home, for so many, many hours during this transition period.

We, the officials of our city, are grateful for our fine citizenry and with honor and humility solicit full and continued cooperation to the end that we may enjoy through our united efforts an honest, forthright, economical city administration capable of expanding with the growth of our community.

Boulder City has been unique among her city sisters. It is our sincere desire that this uniqueness will be added to in the future.

We have all the basic needs for growth and development—fine people, good resources. With diligence and united effort, Boulder City will be Nevada's city of dreams come true.

[From the Boulder City News]

MORRY'S STORY

(By Morry Zenoff)

This newspaper today records for posterity Boulder City's first official day of freedom—January 4, 1960—and the signing by its mayor, Robert Broadbent, of the city's own declaration of independence.

From 2 p.m. Monday when the little band of city officials gathered in Arlie West's conference room on the hill, there to observe Broadbent's actual signing of transfer documents—until 9 p.m. that evening, when some 300 interested citizens crowded into the grade-school gym to witness solemn ceremonies celebrating the occasion, it was one series of historic happenings.

Every phase of it was photographed by Government and private photographers—and the best of the shots were collected and engraved and included in this freedom edition—which some day for sure will be studied by your children and your children's children, and ours too, as a symbol of democracy in action in the 20th century.

Every word spoken officially from script was collected by our staff and set up on the linotype machines, then placed in pages, locked up and printed on the pages you're now reading.

The newest laws of the city, passed by special council action minutes before midnight of the transfer date—January 4—are contained, too, in this souvenir edition under legal notices—detailing to the populace the law of the land which is now and forevermore in effect.

No longer will the will of the minority rule; no longer must the citizenry rush to

Washington to seek favor or license; no longer must a community turn to the hill for regulation or interpretation.

Today, the laws of the State of Nevada and a charter written by the elected representatives of the community, and ordinances drafted by an elected city council—these all run the city—through home rule—by majority vote, by citizen control.

At every step of Monday's thrilling walk to freedom—familiar faces were evident everywhere—the oldtimers who came before us (12 years ago) and the newtimers who came here since us—all taking in every word, each experiencing the fine fresh air.

Those who fought against home rule and incorporation now stood shoulder to shoulder with those who fought for it—a fine symbol indeed of what the future will offer in the way of unified work toward the common goal of all—a continued beautiful Boulder City.

The speakers of the day—from the Governor, through Dr. Henry Reining, to the mayor—all were as thrilled to be taking part in our day of history as were the spectators in watching and listening to them play the roles given them.

It was a wonderful day for everyone who lived it. It will be a wonderful city now—for those who live in it, or near it.

Surely, none will forget January 4, 1960—emancipation day for Boulder City, Nev.

[From the Las Vegas Review-Journal]
WELCOME TO THE FAMILY

Nevada welcomed a strapping teenager into the family of cities this week when the erstwhile Government community of Boulder City severed its ties with the Federal control and branched out on its own as a true Nevada city.

Boulder City was established back in 1931, when the Government began the task of constructing Boulder Dam. It was laid out by the Bureau of Reclamation as the "model city" and it became just that when it was completed around 1932. Since that time, until January 4, 1960, it was operated as a Government community with the citizens having little to say about its government.

Now, the burdens of government have been taken over by the citizens of the city. They have elected Robert Broadbent as the community's first mayor. From now on the problems of growth will be in the hands of the new mayor and his city council.

In the decade which is just starting, it is probable that many changes will be noted in the operation of Boulder City. Undoubtedly it will grow much as the other cities in southern Nevada have grown. It has all the potentials of becoming a recreational city and for establishing some light industry in the area around the city's fringes.

Growth has been almost completely stymied by the Government restrictions which were clamped on Boulder City. For many years property in the community could only be secured on short-term leases. None could be purchased. Recently longer term leases were developed and, as a result of this move, more and more construction was done.

Now, with all restrictions removed, it is entirely possible that capital can be enticed to make investments in the sector. Every indication points to a decided building boom in Boulder City.

As with all growing cities, there will be problems to be faced. While the liquor and gambling issues probably will not be raised in the immediate future, they are bound to come and there will be some bitter fights resulting. Other issues will be raised which will see the city split down the middle. It has happened in Las Vegas, North Las Vegas and Henderson and undoubtedly will occur in Boulder City.

The citizens of Boulder City must have faith, not only in the future of the community itself, but its elected officials as well. The latter are going into a very complex job and, being human, they probably will make mistakes. However, they all are respected citizens of Boulder City and will have the future of the city at heart. Unless they get too far off the deep end, the citizens should give them tolerance, cooperation and confidence. Theirs will be a tough job. They will have to set the policies upon which the future will be built. If they build solidly, which we believe they will, the future of the city is assured.

Operation of the city as a civic entity rather than under governmental control, will be a tough transition. We are confident, however, that the people of Boulder City will be able to make the bold step.

We welcome Boulder City into the family of Nevada cities, and hope the future continues as bright as it is now.

[From the Las Vegas Sun, Jan. 5, 1960]
GALA CEREMONY BEGINS BOULDER HOME RULE
(By Laura Bell)

BOULDER CITY.—With high hopes for a bright future and every promise that the hopes will be fulfilled, Boulder City was launched on the American way of home rule at ceremonies in the elementary school gymnasium last night.

For the 29 years of its existence up to yesterday it was under Federal control as headquarters for Hoover Dam.

The Federal Government represented by A. B. West, region 3 director of the Bureau of Reclamation, signed over the pretty little model community to Gov. Grant Sawyer of the State of Nevada and Mayor Robert Broadbent, youthful first mayor of the new incorporated city.

West extended the best wishes of Secretary of the Interior Fred Seaton and Commissioner of Reclamation Floyd E. Dominy, whose schedules did not permit them to be present for the ceremony.

He also noted that Senators ALAN BIBLE and HOWARD CANNON and Congressman WALTER BARING had sent word that they were unable to attend because of the beginning of the new session of Congress this week.

"Many of you have joined with the Department of the Interior, your Members of Congress and State and local officials in working diligently many years for this day on which we officially sever Boulder City from Federal apron strings," he said.

The complicated and controversial problem was not easily solved and took many years of effort, he noted; but said he was convinced that the efforts which culminated in passage of the Boulder City Act of 1958 will pay off bountifully.

"We of the Department of the Interior feel that the Federal Government is turning over to the incorporated citizenry the finest little city in the world," he said.

Accepting the contract for the State of Nevada, Governor Sawyer commented on the beauty and high quality of Nevada's newest city and said the State was proud to accept such an addition.

Governor Sawyer welcomed Boulder City to her rightful place alongside her sister cities in Nevada.

"Though many people in this Nation take the right of self-government as a matter of course," he noted, "there can be no danger of this in Boulder City" because of the 20-year effort to bring about home rule.

Boulderites were warned by the State's chief executive, "With your incorporation, you hold a trust and a duty—to yourselves, your city, your State and your Nation. Some may think it absurd that Boulder City, a community of less than 4,000, has any great part to play in national or world affairs.

"But our freedom is not based on the masses, it has its roots in the individual. If

America cannot solve its problems on a community level, how can it hope to solve the problems of the world?"

Residents were advised not to expect perfection from their new city officials since mistakes will be made in the natural course of things.

"Lack of mistakes too often means lack of progress," Governor Sawyer observed.

Mayor Broadbent noted that, in accepting the contract, the citizens are embarking on a challenging course.

The responsibilities and duties and operation of local self-government we accept under the laws of the State of Nevada, the county of Clark and the Boulder City charter.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GRUENING in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PARTY POLICY

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, many scholars and students of government have written and spoken upon the operations and responsibility of our two-party system. This concern of the party system arises from the fact that it is only through the operations of the two-party system that the mass of our people have a meaningful choice and method of giving direction and mandates to their government. It would follow, then, that the policies of our two major parties, the manner of their formulation and execution, and the responsibility of the parties and their agencies are of vital concern to all citizens.

Party policy, both of the majority and the minority, is surely a matter of vital concern to all Members of Congress and to the people of their constituencies.

Almost from the beginning of the organization of government under the Constitution, the democratic process in the United States has been characterized by the formulation of public policy and the molding of public opinion through a strong two-party system. Almost throughout our history the Congress has been led by a majority party, but with a strong and challenging opposition from a minority party. Third parties have had little success and surely play no significant role now.

Like many others, I have been concerned with the formulation of the policies of the Democratic Party in the U.S. Senate. I have expressed this concern in speeches on the floor of the Senate and in other ways. It seems to me that a method of formulating party policies in the Senate that is representative of and responsive to the majority will of the Democratic Senators is necessary to a responsible performance by the Democratic Party.

That is particularly true now, when the President of the United States is a member of the Republican Party. Unless the Democratic Party in Congress

has some orderly way of formulating legislative policy, the only organ I know of which undertakes from time to time to announce party policy to the country is the advisory committee to the Democratic National Committee, most members of which do not hold an office to which they have been elected; whereas in the Senate there are 65 Members who have been chosen as the nominees of their party in their respective States, and who have been elected by the people of their States to this responsibility.

This subject has been a matter of legislation. It has been a matter of frequent debate in the Senate. I debated the matter in the Senate last year. It is a matter of public interest. It is surely a matter of interest to every Democrat in the United States. More than that, it is a matter of concern to every citizen, because it goes to the heart of the responsibility of the party and of the operation of the two-party system, in which all people, as I have said, have a concern.

I say these things in a general way, Mr. President, because I am concerned with a current interpretation of the purpose and role of the Democratic senatorial policy committee, by some, that this committee is merely an arm of the Democratic leadership of the Senate. I do not accept this interpretation. It does not comport with the purposes for which the policy committee was created. It neither comports with democratic procedure nor complies with the principle of responsibility of an agent to a principal.

In my view, the Democratic policy committee is, or should be, an agent of the conference of Democratic Senators.

The Senate Democratic policy committee should represent all the Democrats in the Senate, not merely one. The Democratic policy committee of the U.S. Senate should operate in the study and in the formulation of policy, working with all the Democratic Senators. It should be elected by the Democratic Senators. This goes to the heart of democratic procedure within the Democratic Party.

One can understand, then, Mr. President, why at the conference of Democratic Senators last Thursday, I found it impossible to accept the dictum that the Democratic policy committee is "an arm of the leadership."

Perhaps it would be helpful to review briefly the history of the Democratic policy committee, the purposes for which it was created, and the manner of its creation. The Democratic policy committee had its genesis in the Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress. It was this committee, which was headed by the late Senator Robert M. La Follette, Jr., and then Representative, but now Senator, A. S. MIKE MONRONEY, which recommended the Reorganization Act of 1946, by the terms of which Congress now operates. The committee held long hearings on the problems of the Congress and the manner in which it could be more representative of, responsive to, and more effective in implementing the public will and party policy.

I should like to read two sentences from the recommendation of this committee.

Recommendation: That both the House and the Senate establish formal committees for the determination and expression of majority and minority policy. The majority and minority policy committees in both Houses would be appointed by their respective majority and minority conferences.

From this, Mr. President, it is perfectly clear that the Monroney-La Follette committee recommendation which gave birth to both the Republican and Democratic policy committees in the U.S. Senate did not envision the policy committee as a mere "arm of the leadership." Quite to the contrary, the report clearly recommends the establishment of majority and minority policy committees which would meet at frequent intervals "to formulate the overall legislative policy of the two parties." Moreover, as I have already said, it recommended that these committees be appointed by their respective majority and minority conferences. Perhaps it would be appropriate to read the entire section of the joint committee report with respect to this particular subject. That I shall now do.

MAJORITY AND MINORITY POLICY COMMITTEES

Strong recommendations were made to your committee concerning the need for the formal expression within the Congress of the main policies of the majority and minority parties. These representations called for some mechanism which could bring about more party accountability for policies and pledges and announced and made in the national platforms of the major political parties.

These recommendations were based on the theory that in a democracy national problems must be handled on a national basis. Only through the expression of the will of the people by their support of political parties on the basis of their platform pledges can the majority will be determined. Likewise the minority viewpoint is also expressed in support of the minority platform.

No one would claim that representative democracy as we know it today could exist without majority and minority parties. The 435 voices of the House and the 96 of the Senate would be confused babel of conflicting tongues without party machinery. Instead of unorganized mob rule where the strength of varying viewpoints cannot be measured or determined, party government furnishes a tug-of-war in which the direction and strength of opposing viewpoints can be more or less accurately measured and weighed.

Under the American party system there are always two main groups, each checking the other and offering the choice of alternative courses of action. Around these two groups Congressmen can rally and express themselves, helping in party caucuses to determine the policy for their group.

Your committee recognizes the need for freedom of action on the part of the individual Member of Congress and his right to vote at any time against the announced policy of his party. But we feel that if party accountability for policies and pledges is to be achieved, stronger and more formal mechanisms are necessary. The present steering committees, an informal and little-used device, seldom meet and never steer.

We recommend that these be replaced with the formal establishment in the House and the Senate of majority and minority policy committees. The majority policy committees of the two Houses would meet jointly at

frequent intervals, as would those of the minority, to formulate the over-all legislative policy of the two parties. The majority policy committee of each House would also hold frequent meetings to consider its role in expediting consideration and passage of matters pledged to the people by their party.

On issues where party policy is involved the decisions of these policy committees would be formally announced in the proceedings of Congress and formal records would be kept of such decisions. No member of either party would be required to follow such announced party policy except as he chose to do so. Each member would be free to vote as he saw fit, but the record of his action would be available to the public as a means of holding both the party and the individual accountable.

1. CREATION OF POLICY COMMITTEES

Recommendation: That both the House and the Senate establish formal committees for the determination and expression of majority policy and minority policy. Each of these four committees would be composed of seven members appointed in its entirety at the opening of each new Congress. The majority and minority policy committees in both Houses would be appointed by their respective majority and minority conferences.

We feel that in the establishment of such policy committee, the Congress chosen at the last general election should be controlling and that the policy-committee membership should therefore be chosen at the beginning of each new Congress. Membership on all policy committees would automatically expire at the close of each Congress.

Mr. President, the minority party at the time of that report was the Republican Party, but it became the majority party the following year. The majority leader was the late Senator Taft, of Ohio. As I understand, the Senate Policy Committee of the Republican Party follows those recommendations rather closely. I find it rather strange that the procedure for determining legislative policy within the Republican Party in the Senate is more democratic than the procedure for determining party policy—if we have such procedure—within the Democratic Party in the Senate.

Upon the recommendation of the Monroney-La Follette committee the Senate passed a bill which contained the following provision:

Sec. 244(a) It is the sense of the Senate and the House of Representatives that the majority party and the principal minority party in the respective Houses should each at the beginning of each Congress appoint a policy committee, consisting of seven members, for the formulation of overall legislative policy of the respective parties.

(b) There is hereby authorized to be appropriated annually for each policy committee the sum of \$30,000 for the maintenance of a staff to assist in study, analysis, and research on problems involved in policy determinations. The members of each such staff shall be appointed, and their compensation fixed, by the policy committee concerned, but no such compensation shall be fixed at a rate in excess of \$8,000 per annum.

The above provision was not accepted by the House, but the Senate proceeded promptly upon its own to establish its own majority and minority policy committees. The Senate included in the legislative appropriation bill—passed within a few days after the reorganization bill became law—legislative provi-

sions which, in effect, authorized the establishment of policy committees and the employment of staffs.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield; or does he prefer to proceed at this time?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator from Tennessee has been reading from the text of the bill as it passed the Senate.

Mr. GORE. That is correct.

Mr. DOUGLAS. In that text it is provided that the majority party and the principal minority party shall appoint the policy committees. It does not say that the majority leader and the minority leader shall appoint the committees; the text states that the parties shall appoint the committees. Is that true?

Mr. GORE. That is true.

Mr. DOUGLAS. And therefore the Senator from Tennessee is laying the basis for indicating that it was the intent of the Senate that the policy committee should be the agent of the party.

Mr. GORE. That is clear, it seems to me, from the report of the Committee on the Reorganization of the Congress, from the bill S. 2177, 79th Congress, as introduced in the Senate, from the bill as passed by the Senate, and also from the measure which finally became law, the First Supplemental Appropriation Act of 1947 which was based upon the committee's recommendation, and which is the legislative basis for the Senate policy committees.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I think the Senator from Tennessee is correct. I merely wanted to raise this question, in order to point out, at the very least, the original intent of the bill as passed by the Senate.

Mr. GORE. I thank the able Senator from Illinois. The provision was contained, as I have read it, in the bill which passed the Senate. The provision was not accepted by the House. When the House would not accept the provision, the bill was passed without it.

But to show the intent of the Senate, the Senate proceeded within a very few days to attach a legislative rider to an appropriation bill; and that rider did, in effect, authorize the establishment of policy committees in the Senate and the employment of staffs therefor. I should like to read that provision, which was contained in the First Supplemental Appropriation Act of 1947, and which was passed in August 1946. I shall now read the provision, which today is the law:

For maintenance of a staff for a majority policy committee and a minority policy committee in the Senate, consisting of seven members each, for the formulation of overall legislative policy of the respective parties, the members of such staff to assist in study, analysis, and research on problems involved in policy determinations, and to be appointed, and their compensation fixed, by the policy committee concerned, at rates not to exceed \$8,000 per annum in any case, \$15,000 for each such committee, in all, fiscal year 1947, \$30,000, to be available at the beginning of the 80th Congress.

Note, Mr. President, how closely the language of the provision which became law followed the provisions of the bill recommended by the Monroney-La Fol-

lette committee, and adopted as a portion of the reorganization bill which was passed by the Senate.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield for a question?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. SMATHERS. I wish to remain in the Chamber, to listen to all of the Senator's speech, for I am greatly interested in what he has to say. However, several persons are waiting for me, in my office.

So at this time I wish to ask a question of the Senator from Tennessee. I know he will have a good answer to it, and therefore I wish to give him this opportunity to answer it: In light of the fact that the whole matter of how the policy committee should be selected is on the agenda for tomorrow, to be discussed behind closed doors, at a caucus called for that purpose where we of the Democratic Party can determine what action we should take with respect to this entire problem, I am curious to know why the able Senator from Tennessee wished to make this speech today, here on the floor of the Senate, in public, before all the press, as he is now doing. I am curious about that.

Mr. GORE. I was sure the junior Senator from Florida would be curious about it, and I shall be very pleased to satisfy his curiosity.

For one thing, this is a matter about which I am deeply concerned; and this is not the first time I have expressed such concern on the floor of the Senate. The people of Tennessee have honored me with an opportunity to be a United States Senator. In consequence of that honor and that office, I have the privilege of speaking in this forum; and that is one of the greatest privileges which can come to a man. Here one can be heard. Behind closed doors one can be steamrollered.

This is an issue which I think concerns all the people, because it goes to the heart of the responsibility of our parties; it goes to a method of determining party policy.

I should like to point out to the Senator that last year, without party policy, one committee dealt in one way with the interest rate problem; another committee dealt in another way with that problem. No one could tell us what the policy of the Democratic Party was, unless one wished to acknowledge that the advisory committee to the National Committee constituted such an authoritative organ for policy.

I take it that the Senator does not recognize that group as an authoritative spokesman for the party. Where, then, is there to be, and how is there to be, a formulation of legislative policies of the Democratic Party? As a result of the lack of party policy, as a result of the constant compromise of principle, we ended the last session in virtual rout on the economic issues.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GORE. I want to satisfy the Senator's curiosity. I think this is important to every American, not just to the Senators who are going to meet behind closed doors tomorrow. Yes, I will have

an opportunity to have my say there, and I will say some things there that I will not say here—perhaps—

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GORE. Just a moment, and I will yield. But I have some things to say here as I have the opportunity which I feel it is my duty to say to all who will read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. This is not a matter for the sole determination of Senators behind closed doors. Every Democrat in Florida should be interested in this, and I hope every Democrat in Tennessee is interested in it. I will certainly undertake to interest them in it.

Now I yield further.

Mr. SMATHERS. I am sure the Senator knows nobody questions his right to rise in the Senate and discuss anything about which he has convictions.

Mr. GORE. I understand the Senator has not questioned my right; he has expressed his curiosity.

Mr. SMATHERS. I was interested in your discussion in light of the fact that we know proposals were made for caucuses, having an opportunity to settle this type of question at them. I remember an argument made against the caucuses was that we could come to the floor of the U.S. Senate and debate the problems. I remember the argument was made in opposition to the proposal of the Senator from Pennsylvania that we really did not have to have a caucus, because a Senator could come to the floor and speak, as the Senator from Tennessee is doing, without inhibition, or limitation and to the whole world. But, the counterargument was made—and it prevailed—that we should argue things that have to do with party workings, washing our dirty linen, in our own party caucuses. I sort of subscribed to that practice, and I understood the Senator from Tennessee did. Therefore I have been at a loss to understand why he comes on the floor now. That is the reason why I was curious.

Mr. GORE. In the first place, I do not regard this question as being purely and strictly one of concern to Democratic Senators. As I have said, I think this is of interest to all our party members. Indeed, it is of interest to many independent citizens in the United States who do not have an affiliation with either party, because it goes to the heart of the operation of our two-party system. As our population continues to grow, multitudinous as it is, with 180 million people, it will be only through clear-cut choices, if there are any clear-cut choices any more between the two parties, that the American people will have a meaningful, constructive way of expressing a choice and giving direction and a mandate to their Government.

If we compromise with principle, if we wind up with the Democratic Party almost indistinguishable from the administration's party, then how, I ask, will the American people have a clear-cut choice?

I should like to have the distinguished Senator from Florida tell us what the

Democratic Party policy is with respect to any issue which he wishes to choose, how that legislative policy has been determined in the Senate, and what means we have now to determine such policy.

Mr. SMATHERS. I would say, irrespective of whether we do or do not have such means, that the whole debate involves a matter of mechanics and machinery. At least, that is what I thought. I thought that was the reason why we were to go into caucus tomorrow. That is the reason why I have felt, and many other Senators have felt, that from time to time we should have a caucus, as the Republicans do, which, as the Senator from Tennessee has explained, appear to be successful. However, I have not noticed that they stand on their side of the aisle and air their particular divisions for the whole world to see. Yes, I think they discuss them in caucus. I have not been invited to them. I have not been privileged to learn what they think their problems are. And I think they are wise in not advertising them.

I doubt the wisdom of once again pointing out, as I think everybody recognizes, some divisions in our own party, and the additional problem of how we should proceed to determine policy. I understand that the real purpose of the caucus was to state our positions, which naturally could be stated more freely in caucus, without the necessity of saying the same thing on the floor of the Senate, and without having it misunderstood as it goes out over the wires or radio and television.

If we are to argue the issues here on the floor today, there is no sense in arguing the same things in caucus tomorrow. May I mention this one complimentary thing?

Mr. GORE. Yes, indeed.

Mr. SMATHERS. I know the Senator from Tennessee is absolutely sincere about what he is doing here. I know he has deep convictions about it. I know he is a loyal and dedicated Democrat and patriot. I understand all that. I think what he is talking about in the realm of determining policy has merit to it. I just wonder about the wisdom of rising on the floor of the Senate at this time and talking about it, and now broadcasting it to the public, in light of the caucus which has been called for tomorrow to determine these questions among ourselves. That is what aroused my curiosity.

Mr. GORE. I will have some further comments to make about that in a few moments. But the junior Senator from Tennessee asks the junior Senator from Florida to name one legislative policy of the Democratic Party, to outline, if he can, any formal procedure the 65 Senators belonging to the Democratic Party in the Senate have for determining a policy.

The Senator from Florida responded to my question by saying, "Irrespective of that situation," and then he proceeded to make a statement. I wonder if the able Senator from Florida would be able to tell me—and I am entitled to curiosity the same as the junior Senator from Florida is—

Mr. SMATHERS. Surely.

Mr. GORE. I am curious to know what he regards the policy of the Democratic Party with respect to housing to be.

Mr. SMATHERS. I should like to say, in answer to the able Senator from Tennessee, that one of the great virtues—or vices, I do not know which—

Mr. GORE. Well, now, there is a good deal of difference.

Mr. SMATHERS. I think there is a great deal of difference between them, but I am not sure whether in this instance what I am going to say is a virtue or a vice. I will leave that to the good judgment of the Senator from Tennessee. But one of the good things about the Democratic Party is that we cannot tell a Member what to do. The distinguished senior Senator from New Mexico said he did not care—and I applaud him for his position—how many Members got together and stated what they considered the Democratic Party's position and tried to tell him the way he should vote. He said the people of New Mexico sent him here and no Senator was going to bind him nor dictate to him as to how he was to vote.

I join with him in that noble sentiment. I was not sent to the U.S. Senate to go into any room with any group of people, even fellow Democrats, and have them tell me how I should vote on housing, agriculture, debt management, or on anything. The only people to whom I am responsible are the people of my State of Florida, who elected me to come here to represent them in the best possible way I could.

I ran on the Democratic ticket. The Democrats voted for me, I am delighted to say, and then sent me here to do that which I thought best for them and the Nation as a whole.

I do not know of a single Senator present who feels as though he is going to be bound by any statement of an advisory council, or of a caucus of any nature, or anything else. The whole purpose of the caucus, as I understood, is to converse about these matters, to see what is the middle ground and to see if there is anything upon which most of us can agree.

It would obviously always not be correct to assume that we could get the senior Senator from Illinois, who sits here, for example, to agree with the able senior Senator from Virginia. We could not get the Senator from Mississippi and the senior Senator from Minnesota to agree about civil rights. We could not get the Senator from Rhode Island to agree with the Senator from Oregon about farm problems. We have considerable division about these things.

We do not even have a policy with respect to reclamation which represents 100-percent unanimity.

However, we try to get together as best we can as they do in any legislative body, to give and take, to see what course we can follow with which most Senators will agree. That is what we have been doing.

I think we have been pretty successful, because even though a President of one party won by a tremendous margin

of votes in 1952 and again in 1956, we have nonetheless been able to increase our representation in the House and Senate, despite having to contend with this great personality. We have been able to do this, in my opinion, because the people believe the Congress has been reasonable, responsible, and sensible. The people have voted for our candidates, for our platforms, and for our course of action, as vague as they may sometimes appear to be. The people have voted for us, in the final analysis, and that is the test.

The Senator says, "Look at the Republicans; they have been perhaps a little more democratic than we." I can only say I doubt they have been, but certainly their course has not been as effective as ours, because we have been defeating them in every election.

I make these remarks with deep affection for my friend, who knows I mean sincerely what I am saying. I have the utmost admiration for the Senator from Tennessee. I am in sympathy with what he is saying. I think he is ringing a bell, but I do not think he is ringing it at the right address, on the floor of the U.S. Senate.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, first I thank the able junior Senator from Florida for his generous remarks.

The Senator said he would leave it to me to judge whether in his remarks he was describing a situation which could be considered a vice or a virtue. I choose to apply the word "virtue" to the freedom of choice which my friend says every Senator must have.

I should like to read from the report of the Monroney-La Follette committee, which I read before the distinguished Senator entered the Chamber, on this particular point:

On issues where party policy is involved the decisions of these policy committees would be formally announced in the proceedings of Congress and formal records would be kept of such decisions. No member of either party would be required to follow such announced party policy except as he chose to do so. Each Member would be free to vote as he saw fit, but the record of his action would be available to the public as a means of holding both the party and the individual accountable.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GORE. I will yield in a minute.

Mr. President, I have asked the able junior Senator from Florida to name one instance in which he knows the legislative policy of the Democratic Party in the Senate—to show one way we have of developing in a formal way an effective and meaningful policy. The Senator has not answered.

We have a way of developing one. I shall answer my own question to some extent by saying that in the caucus, or in the conference, we can develop one. This is one effective and meaningful way to develop a policy and to announce formally the policy to the country.

Then the junior Senator from Tennessee would have to accept his responsibility, with the Democrats in Tennessee, as to whether he followed such a policy or whether he did not. As the

situation is now, there may be a coalition of a few Democrats and enough Republicans to bring a bill to the Senate even though the bill does not represent the view of the majority of the Democrats in the Senate. As a result of the coalition, a bill may be enacted into law without any yardstick ever having been established to show that it was contrary to the legislative policy of the Democrats in the U.S. Senate.

Before yielding further, I should like to amplify my answer to the Senator as to why I consider this to be a proper subject for debate on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. SMATHERS. Could the Senator help me by answering one question on that point?

Mr. GORE. I will answer further, and then I will yield.

For one thing, what we are discussing is a matter of legislation. The genesis of the policy committee, the authorization for its establishment and for the payment of its staff, is a matter of legislation. The membership is said to be seven. How did the number come to be more? I do not complain about there being more members. I think there should be more.

I think the rank and file of our party ought to know that on the Democratic policy committee of the Senate there is only one member from north of the Alabama line and east of the Mississippi River, the very distinguished and able Senator, the Honorable THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN.

I think we should have a policy committee which is something more than an arm of the leadership. We should have a policy committee which performs the functions and assumes the responsibilities envisioned in the Monroney-La Follette committee report.

Furthermore, I think the membership of the committee should be increased so that the committee will be more truly representative of all the Democrats in the Senate and of their constituents and so that it will be representative of all the great geographic sections of our country.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GORE. The Senator from Florida has one additional question.

Mr. SMATHERS. I have only one question.

Mr. GORE. I yield to the junior Senator from Florida.

Mr. SMATHERS. Even if somebody wished to agree with everything the Senator from Tennessee has been saying, with respect to the verity of his argument about policy and how to get it, I think, however, that person could also logically say that this forum in which we speak today is not a caucus and is not a conference of Democrats, where these intraparty matters are supposed to be decided. On the contrary, this is the floor of the Senate of the United States, where we are bringing out into the open once again the washing, so to speak, our "dirty linen."

Mr. GORE. This is not "dirty" linen; it is simply faulty linen.

Mr. SMATHERS. Very well; faulty linen. If this were a Democratic caucus we would not see the able and distinguished senior Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL] sitting here. We would not have a room full of people. We would not have a crowded press gallery looking down on us.

Perhaps we could decide this question in a party caucus. In a caucus each member would be free to vote as he saw fit. Perhaps we could decide some issues but I do not believe we Democrats are going to be able to decide anything on the basis of what we do this afternoon on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, the Senator wished to ask me one further question.

Mr. SMATHERS. I do not have another question. I merely wished to make that observation, in all good conscience and good spirit.

I thank the Senator for yielding to me. As I say, I am not unsympathetic with the argument he is making. I am only a little doubtful whether the forum in which he is making it is the correct forum. I have been wrong before. I may be wrong in the future, and I may be wrong now. But I do not believe I am.

I thank the Senator for yielding to me.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, in the first place, the Democratic Party is the party of the people. I do not mind the people knowing my views on this subject. I do not mind the people knowing whether the party has or has not a means of formulating Democratic policy in the U.S. Senate. I want my constituents to know my views on this question, and this is the proper forum for a Member of the U.S. Senate.

I say again to the able junior Senator from Florida that this problem cannot be interpreted as purely a problem to be decided within the Democratic caucus, because the Congress enacted a law on the subject.

Furthermore, the Democratic Party in the Senate must go back to the basic legislation, containing the authorization for the payment of the staff of the committee. Therefore, the problem cannot be dealt with exclusively in the Democratic caucus.

There is one further point. I am not so naive as to think that this problem will be settled in the right way if no public notice is given as to the existence of the problem. I have been in public life for a few years. What little accomplishment it has been my opportunity to achieve has been in direct ratio to the extent of public information as to my efforts. Therefore, I am glad to accept the impeachment of the Senator's curiosity, and I am pleased to tell him that I am speaking as a Member of the U.S. Senate on a problem which goes to the very heart of the operation of the two-party system in the legislative branch of our Government. I do not think that is exclusively the privilege of either the Republican caucus or the Democratic caucus.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GORE. I promised to yield to the distinguished senior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ].

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I shall now prove a point in connection with what I said in the conference the other day, namely, that if three Democrats get together, it is impossible to get two of them to agree with the third.

With all due deference, and with no personalities whatsoever being involved, I shall remain on the side of my good friend from Tennessee this afternoon.

Mr. GORE. I thank the Senator.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I feel that we can settle more party policy on this floor than in a million conferences.

Our friends on the other side—and I note the presence in the Chamber of my good friend from California [Mr. KUCHEL]—are supposed to be democratic in their way of thinking. They meet every day; but look at them.

Mr. KUCHEL. I hope my friend is not referring to my facial expression. [Laughter].

Mr. CHAVEZ. No; nothing like that at all.

We are not going to determine in a party caucus whether we are to have housing legislation. We are not going to determine in a party caucus whether we are to have civil rights legislation. We are not going to determine in a party conference whether we are to have progressive legislation and liberal legislation. The only time I ever had an opportunity to vote on liberal legislation was when I entered a big fight with my good friends from the South on the fair employment labor practices bill. At that time I occupied the seat in this Chamber now occupied by my friend from Oregon [Mr. MORSE]. I handled the legislation from my committee.

Party policy, so far as Democrats are concerned, will be determined here. Let us get to work and vote for the legislation by which we intend to make policy. To become irritated after listening to someone talk does not accomplish anything.

I repeat, that no party conference is going to bind me. I wish to find out what I am voting on, and not what the members of a party conference may think or say behind closed doors. I want the public to know the facts. I want the people of New Mexico to know how I stand and how I vote.

I, for one, am glad that the Senator from Tennessee is making the speech which he is delivering, even though I do not agree with him entirely.

Mr. GORE. I thank the Senator for his generous remarks.

I agree with the Senator from New Mexico that it is difficult for Democrats to get together. If I wished to live in perfect harmony with all members of my political party, I would join the Republican Party.

Mr. MORSE. That would be a mistake.

Mr. GORE. But I do not want to be a Republican. I want to be a Democrat.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. SMATHERS. I think there is one important difference between the original voting position of the able senior Senator from New Mexico, and that of the very able Senator from Tennessee. When the question was first discussed the other day at our Democratic conference the able Senator from New Mexico said he did not believe any caucuses were necessary, because Senators could come to the floor and do exactly what the Senator from Tennessee is doing. But the Senator from Tennessee and other Senators said no, or implied that they did not agree, but that we should have a caucus, and there discuss such questions. That is the basic difference. I was one of those who agreed to a great extent with the able Senator from Tennessee and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK].

Mr. GORE. But the Senator did not vote that way.

Mr. SMATHERS. On the contrary, the Senator from Florida did vote that way. As a matter of fact, there was no vote, but the Senator from Florida was prepared to so vote.

The point is that when the issues which are considered in the caucus are eventually brought to the floor of the Senate for debate, we can then get up and speak our piece, and let the people know where we stand. And we do not have to be bound by any discussion in the caucus, but we have had the benefit of it.

The type of meeting which I envisioned at the caucus was a meeting to decide when to bring issues to the floor of the Senate, and the most strategic way to bring them up. There was no effort to close the door on any Senator. All that was involved in the conferences which some Senators wanted was getting together on a policy which most of us could follow, and then bringing the issue to the floor of the Senate, so that every Senator could speak his piece.

That is why I applaud the able Senator from New Mexico, because he is consistent in his position.

Mr. GORE. I thank the able Senator.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I wonder if my good friend will bear with me momentarily, in order to keep the record straight.

Mr. GORE. I am glad to yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Like Al Smith, I say, Let us look at the record.

This is not the first time that the question of a conference or policy committee has been discussed. Let me say to my friend from California [Mr. KUCHEL] that I remember when we were in the minority, not so long ago. On February 4, 1953, we met behind closed doors in a minority conference of Senate Democrats. At that time my good friend from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON], who is at present the majority leader, was then the minority leader.

He and I had a little colloquy, and I should like to quote from it:

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, with all due deference to the minority leader, I, as one Senator, would like to find out from the President what his ideas are. I am willing

to use my own judgment in trying to cooperate with him in his desire to carry out his ideas. However, the point I should like to make is that the decision of the minority policy committee is not the decision of the minority. After all, I do not want the minority policy committee to make a decision for me. I should like to use my own judgment.

After all, the President of the United States is entitled at least to a fair chance to try to carry out what I consider to be the mandate of the American people. However, I should like to ask the minority leader at this time if it is expected by him that what the policy committee decides is to be the decision of the minority Members of the Senate.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, the minority leader merely read to the Senate the statement which was adopted by the minority policy committee. He did not attempt to speak for any Member of the Senate other than the members of that committee.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I know, but what—

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I should like to finish my answer to the Senator from New Mexico. If the Senator will read the statement and then assume the same position which the nine members of the committee assumed, well and good. If he does not care to do so, of course, the Senator may—and I know he will—express his own personal viewpoint.

In other words, the way I understood the minority leader's answer at the time was that he was expressing only the opinion of those who had met with him as members of the policy committee, and did not intend in any way, shape, or form to bind individual Members of the Senate.

Mr. GORE. I thank the Senator.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I wish the RECORD to be clear that the minority leader at that time, the Senator from Texas, did not at any time try to contend that they represented the majority of the Senate, or that they wanted the majority to be bound by their decision.

Mr. GORE. I thank the Senator. I should like to make one further suggestion to the junior Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS]. I was not one of those who originated the motion in the conference the other day for regular Democratic conferences. I was one of those who felt that we should not ignore the sentiment of so many of our colleagues who wished to have more Democratic get-togethers and discussions. I did not share the enthusiasm and hopes for party conferences which some of my colleagues expressed or felt. I thought, since they desired them, we should have some. However, I would not want in any respect to have the junior Senator from Florida take from me the privilege of discussing a public issue on the floor of the Senate, an issue which I have discussed many times heretofore on the floor of the Senate, just because I thought we should accede to the wishes of so many of our colleagues for some Democratic conferences.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I should like to join the Senator from New Mexico in commending the Senator from Tennessee for taking the floor this afternoon. I am delighted that all of this is coming

out in the open, not being leaked from behind closed doors supposedly clothing conferences or caucuses of Democratic Senators.

In that connection I should like to say that I was very much surprised to read in the paper this morning after last week's conference or caucus that there was literally a rebellion going on against the leadership on the Democratic side. It just was not so. I told the reporters who spoke to me about it that it was a harmonious meeting. One of the people who did the most to maintain a great degree of harmony was the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. GORE. That is how I got into it.

Mr. MANSFIELD. That is right. I believe that caucuses are a waste of time. I believe we would lose more votes than we would probably gain, because stories will get out of the conferences which will overemphasize something of perhaps a somewhat spectacular nature, or contain only partial truth.

If we discuss issues in which we are interested, such as housing, aid to education, civil rights, and so forth, down here on the floor of the Senate, the newspaper people up there in the gallery will get an accurate report of what is said down here. I would hope that we would do our arguing and our quarreling and our debating out in the open.

As I understand, the Senator from Tennessee says—and I quote him—"This is the proper forum." I believe we will accomplish a great deal more here on the floor than in caucuses, from which stories are bound to be leaked. Those stories will contain half truths, and the result will be that the Democratic Party will be set against itself, and we will be furnishing fodder to the Republicans, who are sitting over there just laughing and enjoying themselves no end. I do not blame them.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I understand—

Mr. GORE. I understood the Senator from Montana to say that in his opinion caucuses would do that, and not what the junior Senator from Tennessee said.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Is it not a fact that the Republican Party has been holding caucus after caucus during the last 5 or 6 years?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I understand that they have been having luncheon after luncheon.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. And they have lost man after man because of it.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I believe the Democrats have been gaining Members in the Senate because of the responsible and constructive way we have conducted ourselves.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. KUCHEL. Do I understand that the Senator from South Carolina is suggesting that here is some type of undercover urging by the Senator from Tennessee that the holding of caucuses could

defeat more Senators on his side in the next election?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. All I know is that as a result of caucuses held by the Senator's party, newspaper stories have been printed about Republican Senators fussing among themselves in the caucuses, and that some of the Senators who came up for election later were defeated for some cause or other.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for not more than thirty seconds for another statement.

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. KUCHEL. On that point I should like to say that I have been admonished by some of my fellow Republicans on this side of the aisle to be very careful about accepting any recommendation from the other side of the aisle as to how we can increase our membership on this side of the aisle.

Mr. MANSFIELD. That is good advice.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I should like to say once again that I am not one of those who believes that frequent conferences of the Democratic Party will solve all our problems, or even, necessarily, develop a party policy. What I feel very strongly about is an effective, working Democratic policy committee performing the functions for which it was created. That is my concern. My concern is with an effective Democratic policy, perhaps above the necessity or the desire for having so many party conferences. That, I will say to the Senator from Montana, is my principal concern.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Before I go into my next topic, I should like to express the hope that, if we have a conference tomorrow, the members of the press will be in attendance, so that they can get a true and accurate story of what goes on, and not what is leaked out to them.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator from Tennessee in his discussion has been very accurate in his historical background of the legislation and the proposals emanating from the Monroney-La Follette idea for the reorganization of Congress—as far as he goes.

However, I believe there is another point I should bring out, and that is that on January 2, 1947, the next year, there was a meeting of the Democratic caucus under the leadership of the late Senator Alben W. Barkley, of Kentucky. I now read from the minutes of the conference:

Senator Barkley then stated that the conference should discuss and determine the procedure to be followed in connection with committee assignments and questions relating to the steering committee and the minority policy committee, created by Public Law No. 663, 79th Congress (1st Supplemental Appropriation Act of 1937).

Senator Barkley stressed the importance of the newly created policy committee—

Incidentally, I think the committee is misnamed—

stating that while, of course, it was necessary to work as closely as possible in cooperation with the majority, it would neces-

sarily follow that the policy committee as a group would work in close association with the President.

A Democratic President.

Senator Barkley suggested that the conference first discuss the question of the minority committee assignments. Senator McKellar, of Tennessee—

The predecessor of the distinguished junior Senator from Tennessee—

stated that in his opinion the minority policy committee should be elected by the conference.

Mr. GORE. That shows that Tennesseans can be right twice.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes, indeed, but wrong when it comes to the votes.

Senator Barkley stated that the question of how membership on the policy committee should be filled would be taken up later in the meeting.

The conference then discussed the minority policy committee heretofore referred to, and Senator Barkley repeated his previous statements regarding the committee. Senator O'MAHONEY, of Wyoming, recalled the suggestion previously made by Senator McKellar that membership on the minority policy committee should be filled by election by the conference. Senator O'MAHONEY addressed the conference and submitted the following resolution:

"Resolved, That the chairman of the conference be authorized to appoint the membership of the minority policy committee, provided for by Public Law No. 663, 79th Congress, and that he is hereby named chairman of such committee."

The resolution offered by Senator O'MAHONEY was adopted by voice vote. (Senator McKellar, of Tennessee, voting in the negative.)

I thought the Democrats ought to know that, because that was done by the democratic action of the Democratic conference.

Mr. GORE. I do not think the record should be necessarily interpreted as indicating that there was only one vote in the negative. The usual custom is that, when there is a voice vote, no one's vote is recorded except when an individual says he wishes to be recorded either in the affirmative or the negative. I do not know whether on the voice vote in question there was only one negative vote, and the record does not say.

My esteemed predecessor, in my view, was right. He was a great Democrat, and he advocated democratic procedure within the Democratic Party. I am proud to be following in his footsteps in this particular regard.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator from Tennessee is just as distinguished in his own right as was Senator McKellar.

Mr. GORE. I thank my able friend from Montana.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. I thank the Senator from Tennessee for yielding. I would be happy if I could have the attention of the distinguished junior Senator from Montana. The Senator from Montana, in his remarks a few minutes ago, indicated that there had been leaks from the conference last week.

Mr. MANSFIELD. That is correct.

Mr. CLARK. Leaks which had given an improper indication of what took place at the meeting.

Mr. MANSFIELD. That is correct.

Mr. CLARK. I read the Washington newspapers, the New York newspapers, the Philadelphia newspapers, and other Pennsylvania newspapers quite carefully. In my judgment, there was nothing in any of those news accounts which incorrectly reported what took place at the conference.

The majority leader, in my presence, was interviewed by reporters immediately after the conference. With his permission, I sat with him. The account which he gave of the conference was completely accurate. With his permission, I made a slight addition, which he thought was equally accurate. So far as I am concerned, there was nothing in any of the newspapers which gave the slightest reason for believing that anything had been done or said which could be construed as an attack upon the majority leader, either before the conference or afterward.

Neither do I think there was any reason to infer from any of the press accounts that there was a wide split in the Democratic Party which was causing difficulty.

I myself think—the junior Senator from Montana was there, and he will have his own view—that the conference was conducted in a mature, orderly manner; that everyone was in good humor; that there were no voices raised; and that there was just the kind of democratic discussion of important issues which, in my judgment, should take place far more frequently in the future than has been the case in the past.

Mr. MANSFIELD. In other words, it was a harmonious meeting.

Mr. CLARK. Yes.

Mr. MANSFIELD. That is what I said. But did the Senator see what some of the newspapers said, did he read what the Washington Post said, that there was an indication that there was an uprising against the majority leader? But the New York Times, the New York Herald Tribune, and the Baltimore Sun made no such statements.

Mr. CLARK. I read the Washington Post, and I saw nothing in the article which was inaccurate.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Did the Senator read the headlines? I read the article, too. But it is the headlines which attract attention to the news accounts.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I had intended to make one thing perfectly clear before I finished. I think now is the time to do it.

My motion in the Democratic conference does not arise out of any hostility to the leadership of the distinguished senior Senator from Texas [LYNDON JOHNSON]. I have stated these views previously. He and I had a debate on this subject last year. My esteem for him as a Senator, as a man, and as a leader has been expressed on the floor many times, and in many other ways and many other places. I think the senior Senator from Texas, the Honorable LYNDON JOHNSON, is the ablest Democrat who has served as Democratic leader in

the Senate in my lifetime. Should there be any further question? This is a matter of principle; it is a matter of party responsibility, party policy, and party performance. It is not a matter of personality. I would certainly resist any such interpretation being placed upon my efforts.

I wish to make one other point clear. I have no objection to the present membership of the Democratic policy committee. Each member is my personal friend; each is the object of my esteem and affection. My concern arises out of my desire to see the Democratic Party have a fairly effective way of formulating policy and announcing that policy to the country, and then letting each Member consider his own responsibility in voting. But let the rank and file of our party and the people of the country have a yardstick by which to measure any Senator's party loyalty.

Unless there is some sense of party responsibility, the workings of the two-party system will break down in its end goal, which is to give to the people clear-cut choices.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. CARROLL. I was not in Washington at the time the discussions took place, which have been mentioned. All I know is what I have read in the newspapers, except what I have heard today. I should like to put a question to the junior Senator from Montana.

Mr. GORE. I yield for that purpose.

Mr. CARROLL. I want to ask the Senator from Montana about the resolution passed in the 1947 Democratic conference. I think the Senator has read it.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes.

Mr. CARROLL. How have the policy committees been appointed since 1947? Was it by virtue of some resolution?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes; by virtue of some resolution and by virtue of the fact that each majority leader appoints to any vacancy which may exist.

I point out that the present majority leader, the distinguished Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON], has appointed two members, and only two, of the present policy committee. One is the senior Democrat in this body, the distinguished senior Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN]; the other is my colleague, the distinguished senior Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY]. In the latter respect, I believe I am correct—and I observe the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] on the floor; he can correct me if I am in error—in stating that the majority leader went to the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], to former Senator Lehman, and other Senators, and asked whom they wanted to have named to the policy committee. If I am correct, it was on their recommendation to the leadership that the senior Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] was placed on that committee. Am I correct?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I think that is substantially true. My memory is not perfect, but I think that is substantially true.

Mr. CARROLL. At the time the resolution was passed, was the Democratic

Party in the Senate the majority or the minority party?

Mr. MANSFIELD. It was the minority party. I think we had 43 Members, if I remember correctly. But the President was of the Democratic Party.

Mr. CARROLL. I should like to ask a further question in regard to the caucus, about which I received notification only this morning.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The notice was sent out only on Saturday morning, on the initiative of the majority leader, the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON], and before a letter—supposedly being sent—was received by the leader or anyone else; I refer to a letter asking that a conference or caucus be called.

Mr. CARROLL. That is the way the matter was reported by the press in Colorado.

I want to commend the leadership for calling the conference. After listening to the colloquy, I suppose we are discussing some of those questions at this time.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I wish to say I think the Senator from Tennessee has performed a real public service by bringing out this matter on the floor. I hope that we Democrats never arrive at the point where we have to reach our decisions behind closed doors. Let us use this public forum, and thus let all the people know of our differences and how we reconcile them.

Mr. GORE. I thank the distinguished Senator from Montana.

Mr. CARROLL. Let me say that I agree with the Senator from Montana.

I have listened to the colloquy between the Senator from Tennessee and the Senator from Montana. Certainly there is no dirty linen to be washed here. The Senator from Tennessee has said we are dealing with basic principle, and that is the question here. There is nothing to hide. But we should not be afraid to air or ventilate or fumigate if it becomes necessary. I ask the Senator from Tennessee whether it is his purpose today to discuss broadening the membership of the policy committee.

Mr. GORE. Yes; and if possible to spur its functioning in accordance with the responsibilities and the purposes for which it was created.

Mr. CARROLL. In other words, as I read the law and as the Senator from Tennessee has indicated, it contains nothing which states that a Democratic caucus cannot elect the members of the policy committee. But because of a resolution which was adopted by a Democratic conference some years ago, and which seems to be continuing in nature, some of us who were not here at that time are bound by its provisions.

Today our party is in a different position. It is no longer a minority party; it is now the majority party, and has a majority of almost 2 to 1. As some Member has said, since the resolution was agreed to, the population of the country has increased by 20 million persons. So far as I know, never before has our party had so large a majority.

Our own majority leadership talks about responsibility. Certainly we have responsibility—not only to the Nation, but also to the people who form the Democratic Party.

Is there any reason why intelligent men cannot sit down and discuss who they wish to have serve on the policy committee?

Mr. GORE. I know of none.

Mr. CARROLL. Is there now any reason why intelligent men cannot enter the caucus room, and invite there the newspaper reporters, if necessary, to talk about something which I believe is more fundamental than the membership of the policy committee—namely, the membership of the steering committee? This is the crux of the matter. Such decisions should not be made by only one man or by a small group of men. All of us have had sufficient experience to know that it is our job never to permit too much power to be placed in the hands of one man or in the hands of a small group of men. The essence of democracy is the diffusion of such power; and the way to diffuse it properly is to have democratic representation, by means of voting. The Senator from Tennessee knows that to be true.

In the House of Representatives, where I formerly served, I was a member of the Ways and Means Committee. The Democratic members of that committee were selected by the Democratic Members of the House of Representatives, not by only one person. I do not know how the Republican members of that committee were selected; but the Democratic members of the Ways and Means Committee had to run for that office. In those days, there were approximately 200 Democratic Members of the House of Representatives; and the procedure followed was to have them vote on candidates for the important Ways and Means Committee. They acted and proceeded through the Committee on Committees, which had the power to appoint the members of the other committees. The members of the Committee on Committees represented various zones. I remember that, because in those days I represented Colorado, Missouri, and, I believe, New Mexico.

I believe we can discuss this matter further in our meeting tomorrow. The discussion we have had here today is certainly in no way a reflection on the conduct of the majority leader.

Mr. GORE. Certainly I have not intended it to be.

Mr. CARROLL. The Senator from Tennessee has said so clearly.

We have nothing to hide. Why cannot we open up this matter to the public? Certainly the Senator from Montana is 100 percent correct. We do not have to hide anything when we discuss party issues and party measures.

No skulduggery is involved in connection with these problems; but if there were some, it should be brought out into the open.

As the Senator from Tennessee has said, we are United States Senators, and we did not come here to bow before any-

one. If we have to fight over such matters, we will fight, if that is necessary.

Mr. GORE. And multiply.

Mr. CARROLL. I had not heard about this matter before today.

I commend the majority leader for calling the conference tomorrow; and at the conference tomorrow, if it is not feasible immediately to hold elections, it should be feasible immediately to broaden the base of the policy committee; and after we broaden its base and have more chance to express our views, then we ought to move into the next phase, which is to determine how elections ought to be made to the steering committee.

I have a basic interest in that matter; I refer, not to the membership of the policy committee, but to the membership of the steering committee and how its members are selected. This issue goes to the central power of the political body.

Mr. GORE. I thank the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield?

Mr. GORE. I had finished, and I am prepared to take my seat, unless the Senator from Wisconsin wishes to ask me a question.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I wish to commend the Senator from Tennessee for his masterful presentation, and I desire to ask him several questions about his position.

Mr. GORE. Very well.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I wholeheartedly and enthusiastically agree with the position taken by the Senator from Tennessee. However, I wish to ask several questions in regard to the way he has presented his position.

I take it that his purpose is to arrive at an orderly, systematic method of formulating Democratic policy. Is that correct?

Mr. GORE. That is very correct. Unless we have some guidelines by which the standing committees can operate, some guidelines for individual members, we have to "play by ear"; and in that event I fear that the rendition will not be a very harmonious one.

Mr. PROXMIRE. In the second place, the Senator from Tennessee is urging that the policy be formulated in such a way that, as he has stated the matter, there can be a greater sense of party responsibility on the part of all the Democratic Members of this body, and a better understanding of what our party stands for and what it seeks to do.

I believe the Senator from Tennessee has brought out most effectively, in the course of his colloquy with the junior Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], the point that, first of all, we Democratic Senators do not know what the party policy is; and, in the second place, he has pointed out that the policy of the Democratic Party should be arrived at by some representative procedure, that is, by persons who represent us. He also emphasized that the policy should be formulated, not for our direction, but for our information and guidance.

Mr. GORE. And I want to be the first—well, not actually the first, because all Members who have spoken on this subject have proclaimed their independence and their reservation of the right to vote as they please. That I will do, but I want to have formulated a legislative policy of the Democratic Party. That legislative policy cannot be formulated by the advisory committee to Mr. Paul Butler. It cannot be formulated by Mr. Butler. He has not been chosen by the ballots of the people. Here in the Congress, where the Democratic Party has a two-thirds majority of the House and the Senate, chosen by the people as Members of the two bodies and as representatives of the Democratic Party, we have the most responsible spokesmen and officials of our party on the national level. Surely this group can devise some way of formulating a policy for the party, within the legislative branch. That is what I am pleading for. I think it is necessary. Without that, the vision of the Democratic Party is blurred; without that, and with one compromise after another, we would stand before the country as a party with an indistinct position.

For instance, I favor the passage of one housing bill. After careful consideration of the views of the President, the views of the Federal officials, the views of each member of the Democratic Party, the views of my constituents, and the views of the industry involved, and after having carefully determined the provisions of a housing bill supported by the Democratic Party, I favor sending it to President Eisenhower, and then letting him determine, for himself, whether he will veto it or whether he will sign it into law. I would not "weasel" one time after another until we stood for nothing except compromise.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The Senator from Tennessee is reflecting, vigorously and properly, I think, on the recommendation which was contained in the Monroney-La Follette report, as follows:

These representations called for some mechanism which could bring about more party accountability for policies and pledges and announced and made in the national platforms of the major political parties.

I should like to say further that the distinguished assistant majority leader [Mr. MANSFIELD], as the spokesman for the leadership, has asked us—and I am sure he did not mean this to be a definitive answer—why we do not arrive at decisions like this on the floor of the Senate. I presume he believes the conference is no way to arrive at them. He was not asked his opinion, so it is not fair to imply he feels we could arrive at such decisions on the floor of the Senate, in contradistinction to the policy committee.

I should like to ask the Senator from Tennessee if he thinks we can arrive at a party decision on the basis of this discussion on the floor today?

Mr. GORE. I hope the discussion will contribute to that end.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Perhaps I mistook the implication of the Senator from Wisconsin. I was not speaking for the leadership; I was speaking in my own capacity as a Senator from Montana, as I could speak only in that capacity, and as I always will. So far as getting anything accomplished in caucuses is concerned, it is my considered judgment that less will be accomplished in a caucus than will be accomplished in the open and through having a discussion in the forum where the ideas of Senators may be made known to the people of the country as a whole.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield to the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I think the junior Senator from Wisconsin made it emphatically clear last year on at least three occasions that he believed it was desirable to come to the floor of the Senate and speak one's convictions on these matters, but I did not say this was exclusive in any sense. I think the Senator from Tennessee is eminently correct in carrying the public's business to the people through their forum. I think it is also correct, however, as some of us contend, that these decisions—I repeat, decisions of Democratic Senators can only be made in conference of Democratic Senators.

Mr. MANSFIELD. In other words, what the Senator is saying is that it is correct to bring these matters to the floor of the Senate, which is what we have been doing for many years.

Mr. PROXMIRE. That is right, but I do not see why that excludes our deciding that and other matters in conference.

Mr. MANSFIELD. It does not do so at all, but to be perfectly frank, in my opinion, the name "policy" does not apply to that committee. It is a misnomer. The closest parallel one can give is the Rules Committee in the House of Representatives, which acts as a traffic cop on all kinds of vital and necessary legislation. But I challenge anyone to point to one piece of legislation which was held up by the policy committee, at least in the past 7 years.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The Senator is exactly correct. I think this is a point the Senator from Tennessee has made very well. The name "policy committee" is a misnomer. It is not a policy committee. It performs a very important function, but it is not the policy committee of the Senate. The Senator from Tennessee is calling this matter to our attention, and what we are trying to do is infuse responsibility and policymaking authority into the policy committee.

Mr. MANSFIELD. If the Senate wants that, it can set up a policy committee and define its functions.

Mr. GORE. It has done so. I think the policy committee ought to be more than a traffic-control body. I want it to operate as it was intended. I want it to perform the functions for which, according to the record, it was created.

A part of its functions may well be to advise the majority leader in the scheduling of bills; but its functions are, or were intended to be, far broader than that.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield right there?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator is a veteran of more than 20 years' service, and of really distinguished service, in the Congress of the United States.

Mr. GORE. I thank the Senator.

Mr. MANSFIELD. He knows where policy is made. It is made in the legislative committees and is determined by a majority of the members of the committees. The policy committee, so-called, cannot go against the wishes of the legislative committees. All the policy committee can do is to expedite legislation, and we have done so very effectively. Again I say I do not know what further this committee can do. But if the Senator is interested in creating a bona fide policy committee, that can be done by majority vote of the Democrats in the Senate.

Mr. GORE. At the risk of repeating comments I have made earlier, I suggest that the able junior Senator from Montana read the recommendations of the Monroney-La Follette committee, because I think there it was envisioned that this policy committee would be selected by the Democratic Senators and that it would be a smaller group, a working group, to confer with all Senators, to meet with the caucus from time to time, but to formulate what in its opinion, after careful consideration, was the proper legislative position for the Democratic Party. Then each standing committee could be advised thereof. It was envisioned that this policy, once formulated, would be proclaimed to the world, to the Senate, in the Journal, and in the records of the Senate. Then each committee, each subcommittee, each individual Senator could perform its or his duties in the light of this promulgated policy.

As it is now, as it was last year, we dealt with the interest rate problem in one way in veterans' housing legislation and in another way in the other housing bill, and in a still different way in proposed legislation from the Senate Finance Committee, all without any determination of party policy on this very important question.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GORE. Yes.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Was there discrepancy insofar as interest rates were concerned in the passage of legislation affecting housing, veterans, and so forth, and so on?

Mr. GORE. Yes.

Mr. MANSFIELD. So how could we formulate a policy—

Mr. GORE. We raised interest rates on veterans' housing, and refused to do so on long-term Government bonds. We gave way piecemeal, but not wholly.

Mr. MANSFIELD. There were differences.

Mr. GORE. But we still have no policy.

Mr. MANSFIELD. To get back to the position which was adopted in the Monroney-La Follette report, it states:

For maintenance of a staff * * * consisting of seven members each, for the formulation of overall legislative policy of the respective parties, the members of such staff to assist in study, analysis, and research on problems involved in policy determinations, and to be appointed—

And so forth.

I can repeat that policy is made in the regular legislative committees. Then their recommendations are brought to the so-called policy committee, which is really a rules committee, and our job is to expedite the legislation proposed whether or not we are in accord with it.

Mr. GORE. The Senator is accurately describing the present procedure; I am undertaking to say we should proceed further.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Then we ought to have a new committee which would really be a policy committee. It is really the rules committee of the Senate.

Mr. GORE. That is not the purpose for which it was created.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I would say it has been so interpreted by Senate leaders from Mr. Barkley down.

Mr. CLARK, Mr. CARROLL, and Mr. PROXMIRE addressed the Chair.

Mr. GORE. I should like very much to yield the floor. I have been speaking a long while. But I yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CLARK. I thank my friend from Tennessee for his courtesy. I should like to ask him two questions.

Does the Senator from Tennessee agree that the jurisdiction of the policy committee should be that which was set forth in the Monroney-La Follette committee report and subsequently written into law in the appropriations bill about 10 years ago?

Mr. GORE. That is my view.

Mr. CLARK. Therefore, if the Senator's view should prevail in the conference, it would be the duty of the policy committee to formulate overall legislative policy, with a staff to assist in the study of, analysis of, and research on problems involved in policy determination, and not merely to be a rules committee?

Mr. GORE. That is my view.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield on that point? I am trying to follow, but I did not quite understand the last part of the statement.

Mr. CLARK. I merely read from the provisions of the act and asked the Senator whether he agreed that is what the jurisdiction of the policy committee should be, and he said he did.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Very well.

Mr. CLARK. My second point is this: I should like to associate myself with the view of the Senator from Colorado that the steering committee is almost as important as the policy committee, and that it, too, should be chosen by a majority of the members of the conference. This seems to me to be of substantial importance this year, but it will be of absolutely vital importance next year, when we hope to have a Democratic President, who will want to have his

policy, in accord with our party's platform adopted by the Democratic National Convention in July, carried into effect by the Congress. I see no way of doing that through the democratic process unless both the Democratic policy committee and the Democratic steering committee are selected by the members of the Democratic Party in the Senate of the United States.

I should like to commend my friend from Tennessee for a very able and reasoned presentation.

Mr. GORE. I thank my friend from Pennsylvania.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I commend the Senator from Tennessee for raising this very important issue not merely on the floor of the Senate, but before the Nation. There are, probably, certain aspects of this question which can be best discussed inside a Democratic conference, but the general proposition which the Senator from Tennessee has developed, namely, that the policy committee should be the arm of the Senators of a given party and not the instrument of the leadership of that party, seems to me to be indisputably sound. I commend the Senator for presenting that point of view with great ability.

Mr. GORE. I am very grateful for the remarks of my friend from Illinois.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield so that I may say a very few words?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. CARROLL. I commend the Senator from Tennessee. This has been a helpful discussion.

Especially I should like to have the attention of the junior Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], because he has contributed much wisdom to the discussion today.

Mr. GORE. I should like to thank the junior Senator from Montana, the whip, for his presence and for his participation. I am grateful for the presence of the distinguished majority leader, the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON], and for the presence of other Senators.

I hope this has been a helpful discussion. The Democratic Party is our party. The operation of the two-party system is a necessary part of our democratic procedure. Perhaps from this discussion will come an improvement of it. I hope that will be true.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield further, there is one point I should like to make. I have learned one or two simple facts, which I had not known before. Our present majority leader did not establish this policy; it was established before he became the majority leader.

Mr. GORE. That is correct.

Mr. MANSFIELD. It was established by Mr. Barkley and the Democrats.

Mr. CARROLL. Yes; but that was some years ago. At that time we had control of the executive branch of the Government, but were in the minority in the Congress.

There has now been a change in the situation. The distinguished junior Sen-

ator from Montana said that we all know from experience we cannot have a policy committee which can set definite standards. Why is that so? It is because we operate under the committee system. This is why I emphasize that the steering committee represents the crux of the problem.

Suppose I were to be chosen as a member of the policy committee. I could name many Senators who would be excellent candidates. But who is so wise that he could formulate a policy which could bind the Democratic Party? This is why the committee has limited powers.

As the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] has stated, matters would come to the committee, as is done in the House, and it would act more or less as a traffic cop. The majority leader has to have some leeway, so that he can sense when the body can move and when it should move. The policy committee must be a group which will cooperate.

The point the Senator from Tennessee makes is a good one. This being true, let us broaden the base. Why should we do that? There are 10 more Democratic Senators who have come from the West. They were not Senators when the Barkley resolution was adopted. The junior Senator from Montana in the interim period has been made the whip of the Democratic Party in this body.

We have heard many arguments which, in commonsense, should be agreed with. We ought to broaden the base of the policy committee. That ought to be done tomorrow, without any argument.

Secondly, but of more importance, we ought to establish a little larger group. We can call it, not a policy committee, but a steering committee. The committee would be a Democratic representation of 65 Senators, to help in committee appointments and to help in policy matters. There would be no criticism against the majority leader or against anybody else if we broadened the base of our operation.

I understand that is what the Senator from Tennessee has been talking about today. I commend the Senator from Tennessee for a very brilliant presentation.

Mr. GORE. I thank the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. GRUENING and other Senators addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MANSFIELD in the chair). The Senator from Alaska.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, has the Senator from Tennessee yielded the floor?

Mr. GORE. I have.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alaska yield?

Mr. GRUENING. I yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. PROXMIER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alaska yield to me for a minute and a half?

Mr. GRUENING. I yield.

Mr. PROXMIER. I thank the distinguished Senator from Alaska.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wisconsin is recognized.

Mr. PROXMIER. Mr. President, I should like to make a statement at this point, where it will follow the very fine speech of the junior Senator from Tennessee, as it relates to it.

There seemed to develop in the course of the colloquy this afternoon a feeling that conferences might be unwise for a number of reasons. I subscribe to the view that there are very great difficulties in having successful conferences in the Democratic Party in the Senate.

As one who championed conferences last year I want to go on record as stating that I would be satisfied if we could develop a policy committee which was representative of all Democrats, a policy committee which would meet and determine policy and which would permit all Democrats to be present when it met and when it discussed the important legislative policies at which the committee decided it would like to arrive. I think that would provide the principal objective I was trying to obtain when I championed conferences last year.

Therefore, I think there is no real or substantial difference between the position taken by the distinguished Senator from Tennessee this afternoon and the position I have consistently taken.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator from Alaska yield to the Chair for a moment?

Mr. GRUENING. I am glad to yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair thinks it should be brought to the attention of the Senator from Wisconsin that when proposed legislation is considered by the policy committee the Senators who are interested in the proposed legislation can appear before the policy committee.

Furthermore, during the past year and extending into this year there have been three additional members of the policy committee; namely, the members of the calendar committee, which is composed of the distinguished Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT], the distinguished Senator from California [Mr. ENGLE], and the distinguished Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART].

The Chair simply wanted to mention that fact.

Mr. PROXMIER. The Senator from Wisconsin is aware of that fact, and is aware of the fact that Senators are urged to appear before the committee if there is proposed legislation in which they are interested which is important in regard to policy. I am simply saying that if the policy committee became the kind of policy formulating body which it is not now but which the Senator from Tennessee suggested, and if all Senators could attend the meetings, it would serve the purpose of the caucus, in my judgment.

Mr. DIRKSEN and Mr. DOUGLAS addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Alaska yield?

Mr. GRUENING. I should be glad to yield to either Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I merely desire to have two resolutions from the House of Representatives laid

before the Senate, with respect to deceased Members.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am interested in one of those resolutions, Mr. President, but I should be happy to have my colleague offer a resolution first.

DEATH OF REPRESENTATIVE CARTER, OF IOWA

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair lays before the Senate a resolution coming from the House of Representatives, which will be read.

The legislative clerk read the resolution (H. Res. 402), as follows:

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, U.S.,
January 6, 1960.

Resolved, That the House has heard with profound sorrow the death of the Honorable Steven V. Carter, a Representative from the State of Iowa.

Resolved, That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect the House do now adjourn.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], I submit a resolution and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be read.

The resolution (S. Res. 222) was read, considered by unanimous consent, and unanimously agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow the announcement of the death of the Honorable Steven V. Carter, a Representative from the State of Iowa.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That, as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased, the Senate, at the conclusion of its business today, adjourn until Wednesday next.

DEATH OF REPRESENTATIVE BUSH, OF PENNSYLVANIA

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following resolution (H. Res. 403) from the House of Representatives, which was read, as follows:

Resolved, That the House has heard with profound sorrow the death of the Honorable Alvin R. Bush, a Representative from the State of Pennsylvania.

Resolved, That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect the House do now adjourn.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT], I send to the desk a resolution, which I ask to have read, and for which I ask present consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be read.

The resolution (S. Res. 223) was read, considered by unanimous consent, and unanimously agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow the announcement of the death of the Honorable Alvin R. Bush, a Representative from the State of Pennsylvania.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That, as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased, the Senate, at the conclusion of its business today, adjourn until Wednesday next.

DEATH OF REPRESENTATIVE BOYLE, OF ILLINOIS

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following resolution (H. Res. 401) from the House of Representatives, which was read as follows:

Resolved, That the House has heard with profound sorrow of the death of the Honorable Charles A. Boyle, a Representative from the State of Illinois.

Resolved, That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect the House do now adjourn.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I send to the desk a resolution, which I ask to have read, and for which I ask present consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be read.

The resolution (S. Res. 224) was read, considered by unanimous consent, and unanimously agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow the announcement of the death of the Honorable Charles A. Boyle, late a Representative from the State of Illinois.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That, as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased, the Senate, at the conclusion of its business today, adjourn until Wednesday next.

SEAWAY ROBBERY—A PLEA TO PRESIDENT EISENHOWER TO SUP- PORT HIS OWN STAND AGAINST INFLATION

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, the State of Alaska is now engaged in a fateful contest, which represents yet one more battle in a perennial war which it has long fought for the life of its economy. Our opponent in this struggle is a familiar one, one with which we have contended for many years. It is the conference of steamship lines on which Alaska depends for its existence, the most powerful member of which is the Alaska Steamship Co.

Since the passage of the Jones Act in 1920 the State of Alaska has been the victim of ever increasing costs of water transportation which, while stifling the economy of the former territory, have, at the same time, resulted in benefits to the dominant carrier which, I venture to say, are unparalleled in the experience of common carriers. Under the benign management of the Federal Maritime Board and its predecessors, which passes for regulation of water carriers, the Alaska Steamship Co. has obtained one increase in its rates after another. The last, an increase of 15 percent was granted in 1958. Now, less than 2 years after

receiving this tribute from the consumers of Alaska, the same carrier, from the same agency, has obtained another increase of 10 percent, which became effective yesterday. So, in this short period of time the Alaska Steamship Co. has added 26.5 percent to the burden of unduly inflated transportation costs with which Alaska has long been afflicted.

For a long time, and increasingly in recent years, the people of Alaska have been victims of what I think can only be described as seaway robbery. It is a crime in which the policeman, the Federal Maritime Board, has more often than not helped point the gun and pick the pocket.

This is not the first time the scandal of seaway robbery of Alaskans in the form of exorbitant shipping rates has been brought to the attention of the Congress. Time and time again, committees of Congress and this entire body have been told, with documentation, that shipping rates to Alaska are the highest in the world, with the least justification. Time and time again the Congress has had explanations of the manner in which this situation has continued under the supervision, and indeed, with the aid of the Federal Maritime Board and its predecessor agencies.

Once again, I call the attention of the Congress to the way in which the interest of the public has been flouted and completely disregarded by the arbitrary and capricious action of the only agency upon which Alaskans may rely for protection against unjust, unreasonable, and illegal freight rates of water carriers operating from the other States.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GRUENING. I yield.

Mr. CHURCH. Did I correctly understand the distinguished Senator from Alaska to say that freight rates to Alaska have increased by 36½ percent?

Mr. GRUENING. By 26½ percent within less than 2 years.

Mr. CHURCH. And that a further 10-percent increase has been granted without benefit of a hearing?

Mr. GRUENING. Yes, without benefit of a hearing. It was granted yesterday, as I shall develop in a moment, despite the urgent plea of the Alaska delegation to withhold action until hearings could be held and the case of the people of Alaska demonstrated.

Mr. CHURCH. Does the distinguished Senator from Alaska not regard this action as highly inconsistent with the oft-stated position of the administration against inflation?

Mr. GRUENING. It is not merely inconsistent; it is absolutely contradictory; and, as I shall develop, it goes directly counter to the words which the President uttered in his state of the Union message. Almost simultaneously with the fine references to his policy to fight inflation as one would fight a fire in one's home, that policy was being violated by one of the executive agencies, all of whose members were appointed by the President.

Mr. CHURCH. Does the Senator not agree that that is another flagrant example of the way this administration

has been combating inflation with pious platitudes?

Mr. GRUENING. It is a perfect illustration of that contradiction.

Mr. CHURCH. I thank the Senator. I think he is rendering a great service to the people of Alaska by bringing this question to the floor of the Senate.

Mr. GRUENING. I hope it is a service not only to the people of Alaska, but to the people of our entire Nation. I think it is highly important that we see the great disparity between the fine words which are uttered on high and the actions which are so completely contrary to the noble sentiments expressed.

In accordance with the law and procedures of the Federal Maritime Board the State of Alaska petitioned the Board that a hearing be held upon the issue of the proposed rate increase and that the 10-percent increase be suspended and not allowed to go into effect pending such a hearing and a final order of the Board. The petition cited, at length, the old familiar facts of monopolistic shipping practices of the carrier, the outrageously high price of shipping to Alaska, the need of Alaska for relief from such an intolerable burden, and the fact that the carrier would suffer no damage and would, in fact, retain its presently high earnings if the rates were not increased at all. It pointed out that the basis upon which the carrier has asked for this increase is unrealistic, cannot be substantiated, and is not an accurate reflection of the economics of the case. It pointed out that, contrary to the representations of the carrier, it can expect, as its current rates, not a decline in earnings in the coming year in Alaska, but, instead, a substantial increase in profits after taxes. In brief, the State made such a case it could under the circumstances, to show that the rate increase must be suspended at least until such time as the carrier would be required to come before the Board in public hearing and justify its position.

I remind the Senate that, at this stage of the proceeding, the State is limited to the most meager information concerning the financial status of the carrier. It does not have available the invaluable weapons of interrogation, of discovery, and of cross-examination which can be obtained only with the machinery of a public hearing under established rules of procedure.

As for the Federal Maritime Board, it has before it the bare statement of the carrier that it must add another 10 percent to its already astronomical rates. There has been no hearing, no examination of evidence, no interrogation and cross-examination of witnesses. In short, no process of factfinding at all.

And yet, without having had a hearing, without having given the State of Alaska, which is the most important party in interest in this matter, an opportunity to present its case, the Federal Maritime Board has issued an order by which it refuses to suspend the rate increase.

It has granted a hearing, yes. But to the people of Alaska this is small comfort. In fact, it is a farce. Even should the 10-percent increase be found exces-

sive as a result of the hearing, the people of Alaska are faced with an immediate and unjustified addition to the already scandalously high cost of living in the 49th State. Had the increase in rates been suspended for the 120-day period for which provision is made in the law, the people of the State of Alaska would have, at least, been saved from its inflationary effects for that length of time. They would have had an opportunity to put the Alaska Steamship Co. to its proof of the need for an increase. They would have had an opportunity to present their case and to challenge that of the carrier.

But this was not allowed Alaska.

Rather, the Board has already allowed the increased rate to go into effect.

In effect, the State of Alaska has lost this case.

Immediately, prices for commodities sold in Alaska will increase and the increase will come from the pockets of every member of the community. There is no way this can be recovered. The prices will not go down if the rate increase is disapproved, after hearing, in whole or in part. There may be a windfall to the shippers if the rate increase is not approved. But there is no possible way in which the citizens of Alaska, the consumers of Alaska, can recover.

They are in the position of one who has been made to serve a sentence in jail; and, even if later found innocent, have already served their time. Except, for Alaska, there is really no end to the effects of this failure to suspend the rates. The increased costs to the shippers occasioned by the higher rates will simply be passed on to the merchants who will pass them on to the consumer, with inevitable snowballing all along the way. The tragedy of this is that the individual Alaska consumer, on whom the full burden falls, has had no opportunity whatever to protest or to avoid effectively the consequences of the action of the Federal Maritime Board.

There is another aspect of this freight rate increase which is particularly unfortunate, distressing, and ironic. All of us listened attentively last Thursday in the Chamber of the other body when the President of the United States in his address on the state of the Union solicited our cooperation in the struggle to prevent inflation. To quote the President, "We must fight inflation as we would a fire that imperils our home."

At that very moment, before the echoes of the President's words were stilled, one of the agencies of his administration was busy pouring fuel on the fire of inflation. The Federal Maritime Board, every member of which was appointed by this administration, was taking the most inflationary of actions and doing so without even looking at the evidence.

The President of the United States on Thursday described the inflation as "an opponent of so many guises that it is sometimes difficult to recognize." There is no difficulty involved in recognizing the direct inflationary effects of a general 10-percent increase on top of a 15-percent increase less than 2 years ago, in shipping costs to an area like Alaska which depends for its existence on ocean transportation.

Mr. President, if the State where this large increase fell were California, or Texas, or Massachusetts, there would be alternatives by which the citizens could in some measure adjust their operations so as to lessen its consequences. They could turn to other means of transportation. They could ship by railroad, or by motortruck. But in Alaska, except to a degree and to a limited area which make their effect immaterial, these means of transportation are nonexistent. Every man, woman, and child in Alaska depends on water transportation to a degree which is unknown in any other State except Hawaii. When water transportation rates go up, the cost of living goes up, immediately and for everyone.

The action of the Federal Maritime Board in permitting this 10-percent increase in Alaska freight rates to go into effect without a hearing is the most inflationary action which has been perpetrated in my part of the United States in the past year. In the preceding 12 months, the most inflationary action affecting Alaskans was the 15-percent freight rate increase of 1958. Both of these calamities were permitted, presided over, and even endorsed by a board appointed by the same President Eisenhower who has so often urged the rest of us to fight inflation. The President's fine sounding words will have a hollow ring throughout the 49th State whose entry into the Union in the very same message the President both hailed and saluted as one of our two new western stars. We wish his administration's actions would correspond with his fine words. Certainly the way in which the 10-percent increase which became effective yesterday was permitted without the necessity of any proof of need amounted to an open invitation to the carriers to do it again—and do it any time you like.

To demonstrate the effects of this action somewhat more graphically, let me tell you what this will mean in dollars and cents to Alaska, and to the steamship company.

Based on the company's own estimated projection of its 1960 revenues, the allowance of this 10-percent increase will result in an increase in its revenues of more than \$1,600,000 this year. The State of Alaska, finding that the basis upon which the company's estimate is unrealistic, estimates that this increase to the company will amount to nearly \$1,900,000. This increase, in conjunction with the 15-percent increase previously allowed, places a burden of some \$4 million annually on the people of Alaska.

It fairly staggers the imagination, to say nothing of one's sense of justice and democratic government to think that this intolerable tax for the benefit of the Alaska Steamship Co. was imposed upon the people of Alaska by a Federal agency without their having had the slightest opportunity to protest effectively. I say here that the Federal Maritime Board has acted in this instance without any regard whatever for the public interest. It has acted arbitrarily, capriciously, and with a cavalier disregard of the dismaying results of its action which is shocking.

I wish to emphasize that the law provides for suspension of such a rate in-

crease for a maximum period of 120 days. The Federal Maritime Board could, in its discretion, have taken the action which I believe to be wise and proper, and could have suspended this increase long enough for the people of Alaska to make their case. It refused to do this when specifically requested to do so in the public interest.

It occurs to me that the reasons for such procedures and such decisions by this agency constitute a fitting subject for congressional investigation. The action of the Board was, to be sure, in accord with the procedures permitted by law. The aspect of the matter that is most troublesome is that, having the discretion to act in the public interest by suspending the rates, the Board instead acted only for the benefit of the Alaska Steamship Co. There is, at this time, no way of determining the mechanics by which such action was taken. But I think we can all agree that the Congress cannot look with equanimity upon the spectacle of a public body, which ought to act in the interest of the public, taking action which favors only the interests of a steamship company, an action which it has taken again and again.

Now, had there been some overriding reason for the failure to suspend the rate increase, this action could be explained. But in this case there is none.

This is not the case of a poor, struggling company which, in the interests of the public, should be saved from starvation or bankruptcy. The Alaska Steamship Co. is not losing money. Quite the contrary.

According to the statement of the company itself it was not losing money in 1959. In fact, its own statement of profits after taxes, partially on a projected basis, shows that in 1959 it earned profits of some \$99,617.

The company bases its need for an increase in rates on increases in costs which would cause losses if—and this is the most serious fallacy in its calculations—tonnage carried by the company in 1960 is at the same level as tonnage carried in 1959. Such a projection is without meaning.

As it happens, the year of 1959 was marred, in Alaska, by the occurrence of a prolonged carpenters' strike, which continued from June until September—the prime construction and business season in Alaska. Its effects there were more pervasive, and devastating, than were those of the recent steel strike on the Nation. Construction in Alaska, a major factor in the economy, was almost completely halted, thus depressing severely the economy of the State, and, consequently, diminishing the amount of tonnage carried to Alaska by the Alaska Steamship Co.

But, even in 1959, taking into account the depressed conditions flowing from the carpenters' strike, the Alaska Steamship Co. made money.

And in 1960 there is no likelihood whatever of the conditions which prevailed in 1959. In fact, all estimates for economic growth and development in 1960 indicate a more prosperous year by far than 1959. This will, inevitably, result in an increase in tonnage carried by the Alaska Steamship Co., consequently

an increase in its revenues despite rising costs.

However, we Alaskans do not want to prejudice the case. It may be that the increases will be found on examination to be justified. Certainly, if a way to justify them can be found, we may count on the Federal Maritime Board to do so. My remarks today go to another issue. It is the issue of rendering of a verdict before the evidence has been heard. Of this the regulatory agency in this instance is guilty.

The Federal Maritime Board has said, in answer to protests over its failure to suspend this rate increase, that its primary consideration in this action was the welfare of the carrier.

Mr. President, I submit that the welfare of the carrier has had quite enough attention. It is now time to give attention to the welfare of the public, something which this administration seldom does.

So that the President may not be wholly unaware of what is going on in his administration, the Alaska delegation to Congress, Senator BARTLETT, Congressman RIVERS, and myself have sent him the following telegram:

January 9, 1960.

HON. DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER,
President of the United States,
The White House, Washington, D.C.

We are profoundly shocked that even as you delivered your state of the Union message, which included an urgent plea that "We must fight inflation as we would a fire that imperils our home," the Federal Maritime Board, constituted wholly of appointees of your administration, has just poured gasoline on the fires of inflation, not merely imperiling but beginning to consume the homes of all Alaskans. The Board has granted a 10 percent increase in water freight rates immediately effective without a prior hearing requested by the State government of Alaska, its congressional delegation, and virtually every public body in the State, although the Board is permitted by law to suspend such increases for 120 days.

The burden which runs into several millions of dollars falls not only on the homes of Alaskans but also on the Federal Government which is likewise an important shipper. The implications of the Board's action are known to it because they were explicitly explained to it as late as Friday afternoon by the entire Alaska congressional delegation. It is wholly pertinent that in this very same message, where you so dramatically urged the fight on inflation, you also said: "Neither we nor any other free-world nation can permit ourselves to be misled by pleasant promises until they are tested by performance." We call upon you, therefore, respectfully to back up your words on inflation by performance and to request the Federal Maritime Board to rescind its order and suspend the rate increases ordered as of tomorrow, January 10—

This telegram having been sent on Saturday—

for the 120-day period permitted it by law and give Alaska an opportunity to present its case before being convicted and our whole economy drastically penalized by the fires of inflation.

ERNEST GRUENING,
U.S. Senator.

E. L. BARTLETT,
U.S. Senator.

RALPH J. RIVERS,
Member of Congress.

Mr. President, I think it will be interesting for the American public to see

whether the President is willing, in view of his repeated and vigorous declarations against inflation, to join us in fighting the contemporaneous conflagration which imperils our homes.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GRUENING. I yield.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I congratulate the Senator from Alaska for an argument and presentation to which I believe there can be no successful rebuttal. I believe his logic is unassailable. As one who supported statehood for Alaska for a number of years, the junior Senator from Louisiana became convinced that the problems were so great and so varied, and the injustices to Alaskans so many in number, that it would be absolutely impossible ever to have these matters straightened out, with justice and fairness to all, unless Alaska was represented in the United States Congress by members who would fight for Alaska and point out the injustices which were being done.

I congratulate the Senator from Alaska, not only for the work he is doing here today, but also for the work he has done in the past in writing books and articles and making speeches, explaining the great number of instances in which there has been unfair discrimination against Alaskans, contrary to the will of the great majority of the American people.

Mr. GRUENING. I thank the distinguished and able Senator from Louisiana, who has been helpful to us for many years in our fight to achieve equality. I appreciate his support this afternoon.

I point out to him what will be increasingly evident as the story of Alaska unfolds: That although Congress has granted Alaska statehood, and we have equality on paper, the economic consequences of 90 years of colonialism are still with us. This is a striking example. The same carrier which was given special privileges and a monopoly by congressional action 40 years ago still persists, to the detriment of Alaska, in seeking to extend its monopoly.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. If I might offer a prediction, I believe that if Alaska continues to get the kind of able representation it has been receiving in Congress since it became a State, it will not take a great number of years to correct most of those practices.

Mr. GRUENING. I thank the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alaska yield?

Mr. GRUENING. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I commend the Senator from Alaska for his remarks on the floor today. I, too, have felt the effects of discriminatory freight rates. I well remember that in 1934, when I was elected Governor of South Carolina, I found to my utter disgust that the freight rates imposed against what was known as the South—anywhere below the Mason-Dixon line—were from 35 to 40 percent higher than the freight rates paid in the other areas of the United States. I found that to ship a box of shoes from Boston,

Mass., to South Carolina cost from 35 to 40 percent more than to ship the same box of shoes from Boston to any other part of the country.

The Governors of the Southern States, at my suggestion, held a conference and began to work on the matter of freight rates. The result was a saving to the South of hundreds of millions of dollars in freight rates. That conference caused a saving of that much in freight rates.

The Senator from Alaska is to be commended for what he is doing, at the first sign of a move to increase freight rates on shipments to Alaska without a proper hearing being afforded before the courts.

Mr. GRUENING. I thank the Senator from South Carolina. I congratulate him on his leadership in freeing the South from the burdensome and unjust freight rates which had been imposed on that region of the country.

But I call his attention to the fact that, in addition to the extortionate maritime rates, a precisely similar situation exists with respect to rail rates. It may be of interest to the Senator from South Carolina to know, and for the Senate as a whole to know, that we in Alaska are charged more for the shipment of an article destined for Alaska over the same railroad than if the identical article is sent to any other place bordering on the Pacific. For instance, if a refrigerator is bought in Detroit and is destined for Fairbanks or any other city in Alaska, the freight rates on that article from Detroit are much higher than if the identical article were tagged for some place in Japan, Australia, the west coast of South America, or almost any other place in the Pacific. That is due to the action of the Interstate Commerce Commission, against which we have to date protested in vain. But we will continue our fight, stimulated by the experience of which the Senator from South Carolina has spoken concerning the fight by the South against similar unjust practices.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GRUENING. I yield.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I commend the distinguished Senator from Alaska upon his splendid speech. I have had the opportunity to study and read it as well as to hear a large part of it.

I think the Senator is eminently correct. There may be some kind of case for a 15-percent sales tax—that is what this really is—although I doubt it. It is a tax on virtually everything which Alaskans have to buy. All of us are proud of Alaska. We are proud that it is now a State. There is no question in the mind of anyone that as a State Alaska offers richer potential resources for development than any other part of the United States of America. Whether those resources will be developed or not depends to a very great extent on whether they can be made commercially attractive today. The great penalty and the great problem which the two Senators from Alaska understand so well is the very serious substantial transportation cost.

When the Federal Government raises freight rates, as the Senator from Alaska

says, within a very few hours of the time when the President made his strong speech against inflation, and imposes a 15-percent addition on the cost of the transportation of freight shipped to Alaska, there is no question that such action should be protested vigorously.

I think the Senator from Alaska deserves great credit for what he is doing.

Mr. GRUENING. We greatly appreciate the support of the Senator from Wisconsin. I should like to ask him whether, in view of the fact that within 2 years the freight rates have been increased by 26½ percent, he knows of any other situation, anywhere under the flag, which justifies an increase of that proportion.

Mr. PROXMIER. I certainly do not.

I think the last point which the Senator from Alaska made, namely, that it costs more to ship freight to Alaska than to any other point on the Pacific, points which are farther away, points which are not under the American flag, is a most telling point, one which is most shocking.

Above all, to put this increase into effect without a hearing is something which I simply cannot understand.

Mr. GRUENING. I call attention to the fact that the higher rates, the exorbitant rates, charged by the maritime cargo carrier, are particularly flagrant in that, as I pointed out in the colloquy with the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], they are higher—sometimes as much as 140 percent higher—than the rates charged for precisely the same services involving the same type of articles shipped elsewhere in the United States.

It is hard to believe that if an Alaskan wishes to buy a certain article and if the shipping tag on the article shows that it is destined for Alaska, he has to pay up to 140 percent more, in certain cases, for shipping the article to Alaska, whereas if the article is marked for shipment to Australia or any other area in the Pacific, including even Communist China, if the article could go there, a lower rate is available.

That situation is protested by the General Services Administration, which is interested in saving the Government money.

Thus it is that the people of Alaska are confronted with a terrible dilemma.

Let me say that I greatly appreciate the support of the Senator from Wisconsin and the support of the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. PROXMIER. I should like to say, in conclusion, that in effect, the Maritime Board is imposing a tax on the people of Alaska. Actually, it is a rate increase; but in effect it is a discriminatory tax increase. It is most unfair; and I think the Senator from Alaska is eminently correct in protesting it as vigorously as he has.

Mr. GRUENING. I thank the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, I desire to speak on the subject which has so properly engaged the attention of my colleague from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING]. I join the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON] and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIER] in commend-

ing my colleague [Mr. GRUENING] for his speech, which very much needed to be made.

Mr. President, this is a story which I very much regret to have to tell in sequel to the remarks already made by my colleague from Alaska. It is a story about inflation. It is a story about administrative procedure in which the voice of the public has been stilled.

On December 10, 1959, the members of the Pacific Coast-Alaska Freight Conference, which operate as carriers by water between Pacific coast ports and Alaska, filed tariff supplements with the Federal Maritime Board. The tariff supplements called for a general freight rate increase of 10 percent in the Alaska trade. The carriers published the new schedules to become effective on January 10, 1960, 30 days after filing.

Responsible Alaskans expressed concern. Dedicated to the development of an area whose economic progress is vital to the well-being of our Nation, Alaskans saw in the proposed freight-rate increase a new threat to our efforts to check inflation and to promote the growth of the 49th State.

But the concern in Alaska, Mr. President, was not tantamount to panic. We Alaskans anticipated an adversary proceeding under the practices and procedures of the Federal Maritime Board. Governor Eagan, of Alaska, directed Alaska's attorney general, John Rader, to fly here to the Nation's Capital, and to act appropriately to protect the public interest. The resources of the people of Alaska were ready to be marshaled in the anti-inflation cause. Responsible Alaskans did not prejudice the rate demands of the carriers; but responsible Alaskans did look forward to a quasi-judicial proceeding in which these demands could be assessed after a hearing of all interested parties and after the presentation of evidence. To be sure, we were puzzled to note that the carriers predicted a 1960 freight volume no greater than the volume in the year just ended. As residents of a growing area of America, we realized that 1959 was an abnormally poor year in the history of the Alaska economy. Our construction was brought virtually to a standstill by a labor-management dispute. Our salmon pack reached a low point in its cycle. In fact, the salmon pack was the smallest on record. There was general agreement that the economic prospects for 1960 were bright. Some Alaskans, too, challenge the method by which the carriers calculated their rate base. But Alaskans anticipated that the reasonableness of the carriers' computations of their volume and of their rate base would be the subject of an impartial hearing before the Federal Maritime Board.

The expectations of the Alaska people followed reasonably from the previous practices of the Board on matters affecting the Alaska trade. We recalled, for example, that as recently as 1958, these carriers sought and obtained a 15-percent freight-rate increase. We remembered that the 1958 increase was granted after a hearing, and that no increase was imposed until the hearing was completed. With confidence in our State administration and the abilities of

State experts, we looked ahead to the 1960 hearings in the belief that the interests of the Alaska consumers would be represented adequately and that the hearings would be fair to the people and fair to the carriers. Fairness to all concerned was our desire.

Moreover, Mr. President, the people of Alaska were heartened by the decision of the General Services Administration to participate as an ally of the State of Alaska in challenging the proposed new rate schedule. The General Services Administration agreed with us—who called upon the agency to participate—that the Government of the United States, as the principal shipper of goods to Alaska, has an important stake in the prevention of increased freight costs. All Americans are alerted to the dangers of inflation. We may as practical men disagree about some of the causes of inflation; but no one can dispute the fact that a 10-percent freight-rate increase will raise the cost of living and doing business in Alaska, not only for Alaskans, but for American taxpayers everywhere.

Mr. President, on January 5, the Alaska Senators and Representative sent a telegram to the Chairman of the Federal Maritime Board. Our telegram called for suspension of the proposed rate increase until full hearings could determine the reasonableness of the proposed new tariff. We warned that "The interests of the people of Alaska cannot be adequately protected in any other manner." Our request was consistent with the Board's previous procedure in its regulation of the Alaskan trade. Our request was consistent with the law and the regulations. Our request was consistent with commonsense concepts of fairplay.

I wish that I could advise the Senate, the President, and the people that our expectations were fulfilled and that our warning was heeded. Instead, I must report that the Board, on January 7, ordered the new rates to become effective on January 10, and directing an investigation of them sometime in the future.

So the new year begins with still more inflationary pressure upon the Federal budget, and, in particular, upon the Alaska householder, housewife, and businessman who suffered, only 2 years ago, at the instance of these carriers, a 15-percent rate increase.

The cost of moving goods by water to or from Alaska, then, has risen over 25 percent in 2 years. The people of Alaska are asked to absorb these increases without even having an opportunity to challenge their essentiality.

Mr. President, the imposition of the latest increase made a sad anniversary for my State, which on other counts might review its first year of statehood with satisfaction. Alaska has been handed an anniversary present it does not want, and cannot protest—an anniversary present whose effects cannot be undone.

Mr. President, I can hear already the contention that should the Board's future investigations prove the new tariff to be unwarranted, the Board will require the carriers to make refunds to the shippers of the money paid to meet the

higher rates. But, who, Mr. President, makes refunds to the housewife? Who keeps records to make whole the consumer in Alaska?

For such a procedure and such a ruling as the Board has issued, there ought to be some justification. Here is a procedure that allows a challenge of the higher rates only after they are imposed. Here is a procedure that promotes the inflation which all Americans are committed to resist. Here is a procedure that discourages the development of an area strategic in location, vital in its natural and human resources.

Mr. President, the Alaska delegation to Congress met with the three members of the Federal Maritime Board on Friday afternoon last. We expressed our shock and dismay. We called for justification.

Justification No. 1 was that the practice of allowing rate increases prior to hearings, even in situations in which challengers assert a public interest against the increase, is followed in other administrative agencies. Such an argument deserves little comment except to say that it indicates with what frequency the regulators—or some of them—are seeing the interests of the public and the interests of the regulated through the wrong end of the telescope.

Justification No. 2 was that the carriers in the Alaska trade are in such dire condition that to continue to perform until May 10, 1960, under the old schedule would be disastrous for the trade. May 10, of course, is the latest date, under the regulations, to which the Board could have suspended the imposition of the new tariff.

This conclusion, Mr. President, is unsupportable, unless the carriers have been so irresponsible, so imprudent, and so heedless of the public interest and the interest of their stockholders, that they have waited until the eleventh hour to file new tariffs to save themselves from economic disaster.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARTLETT. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I will not impose at any length on the time of the Senate, but I have been listening to the able addresses by both the senior Senator from Alaska and the junior Senator from Alaska.

It was my privilege and opportunity to serve in Alaska during much of World War II and to have visited Alaska on many occasions thereafter. If my recollection serves me correctly, very often when one asked why the price of so many necessities of life, such as food, lodging, medical services, and other essentials, was so grievously high in Alaska, almost invariably he would be told, "It's the freight rates." The distinguished Senators from Alaska have heard that comment on many more occasions than I have.

Mr. BARTLETT. That is a common phrase used in Alaska.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Now there is to be a further justification for this phrase, to the extent of 25 percent.

It seems to me if this great frontier, which has just been granted statehood,

is to prosper, something is going to have to be done about increased freight rates. Evidently this administration has decided that that something is for freight rates to go still higher.

I join my colleagues from Alaska in protesting against these ever-increasing freight rates and I shall be happy to join with them in any action which they think might possibly bring about a diminution of spiraling freight rates which can only make it more difficult for industry and business to succeed in Alaska.

Mr. BARTLETT. I thank my friend, the Senator from Oregon. I would say that there is something the Federal Maritime Board might do, instead of acceding, almost automatically, to every request for freight increase made by the carriers serving, if you please, not only Alaska, but Hawaii and Puerto Rico. Puerto Rico is the most comparable situation to that which we have in Alaska.

I would say it is the duty of the Federal Maritime Board to evolve a plan for presentation to the Congress to take care of a shipping situation which differs so radically from that which we find in the foreign trade and that which we find in the intracoastal and intercoastal trade. But, to the best of my belief and knowledge, the Federal Maritime Board has given no consideration at all to solving this vexing and very real problem. Instead, it appears that the Federal Maritime Board is content to sit in its offices downtown and merely approve whatever rate increases are asked for by the carriers, whenever they are requested. The time has come, in my considered opinion, when this procedure will no longer do.

The people of Alaska cannot survive economically forever in a situation of this kind, which, in 2 years, has seen a freight rate increase of 25 percent. How is it expected that an economy can maintain its own, much less develop, under that sort of accelerated increase?

Mr. NEUBERGER. I have some constituents in Oregon who are investing some of their capital, if I am not mistaken, in developing a sawmill and related forest industry in Wrangell.

Mr. BARTLETT. They are. We welcome them. They are doing a good job.

Mr. NEUBERGER. They are doing an excellent job. Increases in freight rates make it more difficult for those who invest their capital there to compete with the forest products industry elsewhere. Is that not correct?

Mr. BARTLETT. That statement follows as a matter of course. Alaska is a State of great and many natural resources. From Alaska we obtain some raw materials fractional in amount compared with those available for use for the benefit of the Nation. But if production costs—and freight rates constitute a very considerable segment—continue to mount faster than they do else where, it is obvious we cannot expect to have new mines, new sawmills, new pulp mills. We will have to forget that to which we looked forward so confidently—an era immediately ahead of us of expanding economic growth. That era can still come if the Federal Government

will see to it that freight rates are not exorbitant, and the Federal Maritime Board, as apparently is the case now, does not make every possible contribution toward an increase in those rates.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I conclude by emphasizing again that I wish to join with the Senators from Alaska in such action as they recommend in trying to remove from around the neck of Alaska this albatross of ever-increasing maritime freight rates.

Mr. BARTLETT. I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, I had noted a belief that it is scarcely likely the steamship companies did not know, before the date they filed tariffs for higher rates, that they might require increases. My view, rather, is that the carriers were prepared for a suspension of rates, in accordance with the Board's own precedents, and that they had planned far ahead of the present time. My view is based on what we are entitled to expect from management in a great industry. I note, too, that the leading carrier predicted a loss of \$228,000 in 1960 if the new rates were not imposed. Even assuming that the loss for the first 120 days of 1960 would be one-third of this 1960 loss figure, and even assuming the accuracy of the loss figure itself, it is clear—by the computations of this carrier—that suspension of the rates for not longer than 4 months would have worked no irreparable hardship upon the industry. The procedure adopted, however, does cause irreparable harm to every Alaskan.

At the conference held on Friday between my colleague from Alaska (Mr. GRUENING), Representative RIVERS, and myself on the one side and the members of the Federal Maritime Board on the other side, we invited the members of the Board to reconsider their decision and to suspend the imposition of the new tariffs until all of the facts could be heard. We were promised careful consideration and review of the matter. The Board members parted from us upon that assurance. Within minutes, Mr. President, a telephone message was left for us advising that the Board would adhere to the order of January 7.

Our request was rejected. As a matter of fact, I should note that this is only a rumor so far as I am concerned, to date, but it is a rumor which comes from a good source. The telephone call was made to the office of my colleague from Alaska. The members of the board did not have the courtesy to call me.

The promise of careful consideration and review was nothing more, clearly, than a retreat from an indignant Alaska public. The careful consideration and review—at most—became a quick nose count in a taxicab between the Senate Office Building and Maritime Board headquarters.

So, Mr. President, the first phase of the story has ended. The losers are the Alaska consumers, the American taxpayers, the soundness of administrative process, and, I might add, the justice of administrative process.

Let us resolve that in the second phase of this story we shall scrutinize the per-

sonnel, the practices, the procedures, and the policies of these agencies so that the public interest will be paramount, as it ought to be.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina and Mr. BENNETT addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McNAMARA in the chair). The Senator from South Carolina.

THE EISENHOWER ADMINISTRATION

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, at a later date I intend to present for the RECORD the speech President Eisenhower made in Columbia, S.C., when he was running for the office of President of the United States. The speech he made there will show why I am making these few remarks at the present time.

Mr. President, the state of the Union message delivered by the President of the United States last week was a masterful political speech which leaves no doubt that although Mr. Eisenhower is President, he is also still general.

He was generally misleading. He generously dealt in generalities and he generally left out half the facts about nearly every general subject he spoke upon. I must say, however, his address was much clearer than some of his press conferences.

When the President spoke about the \$290 billion debt, I could not help but think of the \$30 billion that have been added to the national debt since Eisenhower became President. He did not say anything about that.

And I could not help but remember his campaign speeches of 1952 when he attacked the Democratic administration of that day for not having reduced the national debt, ignoring the fact that we had just finished a world war and were in the midst of fighting another war in Korea.

In 1952 the President promised to halt inflation, to reduce the national debt, to eliminate farm surpluses, and to maintain 90 to 100 percent of parity. He also promised to keep our defenses strong, and he promised practically everything else necessary to capture votes.

What is his record? In two terms he has failed completely not only to halt inflation, but even to do anything to try to stop it. He increased the national debt in each of the 7 years he has held office, and during this period has promoted other inflationary policies such as huge nonmilitary oversea spending and high interest rates. Mr. Eisenhower's administration has raised the national debt approximately \$30 billion since it has been in office.

His tight money policies accompanied by high interest rates on all Government loans, both as lender and borrower, have resulted in runaway inflation. In his speech of general terms the President said he wanted a "freer hand" in debt management.

He spoke, as usual, in general terms. But what the President wants to do specifically, as we all know, is to increase interest rates even higher, thereby spiraling the cost of debt management higher,

thus hiking the national debt. All this would be at the cost of the taxpayer, with the benefit reaped by the money-lenders.

Interest rates under Eisenhower's administration in many areas have more than doubled since he took office. If he succeeds in getting his "freer hand" in debt management, I predict interest rates will go higher and inflation will run away with some more of the public's pocketbook before he leaves office.

I am afraid the big economic boom for 1960 that economists are talking about will be confined to inflation and interest rates, and will not include take-home pay for working people if Eisenhower has his way this year on fiscal matters as he has had for the past 7 years.

The administration's handling of farm problems has not varied during its 7 years in office. The President has been a rubberstamp for Mr. Benson, who has promoted programs which have done nothing for the farmers except to lower their net income and to raise their debts. Instead of keeping his promise to maintain high parity, the President bowed on every occasion to Mr. Benson's various jack-leg farm proposals. In doing so, the President knocked the props out from under nearly every program in the books. This shotgun approach to farm problems succeeded in skyrocketing the amounts of surpluses in Government warehouses and the costs of maintaining them.

While he has reduced parity to the lowest possible point on every basic farm program in existence except tobacco, which he could not touch because of the way the law was written, he has allowed the Secretary of Agriculture to maintain the parity for wool at roughly 110 percent throughout his tenure of office. Of course, the people grow wool out where Mr. Benson comes from.

Moreover, the administration closed warehouses in many parts of the country that were storing food surpluses at reasonable prices and shifted the storage to more costly warehouses. Storage costs have skyrocketed under Mr. Benson. Under Eisenhower's farm programs the cost of all farm programs to the Government, including salaries, storage of surpluses, giveaway programs, and everything else amounted to more than \$7 billion in 1959 alone.

Under President Truman, in 1951, the last year before he left office, all these farm programs cost less than \$700 million, or only one-tenth of what they cost under Benson and Eisenhower last year.

In all of Mr. Truman's administration, all farm programs cost approximately \$14 billion, while under Alibi Ike's administration the farm programs have cost roughly \$40 billion. At least under Mr. Truman's administration the farmer was getting 90 percent of parity for his products and could pay his taxes and bills and feed his family. Under Ike the farmers cannot even hold onto their land, much less make a living. Farm incomes have, and still are, steadily dropping, while costs of operation continue to rise, along with what the housewife has to pay for what the farmer grows. I, for one, want no more of the

so-called realistic approaches to the farm problems that Eisenhower spoke of in his address on the state of the Union.

His economies are a big farce. His military glitter is not much better than sequins sprinkled on gummy paper, and his budgeting program is about as sound as a hollow log.

The President's boastings concerning our military missile accomplishments are about as astonishing to responsible thinking people who know the facts as will be the firing of an atomic bomb by France or the invention of a submachine gun by lower Slobovia. It is good that we have developed what we have, but it is a tragedy in our history the way we lag.

I have nothing personal against the President of the United States. I recognize the fact that his job is a most difficult one to perform. But I cannot sit complacently by and let Mr. Eisenhower's high-fidelity speeches send us all into a dream world while the realities of life go by.

It is impossible for me to be as optimistic about the future on every score as the President, and I refuse to accept his state of the Union message as any realistic picture of our situation in the world today. For the welfare of our Nation I hope the President himself knows all the facts that he left out of his half-factual state of the Union message.

Mr. President, there is one final thought that I would like to get over. The President predicts that in 1961 the Nation will have a surplus of more than \$4 billion in the Treasury.

In making up this surplus, he will reduce no wartime taxes. He will also ask for additional taxes, in order to produce a surplus. I doubt whether the Congress will grant them. Very likely a request for supplemental appropriations will be made in a very few months, amounting to probably \$1 or \$2 billion.

The same thing will be true in 1961. I ask Senators to watch that prediction, and see if it is not borne out.

There will be an election between now and 1961, and I presume that there will be a partisan Republican like Mr. Eisenhower running for presidential office this fall. To predict this surplus on paper is good politics, but before we count our chickens, let us wait for the old eggs to hatch.

If President Eisenhower succeeds in raising the interest rates on money borrowed by this country and fails to do anything to halt inflation, I fear that the surplus of eggs he has glowingly predicted will hatch to be nothing but higher debt ceilings, bigger national debts and similar creatures he has been laying and hatching for us for the past 7 years.

The total interest paid today on money borrowed by this country is approximately \$9½ billion. The amount of interest paid has been approximately doubled since Mr. Eisenhower has been in office.

Again I say that I do not share the President's delight over his record of the past 7 years nor his optimistic glowing over the future of his last year in office.

SPECIAL SENATE SHOWING OF THE MOTION PICTURE "ON THE BEACH"

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I know it is impertinent for a Republican to comment on the matter which has occupied the attention of many of my colleagues this afternoon, the question of Democratic policy meetings. However, I should like to suggest, after sitting here for most of the afternoon, that I am in favor of more of them, because if they are held during the session of the Senate, there will be time for a Republican to be recognized before a quarter to 6 in the evening.

The failure to get timely recognition bothers me a little tonight, because the subject on which I wish to speak had a kind of deadline at 5 o'clock.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield I should like to suggest the absence of a quorum, because his remarks may be very important.

Mr. BENNETT. I hope the Senator from Alaska will not go through with that suggestion, because the effect of it would be to delay me another 20 minutes before I would have an opportunity to make the remarks I should like to make.

Mr. President, the junior Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING] had thoughtfully arranged for a special showing to-day at 5 p.m. of the motion picture "On the Beach," for Senators and members of their staffs. I hope that many Members of the Senate were able to take advantage of this opportunity to view a motion picture which is both interesting and thought provoking.

However, I should like to sound a note of warning. I think this film could do a great deal of harm. In my opinion it paints a distorted picture of what a nuclear war would probably be like, and I believe it is important that those who see it should accept it for what it is—an imaginative piece of science fiction, a fantasy, and not a dramatization of what would probably happen in the event of nuclear war.

Let me make two things crystal clear at this point.

First, I do not minimize the wholesale destruction which is implicit in an all-out nuclear attack. The loss of life and property would far surpass anything the world has ever seen, and the prevention of such a holocaust is the biggest job facing the diplomats of the world today.

Second, I do not criticize the motion picture on dramatic or esthetic grounds, and I do not challenge the right of the author to create any fictional situation, however unrealistic it might be, for dramatic purposes. But I think it should be made clear that the situation, as well as the plot, is fictional.

As most Senators know, the situation involves the contamination of the atmosphere by radioactivity, which engulfs the earth over a period of months, wiping out all human life.

In fairness to the author of "On the Beach," Mr. Neville Shute, let me say at this point that I believe the novel made it clear that this situation did not result from the kind of nuclear war which

might be fought with existing nuclear weapons, but that it could result from what we might call a technological breakthrough, which made it possible for cheap atomic bombs to be made by the thousands, so that even the tiniest countries had large supplies, including bombs of far greater radioactivity than those we now have.

The picture does not make this point clear. It creates the impression that a major nuclear war, if there should be one in the near future, would be the sort depicted. It does not go into the "ifs, ands, and buts" which are prerequisite to that situation.

To take this kind of motion picture literally is to invite catastrophe. If we assume, as the picture does, that civil defense measures are completely worthless, as they would be in the fictional situation of "On the Beach," we will make no effort to take cover, to protect ourselves from fallout, to resist the attack as best we can. And if an enemy knows we have that attitude, he will be that much more likely to attack.

In some respects, this situation is reminiscent of the "Invasion From Mars" staged by Orson Welles two decades ago. In that case, as in this, a conceivable but highly unlikely situation was accepted as fact by many Americans. In that case, however, the error was easily corrected; in this case, it is very difficult to set the record straight.

Let me reiterate that I am not saying that nuclear war is as remote a possibility as an invasion from Mars. I am saying only that the kind of nuclear war contemplated in the movie, with a 5- to 20-year blanket of lethal fallout all over the globe, is at present in the realm of fantasy.

This is not merely a personal opinion. As a member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, I have sat through many hearings on radioactive fallout, and just this morning I consulted with several radiation experts from the Atomic Energy Commission on this subject. I think there is no question about the premise of the movie being unrealistic.

God forbid that we shall ever witness the use of nuclear weapons in international conflict. But if, despite our best efforts, we should become involved in that kind of catastrophe, I hope—and I believe—that the human race will retain the will to live, the innate courage which keeps us going against seemingly insurmountable odds.

The black death, which took the lives of one-fourth of the people of Europe in the 14th Century, must have been just as frightening at that time as nuclear war is today—and it was just as deadly. The 25 percent of the population it killed compares roughly with the 30 percent we would probably lose in a heavy nuclear attack, if no one took cover. But unlike the medieval Europeans, we have the knowledge to reduce that 30 percent figure to 3 percent by taking proper precautions. And this, of course, is assuming the worst. Our real hope lies in finding some way to assure that there will never be a nuclear war.

So I hope that some of those who see this movie today will keep in mind that it is science fiction, and that the situation it assumes is not to be taken as one based on scientific fact.

The science in it is just as fictitious as its characters. Unless the picture is viewed against this background, it can only result in confusion, misunderstanding, and perhaps unjustified resignation to a seemingly inevitable doom.

Mr. President, I have just been handed a note which indicates that the picture which was shown at 5 o'clock, in the auditorium of the New Senate Office Building, will be shown again at 7:30 tonight. I think it is worthwhile for Members of Congress and their staffs to see the picture, if they approach it with the proper background. However, if they view it with the idea that it is a scientific presentation of the actual effects to be expected from an atomic attack, and if their reaction is the same as that of many of the characters in the picture, namely, complete resignation and acceptance of inevitable death, then the picture can have very serious effects.

Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, pursuant to the resolutions previously agreed to, as a further mark of respect to the memory of the late Honorable Richard M. Simpson, a Representative from the State of Pennsylvania, the memory of the late Honorable Steven V. Carter, a Representative from the State of Iowa, the memory of the late Honorable Alvin R. Bush, a Representative from the State of Pennsylvania, and the memory of the late Honorable Charles A. Boyle, a Representative from the State of Illinois, I move that Senate stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock noon on Wednesday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 47 minutes p.m.) the Senate, as a further mark of respect to the memory of the late Representative Richard M. Simpson, the late Representative Steven V. Carter, the late Representative Alvin R. Bush, and the late Representative Charles A. Boyle, adjourned until Wednesday, January 13, 1960, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate January 11, 1959:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Raymond A. Hare, of West Virginia, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be a Deputy Under Secretary of State.

Robert Bernard Anderson, of New York, to be governor of the Inter-American Development Bank for a term of 5 years and until his successor has been appointed.

Douglas Dillon, of New Jersey, to be an alternate governor of the Inter-American Development Bank for a term of 5 years and until his successor has been appointed.

Robert Cutler, of Massachusetts, to be an executive director of the Inter-American De-

velopment Bank for a term of 3 years and until his successor has been appointed.

The following-named persons, who were appointed during the last recess of the Senate, to the positions indicated:

Livingston T. Merchant, of the District of Columbia, to be Under Secretary of State for Political Affairs, vice Robert D. Murphy, resigned.

Foy D. Kohler, of Ohio, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be an Assistant Secretary of State, vice Livingston T. Merchant, elevated.

Walter C. Dowling, of Georgia, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Federal Republic of Germany, vice David K. E. Bruce, resigned.

John D. Hickerson, of Texas, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Philippines, vice Charles E. Bohlen, reassigned.

Walter P. McConaughy, of Alabama, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Korea, vice Walter C. Dowling, reassigned. Edson O. Sessions, of Illinois, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Finland, vice John D. Hickerson, reassigned.

William P. Snow, of Maine, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Union of Burma, vice Walter P. McConaughy, reassigned.

John J. Muccio, of Rhode Island, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Guatemala, vice Lester D. Mallory, resigned.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Edward Page, Jr., of the District of Columbia, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Bulgaria.

Dennis A. Fitzgerald, of Maryland, to be Deputy Director for Operations of the International Cooperation Administration in the Department of State.

John Ewart Wallace Sterling, of California, to be a member of the United States Advisory Commission on Educational Exchange for a term of 3 years expiring January 27, 1962, and until his successor is appointed and qualified, vice Rufus H. Fitzgerald, term expired.

Thomas Sovereign Gates, Jr., of Pennsylvania, to be Secretary of Defense, vice Neil Hosler McElroy, resigned.

James H. Douglas, of Illinois, to be Deputy Secretary of Defense, vice Thomas Sovereign Gates, Jr., elevated.

Franklin B. Lincoln, Jr., of New Jersey, to be an Assistant Secretary of Defense, vice W. J. McNeill, resigned.

Dudley C. Sharp, of Texas, to be Secretary of the Air Force, vice James H. Douglas, elevated.

ASSISTANT ATTORNEY GENERAL

Robert Kramer, of North Carolina, to be an Assistant Attorney General.

U.S. ATTORNEY

William H. Webster, of Missouri, to be U.S. attorney for the eastern district of Missouri, vice Harry Richards, resigned.

U.S. MARSHAL

William K. Holt, Jr., of Georgia, to be U.S. marshal, for the middle district of Georgia, vice Billy E. Carlisle, resigned.

FOREIGN CLAIMS COMMISSION

Thomas W. S. Davis, of Virginia, to be a member of the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission of the United States, vice Whitney Gilliland, resigned.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Robert A. Forsythe, of Minnesota, to be an Assistant Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, vice Elliot Lee Richardson, resigned.

Dr. Winchell McKendree Craig, of Minnesota, to be Special Assistant on Health and Medical Affairs to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, vice Aims C. McGuinness, resigned.

COLLECTORS OF CUSTOMS

John C. Meisner, of Illinois, to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 39, with headquarters at Chicago, Ill., vice Frank Peska, resigned.

Harold W. Reeves, of Florida, to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 18, with headquarters at Tampa, Fla., vice Merrill D. White, term expired.

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

John M. McKibbin, of Pennsylvania, to be Deputy Postmaster General, vice Edson O. Sessions, resigned.

Bert B. Barnes, of Iowa, to be an Assistant Postmaster General, vice John M. McKibbin, elevated.

George M. Moore, of Kentucky, to be an Assistant Postmaster General, vice E. George Siedle, resigned.

FEDERAL MARITIME BOARD

Sigfrid B. Unander, of Oregon, to be a member of the Federal Maritime Board for the remainder of the term expiring June 30, 1961, vice Ben H. Gull, resigned.

CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD

Alan S. Boyd, of Florida, to be a member of the Civil Aeronautics Board for the remainder of the term expiring December 31, 1962, vice Louis J. Hector, resigned.

Whitney Gilliland, of Iowa, to be a member of the Civil Aeronautics Board for the term of 6 years expiring December 31, 1965.

NATIONAL LIBRARY OF MEDICINE

The following-named persons to be members of the Board of Regents of the National Library of Medicine, Public Health Service, for terms expiring August 3, 1963:

Dr. Theodore Robert Van Dellen, of Illinois.
Dr. Warner Lee Wells, of North Carolina.
Dr. Maynard Kiplinger Hine, of Indiana.

SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATOR

Philip McCallum, of Michigan, to be Administrator of the Small Business Administration, vice Wendell B. Barnes, resigned.

U.S. CIRCUIT COURT JUDGE

J. Joseph Smith, of Connecticut, to be U.S. circuit judge for the second circuit, vice Carroll C. Hincks, retired.

U.S. DISTRICT JUDGES

William H. Timbers, of Connecticut, to be U.S. district judge for the district of Connecticut, vice J. Joseph Smith, elevated.

Charles F. Paul, of West Virginia, to be U.S. district judge for the northern district of West Virginia, vice Herbert S. Boreman, elevated.

U.S. COURT OF CLAIMS

James R. Durfee, of Wisconsin, to be associate judge of the U.S. Court of Claims, vice Benjamin H. Littleton, retired.

U.S. ATTORNEYS

James Major Baley, Jr., of North Carolina, to be U.S. attorney for the western district of North Carolina for a term of 4 years. (Reappointment.)

N. Welch Morrisette, Jr., of South Carolina, to be U.S. attorney for the eastern district of South Carolina for a term of 4 years. (Reappointment.)

Joseph S. Bambacus, of Virginia, to be U.S. attorney for the eastern district of Virginia for a term of 4 years, vice Lester S. Parsons, resigned.

U.S. MARSHALS

James H. Somers, of North Carolina, to be U.S. marshal for the middle district of North Carolina for a term of 4 years, vice William B. Somers, deceased.

Robert E. Stockdale, of Ohio, to be U.S. marshal for the northern district of Ohio for a term of 4 years, vice Xavier North, deceased.

Hobart K. McDowell, of Texas, to be U.S. marshal for the northern district of Texas for a term of 4 years. (Reappointment.)

U.S. COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY

Rear Adm. H. Arnold Karo to be director of the Coast and Geodetic Survey for a term of 4 years. (Reappointment.)

IN THE ARMY

The following-named officers for temporary appointment in the Army of the United States to the grades indicated under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3442 and 3447:

To be major generals

Brig. Gen. William Henry Sterling Wright, ~~XXXXXX~~, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Francis Frederick Uhrhane, ~~XXXX~~, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Horace Freeman Bigelow, ~~XXXXXX~~, U.S. Army.

Brig. Gen. Thomas Norfleet Griffin, ~~XXXXXX~~, U.S. Army.

Brig. Gen. Theodore Francis Bogart, ~~XXXXXX~~, U.S. Army.

Brig. Gen. William Darwin Hamlin, ~~XXXXXX~~, U.S. Army.

Brig. Gen. Charles Granville Dodge, ~~XXXXXX~~, U.S. Army.

Brig. Gen. Albert Watson, 2d, ~~XXXXXX~~, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

To be brigadier generals

Col. Andrew Ralph Lolli, ~~XXXXXX~~, U.S. Army.

Col. Wallace Hawn Brucker, ~~XXXXXX~~, U.S. Army.

Col. William Maxwell Rodgers, ~~XXXXXX~~, U.S. Army.

Col. Herbert George Sparrow, ~~XXXXXX~~, U.S. Army.

Col. Stephen Ogden Fuqua, Jr., ~~XXXXXX~~, U.S. Army.

Col. John Frederick Thorlin, ~~XXXXXX~~, U.S. Army.

Col. Benjamin Henry Pochyla, ~~XXXXXX~~, U.S. Army.

Col. Carl Darnell, Jr., ~~XXXXXX~~, U.S. Army.

Col. Robert Moore Blanchard, Jr., ~~XXXXXX~~, U.S. Army.

Col. Oren Eugene Hurlbut, ~~XXXXXX~~, U.S. Army.

Col. Charles Edwin Rust, ~~XXXXXX~~, U.S. Army.

Col. William Hutcheson Craig, ~~XXXXXX~~, U.S. Army.

Col. James Richard Winn, ~~XXXXXX~~, U.S. Army.

Col. Charles Henry White, Jr., ~~XXXXXX~~, U.S. Army.

Col. Robert Carson Kyser, ~~XXXXXX~~, U.S. Army.

Col. Howard Kilbourne Eggleston, ~~XXXXXX~~, U.S. Army.

Col. Robert Butler Warren, ~~XXXXXX~~, U.S. Army.

Col. Frank Joseph Sackton, ~~XXXXXX~~, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Elmer John Gibson, [XXXXXX], Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

The following-named officer under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 3066, to be assigned to a position of importance and responsibility designated by the President under subsection (a) of section 3066, in rank as follows:

Lt. Gen. Clark Louis Ruffner, [XXXXXX], Army of the United States (major general, U.S. Army) in the rank of general.

The following-named officers under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 3066 to be assigned to a position of importance and responsibility designated by the President under subsection (a) of section 3066, in rank as follows:

Maj. Gen. Harry Purnell Storke, [XXXXXX], U.S. Army, in the rank of lieutenant general.

Maj. Gen. Edward Joseph O'Neill, [XXXXXX], U.S. Army, in the rank of lieutenant general.

Maj. Gen. Edward Joseph O'Neill, [XXXXXX], U.S. Army, for appointment as senior U.S. Army member of the Military Staff Committee of the United Nations, in rank of lieutenant general, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 711.

The following-named officer to be placed on the retired list in the grade indicated under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 3962:

To be lieutenant general

Lt. Gen. Blackshear Morrison Bryan, [XXXXXX], Army of the United States (major general, U.S. Army).

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

APPOINTMENTS IN THE ARMY

The following-named officer under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 3066, to be assigned to a position of importance and responsibility designated by the President under subsection (a) of section 3066, in rank as follows:

Maj. Gen. John Cogswell Oakes, [XXXXXX], U.S. Army, in the rank of lieutenant general.

The following-named officers for temporary appointment in the Army of the United States to the grades indicated under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3442 and 3447:

To be major generals

Brig. Gen. Clement Franklin St. John, [XXXXXX], Medical Corps, U.S. Army.

Brig. Gen. Ernest Fred Easterbrook, [XXXXXX], Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. William Frederick Cassidy, [XXXXXX], U.S. Army.

Brig. Gen. Charles Breckinridge Duff, [XXXXXX], U.S. Army.

Brig. Gen. Earle Fremont Cook, [XXXXXX], U.S. Army.

Brig. Gen. James Karrick Woolnough, [XXXXXX], Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

To be brigadier general

Col. Robert Barrett Skinner, [XXXXXX], Medical Corps, U.S. Army.

The following-named officer for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States to the grade indicated under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3284 and 3306:

To be brigadier general, Veterinary Corps

Col. Russell McNeillis, [XXXXXX], Veterinary Corps, U.S. Army.

The following-named officer for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States to the grade indicated under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 3037:

To be brigadier general, Judge Advocate General's Corps

Col. Clio Edwin Straight, [XXXXXX], Judge Advocate General's Corps, U.S. Army.

The following-named officers for promotion in the Regular Army of the United States, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3284 and 3299. All officers are subject to physical examination required by law.

To be majors

Tansey, Robert F., [XXXXXX]

Uhland, Herbert W., [XXXXXX]

Vann, John P., [XXXXXX]

The following-named officers for promotion in the Regular Army of the United States, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3284 and 3298. All officers are subject to physical examination required by law.

To be first lieutenants

Barrett, William T., [XXXXXX]

Beaulieu, Gary P., [XXXXXX]

Bickley, James E., [XXXXXX]

Bolt, Richard R., [XXXXXX]

Bready, Robert J., [XXXXXX]

Bryant, Thomas E., Jr., [XXXXXX]

Drummond, Louis A., [XXXXXX]

Fairchild, Robert L., Jr., [XXXXXX]

Finch, Arthur L., Jr., [XXXXXX]

Fisher, Paul D., [XXXXXX]

Gaines, Merrel E., [XXXXXX]

Gallagher, Joseph P., [XXXXXX]

Geczy, George, Jr., [XXXXXX]

Guba, Howard J., [XXXXXX]

Hampton, Emery W., [XXXXXX]

Harris, Robert W., [XXXXXX]

Higgins, George R., [XXXXXX]

Johnson, Donald K., [XXXXXX]

Klingbell, Richard C., [XXXXXX]

Lemes, Ralph V., [XXXXXX]

Mason, Arthur W., [XXXXXX]

McMillan, Druey C., [XXXXXX]

Meyer, Clyde E., [XXXXXX]

Mills, Robert E., Jr., [XXXXXX]

Musial, Walter F., [XXXXXX]

Nash, Harold F., Jr., [XXXXXX]

Nelson, William J., [XXXXXX]

O'Connor, John H., [XXXXXX]

Pugh, John W., [XXXXXX]

Schlefer, Henry J., [XXXXXX]

Schmidt, Guy L., [XXXXXX]

Simons, Robert J., [XXXXXX]

Tamminen, David L., [XXXXXX]

Tuszynski, Andrew J., [XXXXXX]

Wallace, George C., [XXXXXX]

Walters, Charles O., [XXXXXX]

Yoos, Robert E., [XXXXXX]

To be first lieutenants, Medical Service Corps

Bayne, Calvin, [XXXXXX]

Bryant, Robert J., [XXXXXX]

Casasanta, John J., [XXXXXX]

Clegg, George J., [XXXXXX]

Cornwall, Ralph W., [XXXXXX]

Heriot, Richard M., [XXXXXX]

Hull, Donald R., [XXXXXX]

La Luzerne, Ronald J., [XXXXXX]

Otterstedt, Charles C., Jr., [XXXXXX]

Pantalone, Julius D., [XXXXXX]

Pitts, William P., [XXXXXX]

Romero, Daniel J., [XXXXXX]

Shaw, Dale L., [XXXXXX]

Van Nus, Frederick, [XXXXXX]

To be first lieutenant, Army Nurse Corps

Hanson, Carol L., [XXXXXX]

The following-named persons for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States in the grades, and where applicable, the corps specified under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 1211:

To be colonel

Daughtry, Barney A., [XXXXXX]

To be lieutenant colonel

Tapper, Gordon U., [XXXXXX]

To be captain

Carrig, Stephen J., [XXXXXX]

To be lieutenant colonel, Army Nurse Corps

Galloway, Marie S., [XXXXXX]

To be major, Army Nurse Corps

Leonard, Margaret W., [XXXXXX]

The following-named persons for appointment in the Regular Army by transfer in the grades, and where applicable, the corps specified, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3285, 3286, 3287, 3288, and 3292:

To be second lieutenant

Krimmer, John A., [XXXXXX]

To be captain, Medical Service Corps

Gray, Stephen E., [XXXXXX], Infantry.

To be captain, Judge Advocate General's Corps

Roysden, Brunn W., [XXXXXX], Artillery.

The following-named distinguished military students for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States in the grade, and where applicable the corps specified, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3285, 3286, 3287, and 3288:

To be second lieutenants

Allen, Charlie J.

Alley, Glen D.

Barton, David C.

Brennan, Robert G., Jr., [XXXXXXXXXX]

Brooks, Lawrence E.

Chen, Robert.

Connor, George H., Jr., [XXXXXXXXXX]

Dayhuff, Charles H., III.

Degner, Herbert L.

Durbin, Jerome A.

Evans, Kenneth A.

Gonzalez, Manuel.

Graham, Michael L.

Halbert, Edward, [XXXXXXXXXX]

Hawkins, Cyril A., Jr.

Huntington, William L.

Langdale, Daniel T., [XXXXXXXXXX]

LaSala, Robert J.

Lydum, Robert D.

Lee, George B.

Martin, Robert G.

McNeil, Charles B.

Miner, James F.

Miner, William H., [XXXXXXXXXX]

Quimet, William C., Jr.

Overby, Gordon J.

Pruitt, Fleming S., Jr.

Rabon, Jim D.

Riley, Donald A.

Robe, Edward S.

Robinson, Charles D.

Rydberg, Carl R., [XXXXXXXXXX]

Shine, Joseph P., [XXXXXXXXXX]

Smith, Wayne A.

Symons, John W., [XXXXXXXXXX]

Tanner, Junius I.

Van Zee, James L., [XXXXXXXXXX]

Weatherly, Emory D., Jr.

Weber, Bowman H.

Wesneski, Carl A.

Williams, Cary E.

Zutler, Gerald M.

To be second lieutenants, Medical Service Corps

Grider, Donald A., [XXXXXXXXXX]

Howard, Vance F.

Opitz, Arthur C., Jr., [XXXXXXXXXX]

Schlaak, James R.

The following-named persons for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, in the grades specified under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3285, 3286, 3287, and 3288:

To be majors

Beganle, Henry R., [XXXXXXXXXX]

Bowden, James A., [XXXXXXXXXX]

Brice, Emmett T., [XXXXXXXXXX]

Brigden, Douglas A., [XXXXXXXXXX]

Cahill, James P., [XXXXXXXXXX]

Enteles, Theodore L., [XXXXXXXXXX]

Fields, Hampson H., [XXXXXXXXXX]

Fluckiger, Fred, Jr., [XXXXXXXXXX]

Gildersleeve, Robert E., [XXXXXXXXXX]

Graham, Albert W., Jr., XXXXXXXX
 Harding, Claude D., XXXXXXXX
 Henry, James E., XXXXXXXX
 Hill, James A., XXXXXXXX
 Hostetler, Jerome K., XXXXXXXX
 Kearns, Thomas C., XXXXXXXX
 Knuepfer, Dieter C., XXXXXXXX
 Konvicka, Henry H., XXXXXXXX
 McClain, John W., XXXXXXXX
 Minton, William, XXXXXXXX
 Moeller, William H., XXXXXXXX
 Puleo, Albert, XXXXXXXX
 Purkhiser, Harry R., XXXXXXXX
 Ramsburg, John H., XXXXXXXX
 Sadler, John F., Jr., XXXXXXXX
 Sanders, Leo F., XXXXXXXX
 Sinko, William A., XXXXXXXX
 Smith, James R., XXXXXXXX

To be captains

Abood, Edmond P., XXXXXXXX
 Allred, James H., XXXXXXXX
 Atwood, James P., XXXXXXXX
 Bludworth, Donald G., XXXXXXXX
 Boardman, Donald R., XXXXXXXX
 Booth, James W., XXXXXXXX
 Bowman, James E., XXXXXXXX
 Bradley, Joseph S., Jr., XXXXXXXX
 Brambilla, Robert M., Jr., XXXXXXXX
 Clark, Donald T., XXXXXXXX
 Cleveland, Edwin L., XXXXXXXX
 Cranford, Charles R., Jr., XXXXXXXX
 Dawson, George R., XXXXXXXX
 Desaulniers, John J., XXXXXXXX
 Doster, Robert W., XXXXXXXX
 Duncan, Conrad L., XXXXXXXX
 Engle, John F., Jr., XXXXXXXX
 Ericsson, Eric A., XXXXXXXX
 Finch, Edward B., Jr., XXXXXXXX
 Florelli, Michael C., XXXXXXXX
 Gallagher, Charles P., XXXXXXXX
 Galloway, Jesse M., XXXXXXXX
 Gelges, Elmer B., Jr., XXXXXXXX
 Gendron, Alvin J., XXXXXXXX
 Goosman, John F., XXXXXXXX
 Green, James E., Jr., XXXXXXXX
 Gutzmann, Leslie E., XXXXXXXX
 Hall, Robert L., XXXXXXXX
 Haney, Leslie D., XXXXXXXX
 Haygood, Jack L., XXXXXXXX
 Henry, Henry N., Jr., XXXXXXXX
 Hill, James F., XXXXXXXX
 Hoagland, Dale N., XXXXXXXX
 Hojnacki, William J., XXXXXXXX
 Hunt, Jim I., XXXXXXXX
 Hyne, Merrel E., Jr., XXXXXXXX
 Jackson, Hal G., Jr., XXXXXXXX
 Jackson, Luther H., XXXXXXXX
 Jacobs, Norman P., XXXXXXXX
 Johnson, Albert A., Jr., XXXXXXXX
 Jones, Leon C., XXXXXXXX
 Kean, John J., XXXXXXXX
 Lamastus, Robert L., XXXXXXXX
 Langford, Richard J. E., Jr., XXXXXXXX
 Levy Walter, XXXXXXXX
 Little, Andrew E., XXXXXXXX
 Love, John A., XXXXXXXX
 Maddox, Chesley B., Jr., XXXXXXXX
 Mancinelli, Thomas B., XXXXXXXX
 Manross, Theodore D., XXXXXXXX
 Mattingly, Joseph G., Jr., XXXXXXXX
 McKee, Dewey E., XXXXXXXX
 Melcher, Ralph W., XXXXXXXX
 Miller, Lewis, XXXXXXXX
 Mojecki, John A., XXXXXXXX
 Monahan, William J., XXXXXXXX
 Moore, Wallace D., XXXXXXXX
 Morton, Karl R., XXXXXXXX
 Myron, Harold L., XXXXXXXX
 Nickolls, Charles E., XXXXXXXX
 Nunnelee, Billy R., XXXXXXXX
 O'Brien, George F., XXXXXXXX
 O'Brien, James J., XXXXXXXX
 Okarski, Gerald M., XXXXXXXX
 Owens, Welvin B., XXXXXXXX
 Pannier, Leon G., Jr., XXXXXXXX
 Perkins, John R., XXXXXXXX
 Powell, Alfred J., XXXXXXXX
 Rust, Henry W., Jr., XXXXXXXX
 Schumacher, David J., XXXXXXXX

Shimon, Walter W., XXXXXXXX
 Slegler, Norman J., XXXXXXXX
 Skipper, Powell H., XXXXXXXX
 Slocum, Robert D., XXXXXXXX
 Smith, Dane M., XXXXXXXX
 Snyder, Charles L., XXXXXXXX
 Sorg, Creighton D., XXXXXXXX
 Stahlberg, Joseph M., Jr., XXXXXXXX
 Sullivan, John L., XXXXXXXX
 Sweet, Thomas G., XXXXXXXX
 Tate, Wallace L., XXXXXXXX
 Thompson, Robert J. E., XXXXXXXX
 Threadgill, Frank G., XXXXXXXX
 Tilton, William S., XXXXXXXX
 Tubbleville, Billy C., XXXXXXXX
 Van Horn, Vannah E., XXXXXXXX
 Vorisek, Robert B., XXXXXXXX
 Watson, Robert G., XXXXXXXX
 Whatley, Wayne B., XXXXXXXX
 Wheeler, Douglas E., XXXXXXXX
 Wild, Donald J., XXXXXXXX
 Woods, Jack C., XXXXXXXX

To be first lieutenants

Abrahams, Edwin G., XXXXXXXX
 Abt, Irwin E., XXXXXXXX
 Adams, John E., XXXXXXXX
 Allen, Charles B., XXXXXXXX
 Allen, James H., Jr., XXXXXXXX
 Antkowiak, Robert S., XXXXXXXX
 Ault, William E., XXXXXXXX
 Barrere, Richard P., XXXXXXXX
 Barron, William T., XXXXXXXX
 Bell, Alexander D., XXXXXXXX
 Benoit, William R., XXXXXXXX
 Bernhardt, William R., XXXXXXXX
 Blascak, Donald W., XXXXXXXX
 Bowman, Joseph R., XXXXXXXX
 Brickwell, Wilbur D., XXXXXXXX
 Bryan, Richard L., XXXXXXXX
 Burton, Glenn E., XXXXXXXX
 Caprio, Daniel W., XXXXXXXX
 Cashman, James D., XXXXXXXX
 Cawley, John H., Jr., XXXXXXXX
 Chandler, John R., XXXXXXXX
 Chapman, Joseph M., XXXXXXXX
 Cheesborough, Richard S., XXXXXXXX
 Child, Paul W., Jr., XXXXXXXX
 Christensen, George F., XXXXXXXX
 Clark, Denzel L., XXXXXXXX
 Clark, Jon M., XXXXXXXX
 Clayberg, Richard P., XXXXXXXX
 Collins, Harry D., XXXXXXXX
 Collins, Howard L., XXXXXXXX
 Curran, Kenton W., XXXXXXXX
 DeRouen, Milton, Jr., XXXXXXXX
 Diener, Everett P., XXXXXXXX
 Dilday, Colbert L., XXXXXXXX
 Draper, Leo, XXXXXXXX
 Duffy, Henry A., XXXXXXXX
 Eberhard, Floyd, XXXXXXXX
 Erickson, Charles A., XXXXXXXX
 Eubanks, James M., XXXXXXXX
 Ewing, Leroy B., XXXXXXXX
 Fambrough, John A., XXXXXXXX
 Flynn, James J., XXXXXXXX
 Foradori, Harry L., XXXXXXXX
 Fritchman, Lynn V., XXXXXXXX
 Fronczak, Theodore J., XXXXXXXX
 Furney, Robert M., XXXXXXXX
 Gallagher, Robert J., XXXXXXXX
 Gallagher, Thomas M., XXXXXXXX
 Green, Robert E., Jr., XXXXXXXX
 Gregg, Dale P., XXXXXXXX
 Hallmark, Robert C., XXXXXXXX
 Handback, Henry C., XXXXXXXX
 Haney, Charles H., Jr., XXXXXXXX
 Hartman, Donald F., XXXXXXXX
 Heikinen, Kenneth L., XXXXXXXX
 Hendricks, Thomas E., XXXXXXXX
 Herring, Shelby D., XXXXXXXX
 Hertz, Sanford G., XXXXXXXX
 Hoffmann, Theodore H., XXXXXXXX
 Holt, Bill V., XXXXXXXX
 Hubb, Frank, XXXXXXXX
 Jackson, James C., XXXXXXXX
 Jhung, Bryson, XXXXXXXX
 Johnson, William M., XXXXXXXX
 Jones, David W., XXXXXXXX
 Jones, Ronald A., XXXXXXXX
 Kay, Joseph V., XXXXXXXX
 King, Gregory N., XXXXXXXX
 Lacy, James F., XXXXXXXX
 Lauthers, David E., XXXXXXXX
 Leonard, Dan S., XXXXXXXX
 Lilley, Walter G., XXXXXXXX
 Liscinsky, Robert A., XXXXXXXX
 Long, Arthur W., XXXXXXXX
 Long, Kenneth D., XXXXXXXX
 Looney, Robert C., XXXXXXXX
 Mackey, William C., Jr., XXXXXXXX
 Magness, James L., XXXXXXXX
 Marini, James L., XXXXXXXX
 Martin, John R., XXXXXXXX
 Martin, Quinton T., Jr., XXXXXXXX
 McGraw, John F., Jr., XXXXXXXX
 McGregor, Harold W., XXXXXXXX
 McKee, Kenneth J., XXXXXXXX
 Metzger, Ronald W., XXXXXXXX
 Miller, Leonard L., XXXXXXXX
 Miller, Richard D., XXXXXXXX
 Moore, Robert J., XXXXXXXX
 Moran, Hugh F., Jr., XXXXXXXX
 Morse, Guy P., XXXXXXXX
 Moulton, Rodney F., XXXXXXXX
 Nadworny, M. Joseph, XXXXXXXX
 Neal, Charles A., XXXXXXXX
 Neil, Arthur G., Jr., XXXXXXXX
 Nix, Eddie M., XXXXXXXX
 Noble, George E., XXXXXXXX
 Nork, William G., XXXXXXXX
 Norton, Albert L., XXXXXXXX
 O'Connor, James J., XXXXXXXX
 Okita, Harold K., Jr., XXXXXXXX
 Pack, Kenneth L., XXXXXXXX
 Paradiso, Richard A., XXXXXXXX
 Parks, Hugh W., XXXXXXXX
 Peden, Ronald L., XXXXXXXX
 Rexroad, William P., XXXXXXXX
 Plencner, Francis B., XXXXXXXX
 Price, Oscar G., Jr., XXXXXXXX
 Principe, Martin A., XXXXXXXX
 Pritchard, Donald H., XXXXXXXX
 Puig, Joseph P., Jr., XXXXXXXX
 Ragovis, George, XXXXXXXX
 Raymond, Henry J., XXXXXXXX
 Riviere, George L., XXXXXXXX
 Rodenhiser, Carl L., XXXXXXXX
 Sands, Clifton A., XXXXXXXX
 Saunders, LemRoy L., XXXXXXXX
 Schaefer, John R., XXXXXXXX
 Selig, Clyde P., XXXXXXXX
 Silvanic, George, XXXXXXXX
 Sisk, Isaac R., XXXXXXXX
 Snyder, James E., XXXXXXXX
 Sontag, Paul D., XXXXXXXX
 Stamper, James M., Jr., XXXXXXXX
 Starkey, James E., XXXXXXXX
 Stevenson, Joseph M., XXXXXXXX
 Sullivan, Andrew J., XXXXXXXX
 Swoboda, Edward A., XXXXXXXX
 Tanner, Lester W., XXXXXXXX
 Tenny, Roy L., XXXXXXXX
 Thaxton, Billy J., XXXXXXXX
 Thomas, Max E., XXXXXXXX
 Thomas, Richard W., Jr., XXXXXXXX
 Tobiasen, Richard D., XXXXXXXX
 Tomlin, James R., XXXXXXXX
 Top, John J., XXXXXXXX
 Treece, Ausby J., XXXXXXXX
 Vavra, George R., XXXXXXXX
 Walbbe, Leo C., Jr., XXXXXXXX
 Walter, Paul B., XXXXXXXX
 Watkins, Edward A., Jr., XXXXXXXX
 Wedemeier, Terry T., XXXXXXXX
 White, Harry S., Jr., XXXXXXXX
 Wilson, Charles E., XXXXXXXX
 Woodward, James O., XXXXXXXX
 Young, Lawrence B. H., Sr., XXXXXXXX

To be second lieutenants

Abbuhl, Willmott, XXXXXXXX
 Adams, James G., XXXXXXXX
 Addy, Buford W., Jr., XXXXXXXX
 Adriaansen, Leslie L., XXXXXXXX
 Allen, William L., XXXXXXXX
 Ammons, David C., XXXXXXXX
 Anderson, Joseph M., XXXXXXXX
 Arcari, Joseph J., XXXXXXXX
 Arndt, Terrance L., XXXXXXXX

Aylward, James J., Jr., XXXXXXXX.
 Baker, John P., Jr., XXXXXXXX.
 Barkett, John S., XXXXXXXX.
 Beavers, Guy M., XXXXXXXX.
 Beck, John A., XXXXXXXX.
 Behnke, James E., XXXXXXXX.
 Bennett, James C., XXXXXXXX.
 Berry, William W., XXXXXXXX.
 Bingham, Ellis D., XXXXXXXX.
 Blankenship, Donald K., XXXXXXXX.
 Boccard, Richard A., XXXXXXXX.
 Bosway, Stephen G., XXXXXXXX.
 Bowen, Guy P.
 Bower, Duane M., XXXXXXXX.
 Bowman, Roy R., XXXXXXXX.
 Braa, Emery W., XXXXXXXX.
 Brantley, John T., XXXXXXXX.
 Braspenninckx, Harold J., XXXXXXXX.
 Brassfield, Bobbie A., XXXXXXXX.
 Brett, William J., XXXXXXXX.
 Brock, Robert J., XXXXXXXX.
 Brown, Elbert L., Jr., XXXXXXXX.
 Bruck, Harold A., Jr., XXXXXXXX.
 Brumbaugh, Larry W., XXXXXXXX.
 Burke, Sib H., XXXXXXXX.
 Burton, Dawson L., XXXXXXXX.
 Campbell, Jerry K., XXXXXXXX.
 Cancienne, Louis G., XXXXXXXX.
 Carnahan, Ronald J., XXXXXXXX.
 Catlett, Charles, XXXXXXXX.
 Cauthen, Tommy E., XXXXXXXX.
 Chapman, Ruthven H., XXXXXXXX.
 Chaudrue, Robert G., XXXXXXXX.
 Chesak, Charles D., XXXXXXXX.
 Clark, Dennis J., XXXXXXXX.
 Clark, Donald P., XXXXXXXX.
 Clark, Richard A., XXXXXXXX.
 Clark, Richard M., XXXXXXXX.
 Clary, William T., XXXXXXXX.
 Cole, Leslie W., XXXXXXXX.
 Cooney, Terrence P., XXXXXXXX.
 Cox, Wallace R., XXXXXXXX.
 Craig, Sammy W. II, XXXXXXXX.
 Craighead, Clyde V., XXXXXXXX.
 Cullins, Thomas E., XXXXXXXX.
 Cunningham, James G., XXXXXXXX.
 Daly, George M., XXXXXXXX.
 Dalzell, Gary W., XXXXXXXX.
 Davis, George C., XXXXXXXX.
 Davis, Philip A., XXXXXXXX.
 Dedman, Richard O., XXXXXXXX.
 Dendtler, Robert B., XXXXXXXX.
 Dennen, David W., XXXXXXXX.
 Digh, Ned P., XXXXXXXX.
 Dolby, John F., XXXXXXXX.
 Drewett, George S., XXXXXXXX.
 Duncan, Robert D., XXXXXXXX.
 Dyer, Donald E., Jr., XXXXXXXX.
 Erickson, Curtis C., XXXXXXXX.
 Farley, Dennis S., XXXXXXXX.
 Fassel, Laverene F., XXXXXXXX.
 Faulkner, Gordon K., XXXXXXXX.
 Flesher, Dale D., XXXXXXXX.
 Florey, Richard R., XXXXXXXX.
 Flynn, Thomas F. X., XXXXXXXX.
 Fowler, Darrell V., XXXXXXXX.
 Friend, Stephen G., XXXXXXXX.
 Frink, Robert K., XXXXXXXX.
 Gardella, John L., XXXXXXXX.
 Geddings, Cecil C., Jr., XXXXXXXX.
 Geiger, Arthur H., XXXXXXXX.
 Gilbert, John C., XXXXXXXX.
 Gilliam, Glen L., XXXXXXXX.
 Goodchild, Gerald B., XXXXXXXX.
 Gordon, Dudley J., XXXXXXXX.
 Gosnell, Carlos D., XXXXXXXX.
 Gray, David W., XXXXXXXX.
 Gray, Harlen E., XXXXXXXX.
 Gruber, Lee C., XXXXXXXX.
 Guillory, Kenneth R., XXXXXXXX.
 Haas, Gaylord P., Jr., XXXXXXXX.
 Hackney, Edward C., XXXXXXXX.
 Hall, John M., XXXXXXXX.
 Hallmark, Billy J., XXXXXXXX.
 Halverson, Jay G., XXXXXXXX.
 Harwood, Michael S., XXXXXXXX.
 Hittner, Leon B., XXXXXXXX.
 Hodge, Charles D., XXXXXXXX.
 Holland, Gerald R., XXXXXXXX.
 Hollingsworth, Jerome L., XXXXXXXX.

Hovanec, Vincent J., XXXXXXXX.
 Howard, Lee N., XXXXXXXX.
 Hull, Arthur V., XXXXXXXX.
 Hummel, Theodore W., XXXXXXXX.
 Hunt, James W., Jr., XXXXXXXX.
 Hurley, William P., Jr., XXXXXXXX.
 Iaconis, Emil P., XXXXXXXX.
 Iori, Richard A., XXXXXXXX.
 Jackson, Raymond F., XXXXXXXX.
 Jacobson, Walter R., XXXXXXXX.
 Jankiewicz, Edward J., Jr., XXXXXXXX.
 Jansen, Edward F., XXXXXXXX.
 Jennings, Richard P., XXXXXXXX.
 Keville, Clarence H., Jr., XXXXXXXX.
 Killian, Howard J., Jr., XXXXXXXX.
 Kinnison, Harlen W., XXXXXXXX.
 Kondi, Albert J., XXXXXXXX.
 Kuehn, Walter, Jr., XXXXXXXX.
 Kuntz, George R., XXXXXXXX.
 Kurtz, Robert W., XXXXXXXX.
 Kwak, John J., Sr., XXXXXXXX.
 Lacy, Paul J., XXXXXXXX.
 Ladden, Richard M.
 Lagutchik, Peter, Jr., XXXXXXXX.
 LaMarche, Bertrand D., XXXXXXXX.
 Lane, George H., Jr., XXXXXXXX.
 Lanzillo, Eugene R., XXXXXXXX.
 Lauby, Robert F., XXXXXXXX.
 Lawn, William J., XXXXXXXX.
 Lee, William E., Jr., XXXXXXXX.
 Lide, Theodore A., Jr., XXXXXXXX.
 Loker, Jon O., XXXXXXXX.
 Long, Glenn W., XXXXXXXX.
 Long, Melvin D., XXXXXXXX.
 Longoria, Ezekiel, XXXXXXXX.
 Louney, Patrick D., XXXXXXXX.
 Lovell, Austin L., XXXXXXXX.
 Lowe, James I., XXXXXXXX.
 Lowry, Louis L., XXXXXXXX.
 Lufburrow, Robert P., XXXXXXXX.
 Luisi, Gerard H., XXXXXXXX.
 MacLellan, John A., XXXXXXXX.
 Maffett, Fletcher H., XXXXXXXX.
 Maloney, Mark L., XXXXXXXX.
 Marsella, Louis J., XXXXXXXX.
 Marshall, Wesley B.
 Martin, Alfred L., Jr., XXXXXXXX.
 Martin, Bruce A., XXXXXXXX.
 Martin, Willard L., XXXXXXXX.
 Mason, William B., XXXXXXXX.
 McCloskey, William B., Jr., XXXXXXXX.
 McGinnis, Michael J., XXXXXXXX.
 McGivern, Parlan L., XXXXXXXX.
 McHugh, Charles W., XXXXXXXX.
 McInerney, Bernard M., XXXXXXXX.
 McKenzie, Peter P., XXXXXXXX.
 McKibben, Clifford F., XXXXXXXX.
 McKenzie, George J., XXXXXXXX.
 McMullan, Frank W., XXXXXXXX.
 McWaters, John R., XXXXXXXX.
 Meininger, Herbert N., XXXXXXXX.
 Meister, Jerome F., XXXXXXXX.
 Messineo, Joseph F., XXXXXXXX.
 Mickelson, Roger W., XXXXXXXX.
 Mitchell, Richard G., XXXXXXXX.
 Mixer, Wilbur R., XXXXXXXX.
 Moates, James T., Jr., XXXXXXXX.
 Morgan, Jack E., XXXXXXXX.
 Moriarty, Donald P., Jr., XXXXXXXX.
 Morris, Dannie B., XXXXXXXX.
 Morris, Ellis R., XXXXXXXX.
 Murray, Lark R., XXXXXXXX.
 Neely, Cecil N., XXXXXXXX.
 Nichols, James M., Jr., XXXXXXXX.
 Nilsson, John A., XXXXXXXX.
 Olsen, Norman W., XXXXXXXX.
 O'Neill, Charles F., XXXXXXXX.
 Otto, James W., XXXXXXXX.
 Parker, David M., XXXXXXXX.
 Patterson, James L., XXXXXXXX.
 Pearce, William E., XXXXXXXX.
 Phelan, Arthur J., XXXXXXXX.
 Poach, James R., III, XXXXXXXX.
 Porter, Ronald E., XXXXXXXX.
 Price, Robert D., XXXXXXXX.
 Proeschel, Donald L., XXXXXXXX.
 Radcliff, William A., XXXXXXXX.
 Rambo, James E., XXXXXXXX.
 Reagan, Jerry E., XXXXXXXX.
 Reese, Thomas D., XXXXXXXX.
 Resa, Philip E., XXXXXXXX.

Reynolds, James A., XXXXXXXX.
 Richardson, Joseph B., XXXXXXXX.
 Rider, Charles R., XXXXXXXX.
 Roach, Armand D., Jr., XXXXXXXX.
 Robinson, James B., XXXXXXXX.
 Rooney, Lawrence A., XXXXXXXX.
 Rorie, Forest G., XXXXXXXX.
 Rosamond, John B., XXXXXXXX.
 Rose, Rocco V., XXXXXXXX.
 Sarbanes, Anthony S., XXXXXXXX.
 Saunders, Richard G., XXXXXXXX.
 Schroder, Romayne E., XXXXXXXX.
 Schroeder, William M., XXXXXXXX.
 Schuetze, Raymond A., Jr., XXXXXXXX.
 Schultz, Gary E., XXXXXXXX.
 Schultz, Norman O., XXXXXXXX.
 Scott, Richard L., XXXXXXXX.
 Searl, Peter H., XXXXXXXX.
 Serna, Albert I., III, XXXXXXXX.
 Shanahan, Edward J., Jr., XXXXXXXX.
 Shearer, David L., XXXXXXXX.
 Sheldon, William W., XXXXXXXX.
 Shelton, James E., XXXXXXXX.
 Sherwood, Donald L., XXXXXXXX.
 Siderius, Robert E., XXXXXXXX.
 Siegel, Eugene E., XXXXXXXX.
 Siler, Samuel M., XXXXXXXX.
 Sims, Charles O., III, XXXXXXXX.
 Slak, James C., XXXXXXXX.
 Slocum, Neil R., XXXXXXXX.
 Smith, Robert T., Jr., XXXXXXXX.
 Smith, Robert W., XXXXXXXX.
 Smith, William J., XXXXXXXX.
 Smitherman, Joe V., XXXXXXXX.
 Spelcher, William F., XXXXXXXX.
 Stamps, Doyle W., XXXXXXXX.
 Stedman, Robert W., XXXXXXXX.
 Surprise, Lyle G., XXXXXXXX.
 Symons, Frederick E., XXXXXXXX.
 Taylor, Alfred E., XXXXXXXX.
 Taylor, Paul W., XXXXXXXX.
 Taylor, Thomas W., XXXXXXXX.
 Teasley, Harry N., Jr., XXXXXXXX.
 Tebo, Robert J., XXXXXXXX.
 Thomas, Charles R., XXXXXXXX.
 Thomas, Robert H. B., XXXXXXXX.
 Tomel, Giancarlo A., XXXXXXXX.
 Totin, John R., XXXXXXXX.
 Tudhope, Lawrence K., XXXXXXXX.
 Turner, Peter J., XXXXXXXX.
 Walker, Clifford M., Jr., XXXXXXXX.
 Walsh, Richard J., XXXXXXXX.
 Walton, Warren J., XXXXXXXX.
 Ward, James J., XXXXXXXX.
 Ward, Leonard M., Jr., XXXXXXXX.
 Waring, Mowton L., Jr., XXXXXXXX.
 Watkins, Thomas D., II, XXXXXXXX.
 Wenthe, David H., XXXXXXXX.
 Wesley, Clemon H., XXXXXXXX.
 Westbrook, Tommy R., XXXXXXXX.
 White, Jewel G., XXXXXXXX.
 Widell, Carl A., Jr., XXXXXXXX.
 Widmer, Edwin R., XXXXXXXX.
 Wilson, John P., Jr., XXXXXXXX.
 Wise, Paul E., XXXXXXXX.
 Wizbowski, Walter L. P., XXXXXXXX.

The following-named persons for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, in the grades and corps specified, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3285, 3286, 3287, 3288, 3291, 3292, 3294, and 3311:

To be major, Dental Corps

DiJoseph, Benjamin J., XXXXXXXX.

To be majors, Medical Corps

Pratt, Daniel W., XXXXXXXX.
 Runcik, Karel, XXXXXXXX.
 Van Hoorn, Jacob Z., XXXXXXXX.
 Wilson, William E., XXXXXXXX.

To be major, Medical Service Corps

Bryan, George R., XXXXXXXX.

To be major, Chaplain

Fiser, James H., XXXXXXXX.

To be captains, Army Nurse Corps

Cunningham, Dillard, XXXXXXXX.
 Grech, Anna A., XXXXXXXX.

Rogers, Janet A., XXXXXXX.
Rothrock, Lois R., XXXXXXX.
Utt, Yvonne M., XXXXXXX.

To be captains, Dental Corps

Bellerose, Gilbert A., XXXXXXX.
Civjan, Simon, XXXXXXX.
Cote, Robert R., XXXXXXX.
Cutright, Duane E., XXXXXXX.
Deane, Clarence E., Jr., XXXXXXX.
Guliford, Harold J., Jr., XXXXXXX.
Hatchett, Robert K., XXXXXXX.
Jensen, John G., Jr., XXXXXXX.
Paul, William H., XXXXXXX.
Peppe, Isadore O., XXXXXXX.

To be captains, Medical Corps

Baughman, Charles H., XXXXXXX.
Blakely, Lee A., Jr., XXXXXXX.
Busch, Edwin S., XXXXXXX.
Cadigan, Francis C., XXXXXXX.
Campbell, John J., XXXXXXX.
Erickson, Darroll J., XXXXXXX.
Finnerty, Paul E., XXXXXXX.
Garrison, James M., Jr., XXXXXXX.
Goodner, John W., XXXXXXX.
Luttrull, John W., XXXXXXX.
Munson, Wayne M., XXXXXXX.
Newman, William E., XXXXXXX.
Rank, William B., XXXXXXX.
Roberts, Howard H., XXXXXXX.
Schaefer, Glennon S., Jr., XXXXXXX.
Snyder, Donald L., XXXXXXX.
Swedenborg, Samuel W., XXXXXXX.
Uhrig, Henry T., XXXXXXX.
Wheby, Munsey S., XXXXXXX.

To be captains, Medical Service Corps

Kershner, Edward C., XXXXXXX.
Oestereich, Orlyn C., XXXXXXX.
Wells, Robert J., XXXXXXX.

To be captains, Chaplain Corps

Christoph, Edward J., XXXXXXX.
Miller, Alfred A., XXXXXXX.
Remark, Phillip B., XXXXXXX.
Siege, John C., XXXXXXX.

To be captains, Judge Advocate General's Corps

Lara, William K., XXXXXXX.
Movsesian, Anthony A., XXXXXXX.

To be captains, Women's Army Corps

Bray, Lydia M., XXXXXXX.
Niblack, Sarah F., XXXXXXX.

To be first lieutenant, Army Medical Specialist Corps

Dobbs, Eunice R., M3081.

To be first lieutenants, Army Nurse Corps

Fess, Dorothy E., XXXXXXX.
Hanover, Gloria A., XXXXXXX.
Johnson, Ellen, XXXXXXX.
Joyner, Mary E., XXXXXXX.
Learned, Grace, XXXXXXX.
Littlefield, Jaclyn, XXXXXXX.
Nellis, Virginia M., XXXXXXX.
Reed, Della K., XXXXXXX.
Shoemaker, Vera E., XXXXXXX.
Supplee, Jeanne L., XXXXXXX.

To be first lieutenants, Dental Corps

Brunton, Donald A., Jr., XXXXXXX.
L'Homme, Paul R., XXXXXXX.
Swain, Marshall M., XXXXXXX.

To be first lieutenants, Medical Corps

Agnew, Hall W., XXXXXXX.
Ballard, Michael D., XXXXXXX.
Beck, William L., XXXXXXX.
Bowman, John A., XXXXXXX.
Bybee, Paul R., XXXXXXX.
Collins, Delano M., XXXXXXX.
Genest, Aloria S., XXXXXXX.
Gilroy, Francis J., Jr., XXXXXXX.
Hazlett, David R., XXXXXXX.
Kahane, Stanley B., XXXXXXX.
Kolbert, Gerald S., XXXXXXX.
Kriz, Frank K., Jr., XXXXXXX.
Levy, Joel V., XXXXXXX.
Massad, Louis B., XXXXXXX.
Park, Robert C., XXXXXXX.

Pating, Roger, XXXXXXX.
Peterson, Richard B., XXXXXXX.
Reiss, Walter E., XXXXXXX.
Sokoloff, Burton Z., XXXXXXX.
Spaulding, Abbot G., XXXXXXX.

To be first lieutenants, Medical Service Corps

Bourland, Gene M., XXXXXXX.
Clark, Scott W., XXXXXXX.
Hoen, Warren K., XXXXXXX.
Lawrence, Frank P., XXXXXXX.
Levy, Louis B., XXXXXXX.
Liedtka, Frederick A., XXXXXXX.
Stevens, Clarence O., XXXXXXX.
Van Straten, James G., XXXXXXX.
Van Wyck, William E., XXXXXXX.
Villanueva, Teodoro, Jr., XXXXXXX.

To be first lieutenants, Veterinary Corps

Chandler, Harold K., XXXXXXX.
Eckermann, Edgar H., XXXXXXX.

To be first lieutenants, Chaplain Corps

Ambrose, George Jr., XXXXXXX.
Brooks, Tommy C., XXXXXXX.
Cook, Richard G., XXXXXXX.
Degl, Joseph, Jr., XXXXXXX.
Forrest, Alfred T., XXXXXXX.
Garner, Calvin H., XXXXXXX.
Graber, Howard M., XXXXXXX.
Green, John E., XXXXXXX.
Hartman, Richard W., XXXXXXX.
Johnson, Charles M., XXXXXXX.
Knowlton, Robert L., XXXXXXX.
Kovacic, Francis, XXXXX.
Lapp, Ernest D., XXXX.
Logan, John D., XXXXXXX.
Lyon, Wilson L., XXXXXXX.
Magalee, John E., XXXXXXX.
Martin, William A., XXXXXXX.
McCloy, Charles H., Sr., XXXXXXX.
Moss, Ira G., XXXXXXX.
Nagata, William M., XXXXX.
Ninedorf, Robert W., XXXXXXX.
Nybro, Richard, XXXXXXX.
O'Shea, Edward L., XXXXXXX.
Polhemus, David W., XXXXXXX.
Stanford, James A., XXXXXXX.
Stover, Earl F., XXXXXXX.
Swagger, Robert G., XXXXXXX.
Tate, David F., XXXXXXX.
Tibbetts, Alan C., XXXXXXX.
Trobaugh, William P., XXXXXXX.
Wright, Wendell T., XXXXXXX.
Yarbrough, Jimmie W., XXXXXXX.
Young, Willis F., XXXXXXX.

To be first lieutenants, Judge Advocate General's Corps

Alford, John R., XXXXXXX.
Alley, Wayne E., XXXXXXX.
Davis, Bruce E., XXXXXXX.
Drake, Walter H., XXXXXXX.
Harvey, Alton H., XXXXXXX.
Henson, Hugh E., Jr., XXXXXXX.
Knakal, Joseph C., Jr., XXXXXXX.
Lassiter, Edward A., XXXXXXX.
Miller, Harold L., XXXXXXX.
Miller, William T., Jr., XXXXXXX.
Wells, Jerry E., XXXXXXX.
Wold, Pedar C., XXXXXXX.

To be first lieutenant, Women's Army Corps

Maybin, Patricia J., XXXXXXX.

To be second lieutenant, Army Medical Specialist Corps

Hall, Mary S., M2291388.

To be second lieutenants, Army Nurse Corps

Diener, Dolores E., XXXXXXX.
Jones, Addie B. L., XXXXXXX.
Michael, Marbeth G., XXXXXXX.
Paulsen, Margaret J., XXXXXXX.
Teele, Kathryn M., XXXXXXX.
Tinklenberg, Esther J., XXXXXXX.

To be second lieutenants, Medical Service Corps

Ashwood, Carl R., XXXXXXX.
Barber, Leroy M., Jr., XXXXXXX.
Belcher, Lillard F., XXXXXXX.
Boston, Lester E., Jr., XXXXXXX.
Braddock, Thomas E., XXXXXXX.

Burkett, Samuel L., Jr., XXXXXXX.
Carroll, William F., XXXXXXX.
Clark, Robert C., Jr., XXXXXXX.
Curtis, Michael R., XXXXXXX.
Davis, John F., XXXXXXX.
Eberwine, James A., XXXXXXX.
Fields, Robert E., XXXXXXX.
Fletcher, Oliver K., Jr., XXXXXXX.
French, George R., XXXXXXX.
Gilliland, Bobby E., XXXXXXX.
Goodman, Dorris C., XXXX.
Hayes, James H., XXXXXXX.
Heller, Kyle M., XXXXXXX.
Hopkins, Richard L., XXXXXXX.
Hucks, John A., XXXXXXX.
Hudson, James F., XXXXXXX.
Jessen, Gary C., XXXXXXX.
Jones, Donn C., XXXXXXX.
Kelm, Walter H., XXXXXXX.
Kelly, Peter C., XXXXXXX.
Lander, Robert J., XXXXXXX.
Lawson, James L., XXXXXXX.
Litman, Leon H., XXXXXXX.
Locklear, James P., XXXXXXX.
Loring, Douglas M., XXXXX.
McDermott, Frank E., XXXXXXX.
McLeod, William R., XXXXXXX.
McMahon, Robert P., XXXXXXX.
McNulty, William J., Jr., XXXXXXX.
Merritt, Thomas E., XXXXXXX.
Murphy, Joseph H., Jr., XXXXXXX.
Murphy, Robert J., XXXXXXX.
Pacheco, Miguel, XXXXXXX.
Picha, Norbert O., XXXXXXX.
Powell, Harold W., XXXXXXX.
Rockwell, John H., XXXXXXX.
Rumley, Richard E., XXXXXXX.
Scanlan, William H., XXXXXXX.
Silvas, Manuel M., XXXXXXX.
Sorem, David N., XXXXXXX.
Stavish, Peter J., XXXXXXX.
Tilmon, George W., Jr., XXXXXXX.
Vann, Lawrence K., XXXXXXX.
Walls, Neal H., XXXXXXX.
Webb, Charles L., XXXXXXX.
Wilburn, James H., XXXXXXX.
Wood, Malcolm H., Jr., XXXXXXX.
Wunder, William H., XXXXXXX.

To be second lieutenants, Women's Army Corps

Caldwell, Doris L., XXXXXXX.
Hallman, Jane L., XXXXXXX.
Lipner, Lois, XXXXXXX.
Nelson, Nancy L., XXXXXXX.
Phillips, Charlotte E., XXXXXXX.
Thornton, Dorothy J., XXXXXXX.
von Metnitz, Carol, XXXXXXX.

(NOTE.—These officers were appointed, transferred, or promoted during the recess of the Senate.)

IN THE REGULAR AIR FORCE

The following persons who were appointed in the Regular Air Force under recess appointment provisions during the last recess period of the 86th Congress, for appointment in the Regular Air Force in the grades indicated, under the provisions of section 8284, title 10, United States Code, with a view to designation under the provisions of section 8067, title 10, United States Code, to perform the duties indicated, and with dates of rank to be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force:

To be major, USAF (medical)

John S. Flint, XXXXXXX.

To be captain, USAF (medical)

Don T. Mosher.

To be captain, USAF (dental)

Patrick J. Mulligan.

The following persons for appointment in the Regular Air Force in the grades indicated, under section 8284 of title 10, United States Code, with a view to designation under section 8067 of title 10, United States Code, to perform the duties indicated, and with dates of rank to be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force:

To be captain, USAF (medical)

John W. Barrett, [REDACTED]

To be captains, USAF (dental)

William J. Clark, [REDACTED]
 Robert G. Hutfless, [REDACTED]
 Robert C. Johns, [REDACTED]
 Edward W. Rogers, [REDACTED]

To be captains, USAF (chaplain)

Milton H. Allen, [REDACTED]
 Ramon W. Blach, [REDACTED]
 Jefferson E. Davis, Jr., [REDACTED]
 Homer E. Gardiner, [REDACTED]
 Willis H. Newton, Jr., [REDACTED]
 Erwin R. Ray, [REDACTED]
 Neil F. Wolfe, [REDACTED]

To be captains, USAF (judge advocate)

Harold Howell, [REDACTED]
 Robert E. Johnson II, [REDACTED]
 Hilleary D. Moore, [REDACTED]

To be captains, USAF (veterinary)

Jerry Pineg, [REDACTED]
 Norman D. Heidelbaugh, [REDACTED]
 William L. Jones, Jr., [REDACTED]
 Robert M. McCully, [REDACTED]
 Albert D. Wright, [REDACTED]

To be captains, USAF (nurse)

Elvira C. Bakken, [REDACTED]
 Mary C. Warner, [REDACTED]

To be first lieutenants, USAF (medical)

Henry J. Schmitt, Jr., [REDACTED]
 R. J. Black Schultz, [REDACTED]

To be first lieutenants, USAF (dental)

Rufus C. Hargrove, Jr., [REDACTED]
 Wayne T. Harris, Jr., [REDACTED]
 Arthur F. Mello, [REDACTED]

To be first lieutenants, USAF (chaplain)

Alfred J. Abernethy, [REDACTED]
 John J. Benda, [REDACTED]
 William G. Boggs, [REDACTED]
 Newton V. Cole, [REDACTED]
 Arthur L. Eves, [REDACTED]
 James E. Flinn, [REDACTED]
 William D. Franks, [REDACTED]
 Vancil V. Gibson, [REDACTED]
 Leo J. Lyons, [REDACTED]
 Vincent A. Meskenas, [REDACTED]
 Edward E. Shoupe, [REDACTED]
 Rufus G. Smith, [REDACTED]
 James R. Taylor, [REDACTED]
 William J. Vaughn, [REDACTED]

To be first lieutenants, USAF (judge advocate)

Fred L. Bowden, [REDACTED]
 Maurice F. Ellison, Jr., [REDACTED]
 Jerome R. Isenberg, [REDACTED]
 Frank T. Moniz, [REDACTED]
 Roy A. Olson, [REDACTED]
 Julius C. Ullrich, Jr., [REDACTED]
 Joseph N. Wiltgen, [REDACTED]

To be first lieutenants, USAF (veterinary)

Harold W. Casey, [REDACTED]
 Dean E. Ewing, [REDACTED]
 Charles E. Fuller, [REDACTED]
 Lea R. Hutchinson, [REDACTED]
 Charles C. King, Jr., [REDACTED]
 Joe E. West, [REDACTED]

To be first lieutenants, USAF (Medical Service)

James H. Auburn, Jr., [REDACTED]
 Robert A. Bauer, [REDACTED]
 John L. Bluhm, [REDACTED]
 Donald C. Choisser, [REDACTED]
 Horace A. Corley, [REDACTED]
 Phillip H. Darling, Jr., [REDACTED]
 William J. DeMuth, Jr., [REDACTED]
 Charles E. Deramus, Jr., [REDACTED]
 John L. Gildner, [REDACTED]
 Thomas J. Harn, [REDACTED]
 Richard L. Insley, [REDACTED]
 William G. Jacobsen, [REDACTED]
 Marvin E. Kennebeck, Jr., [REDACTED]
 Paul F. Kratzsch, [REDACTED]
 Adolph A. Lindsley, [REDACTED]

Charles W. Martino, [REDACTED]
 Robert T. McIntyre, [REDACTED]
 John P. Meade, [REDACTED]
 Joseph C. Monk, [REDACTED]
 Curtis G. Park, [REDACTED]
 Albert Podkin, [REDACTED]
 Marvin Podkin, [REDACTED]
 Jerry H. Schussele, [REDACTED]
 Daniel H. Seal, [REDACTED]
 Gordon R. Shaw, [REDACTED]
 Jack L. Shelton, [REDACTED]
 John A. Skinner, [REDACTED]
 Marion J. Stansell, [REDACTED]
 Herbert E. Straughn, [REDACTED]
 Bertram D. Targove, [REDACTED]
 Harold O. Walker, Jr., [REDACTED]
 James R. Wedding, [REDACTED]

To be first lieutenants, USAF (nurse)

Josephine M. Candella, [REDACTED]
 Susie A. Florence, [REDACTED]
 Beatrice J. Hale, [REDACTED]
 Frances A. Hamilton, [REDACTED]
 Anna M. Kresaky, [REDACTED]
 Barbara L. Legalle, [REDACTED]
 Ruth A. McMurdo, [REDACTED]
 Elizabeth L. Park, [REDACTED]
 Loretta V. Petersen, [REDACTED]
 Dolores J. Scribner, [REDACTED]
 Carolyn M. Wagner, [REDACTED]

To be first lieutenants, USAF (medical specialist)

Mary F. Golson, [REDACTED]
 Carolyn T. Page, [REDACTED]

To be second lieutenants, USAF (Medical Service)

Gary L. Adams, [REDACTED]
 Rex D. Gaede, [REDACTED]
 John R. Gillis, [REDACTED]
 Wayne P. Kirchoffer, [REDACTED]
 John C. Kuchta, Jr., [REDACTED]
 Donald G. Silva, [REDACTED]
 Robert W. Suter, [REDACTED]

To be second lieutenant, USAF (nurse)

Delia F. Greer, [REDACTED]

The following persons for appointment in the Regular Air Force, in the grade of second lieutenant, under section 8284, of title 10, United States Code, with dates of rank to be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force:

Distinguished aviation cadet graduates

William D. Bryden, Jr., [REDACTED]
 James A. Dewey, [REDACTED]
 Fredric S. Fitzsimmons, [REDACTED]
 Philip W. Handley, [REDACTED]
 Reginald A. Hearn, [REDACTED]
 Robert A. Martin, [REDACTED]
 Richard E. Read, [REDACTED]
 Dwight E. Roach, [REDACTED]
 Ronald L. Selberg, [REDACTED]
 Belford M. Spurlock, [REDACTED]
 Alden R. Starkey, [REDACTED]
 Carl E. Steingrebe, Jr., [REDACTED]
 Joe T. Stockett, [REDACTED]
 Rodney A. Upton, [REDACTED]
 Bruce E. Wilcox, [REDACTED]
 Norman D. Wilson, [REDACTED]

Distinguished officer candidate graduates

Donald P. Bahr, [REDACTED]
 Charlotte M. DeFuy, [REDACTED]
 Harold E. Eaton, [REDACTED]
 Lawrence M. G. Enomoto, [REDACTED]
 Oscar W. Hall, [REDACTED]
 Robert W. Hultslander, [REDACTED]
 Allen J. Montecino, Jr., [REDACTED]
 Thomas E. Straight, [REDACTED]
 John B. Stueve, [REDACTED]
 Harry A. Thomas, Jr., [REDACTED]

Subject to medical qualification and subject to designation as distinguished military graduates, the following distinguished military students of the Air Force Reserve Officers' Training Corps for appointment in the Regular Air Force, in the grade of second lieutenant, under section 8284 of title 10,

United States Code, with dates of rank to be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force:

Harold C. Alger.
 Thomas N. Arnold.
 Albert H. Collins.
 Troy G. Dobbins.
 Gerald L. Fuller.
 Wingate A. Jackson III, [REDACTED]
 William D. Jones, Jr., [REDACTED]
 Leon B. Newman.
 Charles L. Rackley, [REDACTED]

IN THE AIR FORCE

Lt. Gen. Manuel J. Asensio, [REDACTED] (major general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force, to be placed on the retired list in the grade of lieutenant general, under the provisions of section 8962, title 10, of the United States Code.

The following officers to be assigned to positions of importance and responsibility designated by the President in the rank of lieutenant general, under the provisions of section 8066, title 10, of the United States Code.

Maj. Gen. Jacob E. Smart, [REDACTED], Regular Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Joseph F. Carroll, [REDACTED] (brigadier general, Regular Air Force), U.S. Air Force.

IN THE NAVY

Having designated, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, second 5231, the following named officer for commands and other duties determined by the President to be within the contemplation of said section, I nominate him for appointment to the grade of admiral while so serving:

Vice Adm. Harold P. Smith, U.S. Navy.

The following named officers for appointment to the grade of admiral on the retired list pursuant to title 10, United States Code, section 5233:

Adm. Jerauld Wright, U.S. Navy.

Adm. Walter F. Boone, U.S. Navy.

The following named officers for appointment to the grade of vice admiral on the retired list in accordance with title 10, United States Code, section 5233:

Vice Adm. William V. Davis, Jr., U.S. Navy.

Vice Adm. William G. Cooper, U.S. Navy.

Having designated, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 5231, the following officers for commands and other duties determined by the President to be within the contemplation of said section, I nominate them for appointment to the grade of vice admiral while so serving:

Rear Adm. Charles D. Griffin, U.S. Navy.

Rear Adm. Fitzhugh Lee, U.S. Navy.

Rear Adm. John S. Thach, U.S. Navy.

*Vice Adm. William R. Smedberg III, U.S. Navy, to be Chief of the Bureau of Naval Personnel in the Department of the Navy for a term of 4 years.

Having designated, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 5231, the following named officers for commands and other duties determined by the President to be within the contemplation of said section, I nominate them for appointment to the grade of vice admiral while so serving:

*Rear Adm. Edmund B. Taylor, U.S. Navy.

*Rear Adm. Harold T. Deutermann, U.S. Navy.

The following named officers of the Navy for permanent promotion to the grade of rear admiral:

Line

Ephraim P. Holmes	James M. Farrin, Jr.
John T. Hayward	George H. Wales
Vernon L. Lowrance	Edward J. O'Donnell
Charles C. Kirkpatrick	Andrew M. Jackson,
Alfred G. Ward	Jr.

*Indicates ad interim appointment issued.

Kleber S. Masterson
Marshall E. Dornin
Robert L. Moore, Jr.
Frank L. Johnson
Lot Ensey
Denys W. Knoll
John W. Alles, III
Robert J. Stroh
James W. Davis
Paul P. Blackburn, Jr.
Joseph C. Clifton
Allan L. Reed
Ernest C. Holtzworth
Ray C. Needham
Robert M. Reynolds

Medical Corps

James L. Holland
Cecil L. Andrews

Supply Corps

Howard F. Kuehl
Joseph M. Lyle
James S. Dietz

Civil Engineer Corps

Eugene J. Peltier
Henry G. Clark
Norman J. Drustrup
James R. Davis

The following-named officers of the Naval Reserve for temporary promotion to the grade of rear admiral subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Line

William T. Alexander
Leroy J. Alexanderson
*Grant G. Calhoun
*Louis A. Gillies
Wharton E. Larned

Supply Corps

*Levi J. Roberts

Civil Engineer Corps

Edward Denbo

The following-named officers of the Naval Reserve for permanent promotion to the grade of rear admiral:

Line

Alvan Fisher
Herman Reich
John E. Harlin
Arthur A. de la Hous-
saye
John W. McElroy
Richard O. Patterson
Victor Hicks

Medical Corps

Joseph S. Barr
William L. Rogers
Francis J. Braceland
Robert A. Ross
Wendell G. Scott

Chaplain Corps

William E. Collins

Civil Engineer Corps

Edwin N. Blackwood

Dental Corps

William M. Burns

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for permanent appointment to the grade of major general:

Alan Shapley
Robert B. Luckey
Arthur F. Binney
Thomas G. Ennis
Carlson A. Roberts
James P. Berkeley
Donald M. Weller
Wallace M. Greene, Jr.
Charles H. Hayes

*Maj. Gen. Chester R. Allen, U.S. Marine Corps, to be quartermaster general of the Marine Corps, with the rank of major general, for a period of 4 years from the 1st day of January 1960.

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for permanent appointment to the grade of brigadier general:

Alpha L. Bowser
Harvey C. Tschirgi
Avery R. Kier
Sidney S. Wade
James M. Masters, Sr.
Ralph K. Rottet
Samuel R. Shaw
John P. Condon
Frank C. Tharin
Robert E. Cushman, Jr.
Richard G. Weede
Lewis J. Fields
Leonard F. Chapman, Jr.
Paul R. Tyler

*Indicates ad interim appointment issued.

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps Reserve for permanent appointment to the grade of brigadier general:

James E. Howarth, Jr.

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps Reserve for temporary appointment to the grade of major general:

*William W. Stickney

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps Reserve for temporary appointment to the grade of brigadier general:

*Charles H. Cox
*George E. Tomlinson
*Harry R. Van Liew
*John L. Winston
*Charles O. Clark
*William H. Klenke, Jr.
*Harry N. Lyon

POSTMASTERS

The following named persons to be postmasters:

ALABAMA

Virgil B. Huff, Brundridge, Ala., in place of V. B. Huff, transferred.
C. Burley Finch, Detroit, Ala., in place of Flora Ballard, retired.
Jimmy R. McWhirter, Dolomite, Ala., in place of Gladys Reeves, retired.
Mabron L. Compton, Elkmont, Ala., in place of W. S. Morris, removed.
J. Fred Wilcutt, Falkville, Ala., in place of A. K. B. Patterson, retired.
John D. Lassiter, Hartford, Ala., in place of M. F. Ward, retired.
Hugh F. Penn, Hartselle, Ala., in place of J. T. Cooper, retired.
Mary D. Putnam, Lexington, Ala., in place of A. M. Campbell, removed.
Joe A. Hamilton, McCalla, Ala., in place of N. T. Waldrup, retired.
Ramon N. Days, Sr., Magazine, Ala., in place of Zada Davis, resigned.
Eugene Williamson, Orrville, Ala., in place of H. E. Marshall, retired.
Thomas O. Rudder, Stevenson, Ala., in place of E. O. Mann, retired.
Albert T. Tucker, Sweet Water, Ala., in place of W. F. Beverly, retired.
J. Carson Whitson, Talladega, Ala., in place of B. B. Hardegree, resigned.
Jessie W. Hagood, Town Creek, Ala., in place of J. W. Davis, transferred.
Charles F. Brantley, Troy, Ala., in place of L. J. Ledbetter, transferred.
Doctor F. Gibson, Wadley, Ala., in place of M. M. Pearson, retired.
Samuel W. Carpenter, Jr., Wedowee, Ala., in place of J. F. Wilson, retired.

ALASKA

Virginia L. Simonds, Annette, Alaska, in place of G. A. Cobb, resigned.
Alice P. Harris, McGrath, Alaska, in place of O. S. Felmley, resigned.
Norma I. King, McKinley Park, Alaska, in place of Elvira Hehr, resigned.
Hardy A. Peters, Tanana, Alaska, in place of W. H. Thompson, resigned.

ARIZONA

Jack Meeker, Coolidge, Ariz., in place of F. E. Morris, deceased.
Agnes M. Young, Dateland, Ariz., in place of J. M. Collins, resigned.
Paul E. Violette, Miami, Ariz., in place of H. P. Williams, retired.

ARKANSAS

William McKinley Huddleston, Batesville, Ark., in place of E. F. Crutchfield, transferred.
Ernest E. Castleberry, Bono, Ark., in place of O. E. Wyatt, retired.
Cline C. Pile, Charleston, Ark., in place of C. W. Spiller, retired.
Devoe Bollinger, Jr., Horatio, Ark., in place of A. T. Cowden, retired.
Oscar H. McKamey, Jr., Imboden, Ark., in place of J. D. Fortenberry, retired.
Wilburn Gale Hanna, Luxora, Ark., in place of F. R. Rogers, transferred.

*Indicates ad interim appointment issued.

Ruby R. Ryan, Magazine, Ark., in place of G. O. Thomasson, deceased.
Hubert C. Robbins, Jr., Piggott, Ark., in place of H. M. Jinks, resigned.
Jake M. Dunn, Pocahtontas, Ark., in place of Myrt Walrond, retired.

CALIFORNIA

William G. Moore, Atascadero, Calif., in place of G. N. Southwick, retired.
Florabelle Rominger, Bangor, Calif., in place of V. H. Conger, deceased.
Richard J. Williamson, Camino, Calif., in place of A. B. Peirsol, resigned.
Ruth H. Burkett, Cedar Glen, Calif., in place of B. B. Malcom, retired.
Gay Nell V. Mentzer, Coulterville, Calif., in place of V. E. Sackett, retired.
Paul A. Helms, Culver City, Calif., in place of P. H. Jarrett, retired.
Laurence D. King, Del Mar, Calif., in place of M. A. Kibler, retired.
Helen M. Lowey, Downleville, Calif., in place of J. M. Costa, retired.
William F. Evans, Ducor, Calif., in place of M. L. Stewart, retired.
Leslie V. Sims, Fallbrook, Calif., in place of J. L. Sims, retired.
Donald F. Cox, Hollister, Calif., in place of R. A. Hubbell, retired.
Lulu Ellen Spradlin, Homeland, Calif., office established December 16, 1949.
Shirley J. McLean, Keene, Calif., in place of C. E. Wilson, transferred.
Eva C. Edwards, Littlerock, Calif., in place of M. A. Wallace, resigned.
Walter T. Robinson, Mariposa, Calif., in place of W. C. Quigley, retired.
Harold E. Purpus, Millbrae, Calif., in place of J. H. Meyer, retired.
John A. Black, McClellan Air Force Base, Calif., in place of L. F. Barksdale, retired.
James W. Thoms, Mojave, Calif., in place of B. T. Finnin, retired.
Merritt L. Carroll, Montgomery Creek, Calif., in place of Phoebe Vickroy, retired.
Minnie P. Lynn, Rio Oso, Calif., in place of J. E. Butler, resigned.
Ray E. Taylor, Roseville, Calif., in place of R. A. Bates, retired.
Jewel D. McQuaid, San Ardo, Calif., in place of M. F. Flucker, deceased.
Nancy M. Baranger, Santa Fe Springs, Calif., office established September 1, 1958.
Vera V. Wood, Smartville, Calif., in place of L. W. Colling, deceased.
Carol B. Gamble, Suisun City, Calif., in place of M. R. Wolfskill, retired.
Ralph B. Gump, Tarzana, Calif., in place of D. M. Benedict, retired.
Robert W. Dixon, Thornton, Calif., in place of J. E. Hambleton, retired.

COLORADO

Howard W. Cross, Grand Junction, Colo., in place of R. T. Ellington, retired.
Harold W. Best, Larkspur, Colo., in place of J. U. Mixer, deceased.

CONNECTICUT

Philo J. Perham, Amston, Conn., in place of S. G. Turshen, deceased.
William B. Blackman, Brookfield, Conn., in place of V. C. Geddes, resigned.
Sarah B. Friedman, Colchester, Conn., in place of J. J. Shea, retired.
Jared A. Pratt, Jr., Essex, Conn., in place of P. D. Guptill, deceased.
Peter Perun, Middlefield, Conn., in place of R. A. Chadsey, resigned.
Salvatore J. Puglisi, Middletown, Conn., in place of R. J. Wamester, deceased.
Herbert R. Trolle, Springdale, Conn., in place of J. H. Fahey, retired.
Peter A. Koops, Thomaston, Conn., in place of M. T. Doyle, retired.
Doris M. Madden, Vernon, Conn., in place of F. L. Foley, resigned.
Donald C. MacDonell, Washington Depot, Conn., in place of J. F. Connerty, retired.
Arthur Manzi, Woodbury, Conn., in place of P. F. Cassidy, removed.

DELAWARE

Martha E. Armstrong, Cheswold, Del., in place of M. W. Vaughn, Sr., transferred.
 Martin M. Williams, Kenton, Del., in place of H. W. Pratt, deceased.

FLORIDA

Stewart H. Hawkins, Anna Maria, Fla., in place of F. I. Warttig, retired.
 George C. Coker, Bartow, Fla., in place of L. C. Olive, retired.
 Harlow J. Schutt, Boynton Beach, Fla., in place of E. S. Pierce, retired.
 Robert T. Arnold, Brandon, Fla., in place of R. A. McIntosh, retired.
 Robert K. Tillman, Bushnell, Fla., in place of W. T. Eddins, retired.
 Jay R. Shattuck, Deerfield Beach, Fla., in place of E. V. Morrow, resigned.
 Johnny V. Boling, Eglin Air Force Base, Fla., office established January 1, 1958.
 James F. Rylant, Fernandina Beach, Fla., in place of Louis Goldstein, retired.
 Marion M. Woolley, Fort Walton Beach, Fla., in place of H. T. Stewart, resigned.
 Huber C. Hurst, Jacksonville, Fla., in place of G. C. Blume, deceased.
 Charles T. Perry, Maitland, Fla., in place of J. T. Stover, retired.
 Arthur R. Van Valkenburg, Pinellas Park, Fla., in place of M. M. Stevenson, retired.
 Lorence E. Brandon, Saint Petersburg, Fla., in place of W. H. Bowes, resigned.
 Gordon J. Burris, Sebring, Fla., in place of R. N. Durrance, retired.
 Joseph William Penrod, Stuart, Fla., in place of R. W. Hartman, retired.
 Edward S. Raymond, Venice, Fla., in place of R. E. Shallberg, retired.

GEORGIA

Manor B. Folsom, Jr., Barney, Ga., in place of C. R. Lanneau, transferred.
 Larree Johnston, Cartersville, Ga., in place of J. C. Nelson, retired.
 Henry R. Taylor, Cumming, Ga., in place of W. P. Hughes, retired.
 Henry R. Bennett, Darien, Ga., in place of R. H. Manson, retired.
 John F. Craft, Doerun, Ga., in place of L. J. McPhaul, deceased.
 Horace J. Healan, Hoschton, Ga., in place of J. P. Pirkle, retired.
 Wilfred W. Rivers, Jr., Leesburg, Ga., in place of R. C. Harris, deceased.
 Pauline T. King, Sea Island, Ga., in place of M. D. Cate, retired.
 Robert L. White, Trenton, Ga., in place of E. L. Raulston, retired.

IDAHO

Albert W. Miller, Gooding, Idaho, in place of M. H. Shotwell, retired.
 Wayne S. Shaeffer, Nezperce, Idaho, in place of R. L. Anstine, retired.

ILLINOIS

Arlynn M. Price, Abingdon, Ill., in place of J. W. Lucas, resigned.
 Clarence P. Siebert, Aledo, Ill., in place of C. D. Lawson, retired.
 John W. Dehmlow, Algonquin, Ill., in place of M. W. Struwing, removed.
 Rex H. Carter, Berwyn, Ill., in place of J. J. A. Borkovec, retired.
 Ethel F. Hierman, Bluffs, Ill., in place of T. B. Meehan, removed.
 Glenn E. Jones, Bulpitt, Ill., in place of M. N. Ceyte, deceased.
 Robert V. Loft, Capron, Ill., in place of M. M. Boyd, removed.
 Delbert H. Pittman, Cisne, Ill., in place of Gordon Perry, retired.
 Christian M. Willman, Jr., Deerfield, Ill., in place of J. J. Welch, retired.
 Carl S. Yates, Divernon, Ill., in place of J. W. Rettberg, retired.
 Irma L. Dodds, Eola, Ill., in place of G. L. Dodds, transferred.
 Clarence B. O'Marah, Eureka, Ill., in place of R. E. Duncan, resigned.

Ernie R. Rightmyer, Fairfield, Ill., in place of J. C. Stanley, removed.
 Milton L. Farney, Forrest, Ill., in place of H. O. Franklin, retired.
 Robert M. Maller, Geneva, Ill., in place of A. N. Modaff, resigned.
 Kenneth L. Pfium, Genoa, Ill., in place of J. R. Sester, removed.
 Loren C. Bowman, Greenup, Ill., in place of R. A. Carrell, retired.
 Viola Kinman, Hamburg, Ill., in place of E. F. Day, retired.
 Albert C. Marchi, Hines, Ill., in place of H. M. Gerhard, retired.
 Richard R. Michelsen, Huntley, Ill., in place of W. L. Donahue, transferred.
 John L. Knight, McLeansboro, Ill., in place of M. L. Hunt, retired.
 Harry R. Johnson, Madison, Ill., in place of R. O. Johns, retired.
 Ellen M. Manuel, Mansfield, Ill., in place of W. H. House, declined.
 Albert L. Edwards, Marshall, Ill., in place of Leroy McNary, retired.
 Charles H. White, Media, Ill., in place of R. E. Sullivan, deceased.
 Frank D. Talley, Mount Carmel, Ill., in place of Fay Moyer, removed.
 Clyde H. Steffee, Mundelein, Ill., in place of C. E. Teson, retired.
 Cecil Moore, New Canton, Ill., in place of C. T. Gilbert, retired.
 Joseph A. Gossett, Norris City, Ill., in place of W. S. Smith, retired.
 Robert F. Baker, Oakwood, Ill., in place of E. R. Chestnut, resigned.
 Raymond C. Foley, Paris, Ill., in place of Grady O'Hair, deceased.
 John Craig Templeton, Pinckneyville, Ill., in place of T. A. Denton, transferred.
 Raymond R. Yahnke, Plainfield, Ill., in place of L. V. Keeley, deceased.
 Gerald W. Sears, Plano, Ill., in place of I. W. Nelson, retired.
 Benton Pullen, Princeville, Ill., in place of R. P. Callery, deceased.
 Joe M. Stoddard, Ramsey, Ill., in place of O. W. Hinton, removed.
 Robert L. Kupferschmid, Rankin, Ill., in place of G. H. Sloan, transferred.
 James A. Blender, Raritan, Ill., in place of F. E. Overstreet, declined.
 Leonard E. Kaffenberger, Red Bud, Ill., in place of A. H. Brandt, retired.
 Frank G. Brown, Salem, Ill., in place of C. H. Roberts, transferred.
 Arthur M. Mulford, San Jose, Ill., in place of F. E. Smith, retired.
 Leonard A. Graham, Shobonier, Ill., in place of O. W. Morell, transferred.
 Chester C. Heindel, Stockton, Ill., in place of F. C. Niemeyer, deceased.
 Lester Lippincott, Sullivan, Ill., in place of G. C. Miller, retired.
 Howard M. Welsh, Taylorville, Ill., in place of S. W. Hershey, deceased.
 Charles W. Weaver, Tennessee, Ill., in place of B. P. Hodges, retired.
 Wendell C. Kepner, Warren, Ill., in place of V. C. McGinnis, retired.
 Walter E. Rose, Windsor, Ill., in place of D. M. Wallace, resigned.
 Paul H. Eberle, Wonder Lake, Ill., in place of Arthur Hay, removed.

INDIANA

Hayward A. Claybaugh, Argos, Ind., in place of N. D. Thompson, retired.
 Wilfred M. Bedel, Batesville, Ind., in place of C. H. Andres, deceased.
 Harry R. Shidaker, Bremen, Ind., in place of H. G. Carblener, retired.
 Robert E. McKain, Carthage, Ind., in place of J. E. Porter, removed.
 Arthur R. Wilkerson, Commiskey, Ind., in place of Fred Corbin, Jr., resigned.
 Harold E. Newberg, Donaldson, Ind., in place of C. C. Garrison, retired.
 Lloyd Goodwin, Edwardsport, Ind., in place of M. F. Shepard, retired.

Jack S. Brown, Hillsdale, Ind., in place of L. J. Britton, deceased.
 Philip Earl Buecher, Jasper, Ind., in place of Albert Rumbach, deceased.
 Vernie J. Wright, La Crosse, Ind., in place of C. D. Watson, retired.
 J. George Bascom, Lynn, Ind., in place of D. B. Mann, deceased.
 Norval W. Chamness, Marshall, Ind., in place of H. E. Delp, retired.
 Harold H. Scott, Monterey, Ind., in place of C. A. Good, retired.
 Harry E. Fields, Norman, Ind., in place of C. M. Bowman, retired.
 H. Earl Himes, North Webster, Ind., in place of R. A. Richwine, retired.
 Charles E. Inks, Plymouth, Ind., in place of Jesse Yoder, retired.
 Paul Burns, Oakland City, Ind., in place of T. J. Lemasters, retired.
 Vita J. Hutchison, Oakville, Ind., in place of B. E. Garrett, removed.
 Mary L. Butler, Pershing, Ind., in place of C. E. Rodenberg, deceased.
 Jack V. Porter, Roachdale, Ind., in place of W. E. Etcheson, retired.
 Geraldine Z. Marsteller, Russellville, Ind., in place of I. C. Bain, deceased.
 Lynn A. West, Scottsburg, Ind., in place of Avis Carille, retired.
 Ernest D. Chambers, Springport, Ind., in place of W. C. Bunner, deceased.
 Warren W. Robinson, Tippecanoe, Ind., in place of A. B. Rhodes, retired.
 J. Howard Hetzler, Wabash, Ind., in place of A. E. Reynolds, deceased.
 Charles E. Carey, Whitestown, Ind., in place of E. M. Miller, retired.
 Lowell W. Rush, Windfall, Ind., in place of M. E. Martin, transferred.

IOWA

Donald E. Trees, Armstrong, Iowa, in place of M. E. Daries, removed.
 Norman P. Nelson, Britt, Iowa, in place of J. M. Townsend, retired.
 Dick W. McCauley, Carlisle, Iowa, in place of O. K. Owens, transferred.
 David H. Crenshaw, Des Moines, Iowa, in place of E. M. Johnson, removed.
 Kenneth F. Halverson, Fenton, Iowa, in place of J. A. Schwartz, retired.
 Russell R. McLarty, Kingsley, Iowa, in place of F. J. Spain, deceased.
 Gloria L. Pool, McCausland, Iowa, in place of Arline Darland, resigned.
 Kenneth A. Jensen, Massena, Iowa, in place of T. D. Casey, transferred.
 Lewis F. Paisley, Sherrill, Iowa, in place of A. G. Haberkorn, deceased.
 Oliver H. Wisgerhof, Sully, Iowa, in place of Harry De Jong, retired.
 Willard E. Leiran, Waterville, Iowa, in place of M. A. Slattery, retired.
 Elijah L. Simpson, Wesley, Iowa, in place of H. H. Gerdes, retired.

KANSAS

Boyd W. Ensley, Cambridge, Kans., in place of H. K. Lundy, retired.
 William S. Stevenson, Clay Center, Kans., in place of S. V. Hemphill, deceased.
 Clarence H. Lang, Cuba, Kans., in place of M. F. Jehlik, retired.
 William D. French, Eureka, Kans., in place of R. L. Marlin, resigned.
 Delmar F. Loe, Glasco, Kans., in place of C. E. Brown, transferred.
 Roland I. Kraft, Lecompton, Kans., in place of L. W. Crady, deceased.
 Lorn R. Lahey, Sr., McCune, Kans., in place of C. E. Mansfield, retired.
 Howard J. Chambers, Minneapolis, Kans., in place of L. E. Harvey, retired.
 Lois A. Mitchell, Rose Hill, Kans., in place of R. B. Dunlap, retired.
 Gottfried W. Staub, Jr., Saint John, Kans., in place of M. M. John, Jr., transferred.
 Donald L. Long, Sylvia, Kans., in place of Victor Gibson, retired.

Lloyd W. Barker, Valley Falls, Kans., in place of Clayton Wyatt, retired.
Thomas B. Standard, Winona, Kans., in place of A. F. Goebel, retired.

KENTUCKY

Freeman Fitch, Ashland, Ky., in place of H. D. Shanklin, retired.
Sally M. Conniff, Clermont, Ky., in place of C. B. Riley, retired.
William E. Wilson, Columbia, Ky., in place of Ray Flowers, retired.
Irene M. Mullins, Cromona, Ky., in place of Esther Branham, deceased.
James S. Hinton, Jr., Flemingsburg, Ky., in place of Gilbert Adams, retired.
Edwin P. M. Hamby, Fort Campbell, Ky., Office established June 1, 1959.
James H. Easterling, Grayson, Ky., in place of W. L. Horton, removed.
Ada Lee Davis, Hardyville, Ky., in place of Donald McDonald, transferred.
William D. Gorman, Hazard, Ky., in place of A. M. Moore, retired.
M. Elvadine Riggs, Loretto, Ky., in place of M. H. Buckler, retired.
William B. Mathews, Maysville, Ky., in place of N. M. Hargett, removed.
William H. Smith, Owenton, Ky., in place of H. C. Thomas, transferred.
Smith C. Ledford, Paint Lick, Ky., in place of K. L. Walker, retired.
Jean C. Hall, Viper, Ky., in place of M. H. Brashear, retired.
Amanda N. Blackford, Wilmore, Ky., in place of C. W. Mitchell, retired.
Paul R. Simmons, Worthville, Ky., in place of Nellie Clubb, retired.

LOUISIANA

John T. Baldwin, Jr., Bernice, La., in place of M. M. Baldwin, retired.
Bobby Ray Holley, Dubberly, La., in place of Joe Butler, transferred.
Everett Hill, Pitkin, La., in place of C. W. Carson, retired.
Herman P. Louque, Paulina, La., in place of P. B. Cambre, deceased.

MAINE

Karl T. Spruce, Bradley, Maine, in place of A. F. Barton, retired.
Pauline L. Sawyer, Cambridge, Maine, in place of R. C. Whitney, retired.
Katherine I. Bowden, Castine, Maine, in place of C. W. Richardson, Jr., retired.
Eugene P. Duran, East Corinth, Maine, in place of G. L. Hawes, retired.
Hartley O. Nelson, New Sweden, Maine, in place of W. W. Anderson, retired.
Robert C. Fisher, Oakfield, Maine, in place of G. M. Sullivan, deceased.
Louis W. Bowden, Orrington, Maine, in place of E. A. Spencer, deceased.
Philip G. Lewis, Rumford, Maine, in place of M. B. Manson, deceased.
Edward T. White, Vinalhaven, Maine, in place of O. V. Drew, retired.

MARYLAND

G. Carlton Powell, Berlin, Md., in place of G. E. Boston, retired.
Raymond C. Strine, New Windsor, Md., in place of W. D. Lovell, Jr., retired.
Ethel M. Grover, Solomons, Md., in place of G. W. Condiff, retired.

MASSACHUSETTS

A. Eugene Feio, Central Village, Mass., in place of C. M. Brackett, retired.
Hugo A. Taglieri, Haverhill, Mass., in place of R. V. McNamara, retired.
Edward B. Walker, Millbrook, Mass., in place of L. A. Freeman, retired.
Alice F. Donovan, Pinehurst, Mass., in place of W. F. Eggo, retired.
Joseph H. Boucher, South Carver, Mass., in place of L. W. Jenney, retired.
William H. Evans, Webster, Mass., in place of Alexander Wylie, retired.

MICHIGAN

Milton R. Hein, Ada, Mich., in place of T. M. Lampert, retired.
Budd A. Goodwin, Adrian, Mich., in place of P. F. Frownfelder, retired.
Aubert D. Cox, Battle Creek, Mich., in place of J. O. Curry, retired.
Kenneth S. King, Cassopolis, Mich., in place of O. J. Breece, retired.
Harriet E. Burditt, Cement City, Mich., in place of L. M. Taggart, removed.
Byron B. Borgman, Conklin, Mich., in place of H. D. Harrison, retired.
Morris E. Parish, Coopersville, Mich., in place of R. A. McLeilan, resigned.
Otis E. Howe, Decatur, Mich., in place of H. H. Creagan, removed.
A. Ray Krider, East Lansing, Mich., office reestablished February 1, 1955.
William R. Brazell, Fair Haven, Mich., in place of V. M. Meyer, retired.
Louis Gee, Farwell, Mich., in place of J. R. Littlefield, retired.
Charles H. Pratt, Flint, Mich., in place of W. O. Kelly, resigned.
Paul Richard Conklin, Fremont, Mich., in place of J. E. Davis, retired.
Winifred M. Buss, Galesburg, Mich., in place of J. C. Lane, resigned.
Oscar A. Ohman, Gladstone, Mich., in place of B. M. Micks, retired.
Sayre H. Ostrander, Grand Marais, Mich., in place of E. L. Mulligan, retired.
James Patejdi, Harbert, Mich., in place of O. W. Tornquist, retired.
Otto Klein, Jr., Harrisville, Mich., in place of C. F. Riebow, deceased.
Kenneth E. Scripsma, Holland, Mich., in place of Harry Kramer, retired.
Shirley E. Thorne, Horton, Mich., in place of Velma Strat, retired.
Urho J. Koski, Houghton, Mich., in place of J. C. Healy, removed.
Frederick J. Goossen, Houghton Lake, Mich., in place of W. K. Peters, resigned.
Selden W. von der Hoff, Interlochen, Mich., in place of R. J. Buller, retired.
Edwin L. Gillespie, Jr., Jonesville, Mich., in place of B. A. Dobson, retired.
John W. Van Eck, Kalamazoo, Mich., in place of Walter Schanz, removed.
Frederick E. Reyer, Marshall, Mich., in place of M. C. Kibler, deceased.
Robert H. Gorsline, Milford, Mich., in place of V. E. Boyle, removed.
Georgia E. Larsen, Nawaygo, Mich., in place of C. C. Larsen, Jr., deceased.
Leo G. Smith, Newberry, Mich., in place of Joseph Villemure, retired.
Carl T. Redding, North Adams, Mich., in place of B. F. Taylor, retired.
Richard E. Jackson, Palmyra, Mich., in place of A. C. Johnston, transferred.
Robert C. Miller, Pontiac, Mich., in place of G. L. Stockwell, retired.
Frank E. Rodman, Quinnesec, Mich., in place of Emery Massie, retired.
Cecil L. Erfourth, Rudyard, Mich., in place of P. C. Carr, retired.
Erwin H. Kubath, St. Joseph, Mich., in place of E. M. Evans, retired.
Charlena Shaver, Silverwood, Mich., in place of L. P. Temple, deceased.
Addison L. Pauley, Tuscola, Mich., in place of H. M. Aldrich, resigned.
Harold J. Hawkins, Wayland, Mich., in place of M. R. Ehle, removed.
Robert W. Curtice, Wells, Mich., in place of V. C. White, removed.

MINNESOTA

W. Stanley Sevaldson, Albert Lea, Minn., in place of H. C. Day, retired.
Raymond R. McAloney, Breckenridge, Minn., in place of L. L. Drey, retired.
Marvin E. Michelson, Buffalo Lake, Minn., in place of J. G. Williams, transferred.
Donna J. Gross, Calumet, Minn., in place of P. F. Preice, retired.

Marion G. Berge, Castle Rock, Minn., in place of D. W. Burton, deceased.
John P. De Greeff, Chandler, Minn., in place of C. C. Moret, retired.
Clarence M. Whiting, Clitherall, Minn., in place of H. V. Nelson, transferred.
Mildred E. Mester, Coleraine, Minn., in place of W. L. Franti, deceased.
Donald C. Carrigan, Cosmos, Minn., in place of D. W. Anderson, transferred.
William E. Kieren, Gilbert, Minn., in place of Herman Frajola, retired.
Leslie M. Olson, Hartland, Minn., in place of I. C. Stensrud, retired.
Herbert P. Venske, Howard Lake, Minn., in place of F. C. Larson, retired.
Leo J. Redig, Ivanhoe, Minn., in place of J. L. Gilson, retired.
Charles H. Bordwell, Keewatin, Minn., in place of O. A. Olson, retired.
Richard C. Zimmerman, Kent, Minn., in place of L. C. Clark, transferred.
Herbert F. Zelmer, Kilkenny, Minn., in place of Alice Gillespie, retired.
Hardin H. Kinder, Lynd, Minn., in place of A. H. Roloff, retired.
Frank M. Thompson, Maynard, Minn., in place of W. L. Huber, retired.
Harry E. Maki, Menahga, Minn., in place of A. P. Nunn, retired.
Harry A. Smith, Mound, Minn., in place of R. E. O'Donnell, deceased.
Everett M. Viltala, Mountain Iron, Minn., in place of H. H. Schur, resigned.
Carmen J. Curtis, Noyes, Minn., in place of A. A. Rustad, retired.
William Vedders, Jr., Pease, Minn., in place of F. R. Greenfield, deceased.
Charles T. Trane, Pelican Rapids, Minn., in place of H. N. Halvorson, retired.
Conrad J. Christie, Royalton, Minn., in place of H. L. Fisher, transferred.
Robert L. Penne, Saint James, Minn., in place of C. J. Strom, resigned.
Lawrence E. Hanson, Santiago, Minn., in place of G. M. Wold, resigned.
Sherman A. Granberg, Scandia, Minn., in place of E. M. Hawkinson, resigned.
Eino R. Latvala, Tamarack, Minn., in place of D. W. Brekke, transferred.
Howard K. Uhren, Vining, Minn., in place of P. A. Nyberg, transferred.
Henry J. Maertens, Wabasso, Minn., in place of T. C. Franta, resigned.
Earle Henry Welty, Winona, Minn., in place of C. B. Erwin, retired.
Dennis H. Kilmartin, Zimmerman, Minn., in place of S. E. Jones, retired.

MISSISSIPPI

Sam L. Mansell, Camden, Miss., in place of R. W. Castens, deceased.
Thomas H. Buford, Holly Springs, Miss., in place of H. H. Orr, retired.
Norman J. Stockstill, Picayune, Miss., in place of T. R. Pearson, retired.
Edgar I. Adcock, Ridgeland, Miss., in place of B. D. Battley, resigned.
Levi C. Jenkins, Jr., Sallis, Miss., in place of H. A. Robertson, deceased.
Fabian S. Clark, Ripley, Miss., in place of H. A. Smith, transferred.
James C. Wiggins, Sidon, Miss., in place of O. L. McMath, retired.
Frank L. Middleton, Woodland, Miss., in place of Bessie Abernethy, retired.

MISSOURI

Forrest H. Forderhase, Berger, Mo., in place of H. C. W. Strothmann, deceased.
Robert C. Greenwood, Brunswick, Mo., in place of A. J. Clayton, retired.
Gordon A. Rollins, Carthage, Mo., in place of C. O. Smith, removed.
Wanda P. Wilson, Malta Bend, Mo., in place of E. S. Spencer, deceased.
Norman E. Paul, Chilhowee, Mo., in place of L. H. English, retired.
David C. Baumann, Huntsville, Mo., in place of C. E. Burkhart, transferred.

Jeffrey P. Hillelson, Kansas City, Mo., in place of A. F. Sachs, retired.
 Willard R. Mohns, Lee's Summit, Mo., in place of J. F. Stevenson, retired.
 Harold F. Courtois, Mineral Point, Mo., in place of P. C. Walton, retired.
 John W. Aufder Heide, Owensville, Mo., in place of E. E. Smith, retired.
 William H. Lea, Steelville, Mo., in place of J. D. Marsh, deceased.
 Wilbert Haux, Sturgeon, Mo., in place of F. F. Hulett, retired.
 Harold E. Williams, Waynesville, Mo., in place of V. V. Long, retired.
 Leroy A. Vanzandt, Washburn, Mo., in place of G. B. Windes, retired.
 Loyd V. Howell, Wyaconda, Mo., in place of E. W. Kurtz, retired.

MONTANA

Kenneth M. Hall, Bainville, Mont., in place of A. C. Coulston, deceased.
 Leonard E. Eriksen, Hungry Horse, Mont., in place of H. D. Howell, resigned.
 Phyllis A. Lea, Inverness, Mont., in place of E. M. Shults, deceased.
 Sherman S. Cook, Jr., Lincoln, Mont., in place of Elsie Didriksen, retired.
 Lee M. Enochson, Medicine Lake, Mont., in place of N. P. Miller, retired.

NEBRASKA

Warren W. McBride, Archer, Nebr., in place of W. P. Hansen, retired.
 Raymond W. Pettinger, Burchard, Nebr., in place of E. J. Pepperl, transferred.
 Dale W. Farmer, Callaway, Nebr., in place of C. B. Bengier, retired.
 Marvin J. Capoun, Dwight, Nebr., in place of J. H. Novacek, resigned.
 Carl J. Mann, Hoskins, Nebr., in place of G. E. Fletcher, deceased.
 Lora B. McQuay, Keystone, Nebr., in place of L. L. McQuay, resigned.
 Marie A. Bodzek, Linwood, Nebr., in place of P. F. Thomas, retired.
 Harry A. Simmon, Miller, Nebr., in place of W. B. Brown, transferred.
 Kenneth L. Mussman, Omaha, Nebr., in place of F. C. Slickman, retired.
 M. Ruth Shaver, Primrose, Nebr., in place of V. J. King, retired.
 Helen M. Ilg, Raymond, Nebr., in place of J. E. Schulling, retired.
 C. Clifford Dame, Tekamah, Nebr., E. G. Brune, retired.
 John R. Baumert, Walthill, Nebr., in place of C. J. Mullaney, deceased.
 Carroll L. Falk, Wilcox, Nebr., J. W. Brawner, retired.

NEVADA

William A. Leno, Owyhee, Nev., in place of R. R. Archuleta, resigned.

NEW HAMPSHIRE

Phyllis M. Coniaris, Hollis, N.H., in place of D. H. Goodwin, retired.
 Marjorie A. Kimball, South Danville, N.H., in place of M. M. Heath, retired.
 Earle W. Ladd, West Stewartstown, N.H., in place of L. Y. Ladd, resigned.

NEW JERSEY

William F. Anderson, Allendale, N.J., in place of F. A. Farrell, removed.
 Klaus E. Schmidt, Allentown, N.J., in place of W. F. Rue, retired.
 William T. Minkoff, Blackwood, N.J., in place of J. A. Beetle, resigned.
 Samuel H. Rifkin, Dutch Neck, N.J., in place of H. R. Tindall, resigned.
 Herbert J. Engelhardt, Egg Harbor City, N.J., in place of M. R. Stone, deceased.
 Walter Hamilton, Jr., Fieldsboro, N.J., in place of Elizabeth Hamilton, deceased.
 John R. Wert, III, Hopewell, N.J., in place of M. J. McAlinden, retired.
 Marie J. Holloway, Magnolia, N.J., in place of J. M. Schmidt, retired.
 Michael Czahlo, Montville, N.J., in place of Floyd Smith, retired.

Paul W. Haller, Moorestown, N.J., in place of R. G. Shreve, deceased.
 Stanford B. Tidaback, Newton, N.J., in place of M. N. Strader, retired.
 Joseph L. Yearly, Riverton, N.J., in place of M. E. Haas, retired.
 Albert G. Gleckler, Rockaway, N.J., in place of M. S. Malone, retired.
 Charles T. Camp, South Seaville, N.J., in place of M. M. Ratcliffe, resigned.
 Merrill M. Tucker, Teaneck, N.J., in place of J. F. Carroll, removed.
 Marjorie E. Houghtaling, Vernon, N.J., in place of A. E. Baldwin, deceased.
 Shirlee W. Thompson, Vincentown, N.J., in place of H. S. Eibert, removed.
 Jesse W. Landon, White House Station, N.J., in place of W. W. Lance, retired.
 A. Robert Deter, Woodbridge, N.J., in place of L. E. McElroy, deceased.

NEW MEXICO

Romeo A. Ortiz, Bernalillo, N. Mex., in place of C. C. Montes, retired.
 Charles S. Stanfield, Clovis, N. Mex., in place of E. L. Manson, retired.
 Robert W. Prunty, Red River, N. Mex., in place of E. C. Simlon, resigned.
 Leon F. Dryden, Ruidoso, N. Mex., in place of O. J. Hull, retired.
 Laudente T. Quintana, Jr., Wagon Mound, N. Mex., in place of H. M. Vigil, transferred.

NEW YORK

George M. Wood, Allentown, N.Y., in place of W. A. Withey, deceased.
 Ethel Gowdey, Bloomingburg, N.Y., in place of S. E. Hagan, retired.
 Lyle S. Vannatta, Cohecton, N.Y., in place of W. J. Por, retired.
 Robert S. Freeman, Constableville, N.Y., in place of H. M. Bintz, retired.
 Jean N. Van Kleck, Cragmoor, N.Y., in place of N. C. S. Garritt, resigned.
 Kenneth R. Smith, Delmar, N.Y., in place of A. I. Ryan, retired.
 Mae M. Gibbs, East Nassau, N.Y., in place of P. J. Marsh, resigned.
 John J. Hogan, Flushing, N.Y., in place of F. J. Cassidy, retired.
 Nellie M. Rice, Freeville, N.Y., in place of W. F. Moore, retired.
 John L. Kress, Jr., Galway, N.Y., in place of J. T. Hunter, retired.
 Theodore J. Palcic, Gowanda, N.Y., in place of P. W. Christenson, retired.
 Hamilton C. Fish, Great Neck, N.Y., in place of E. F. Higgins, retired.
 Ellen M. Newman, Greenhurst, N.Y., in place of J. A. Johnson, retired.
 Edward A. Byrnes, Haverstraw, N.Y., in place of E. A. Ganson, resigned.
 Roy E. Jenne, Hermon, N.Y., in place of A. E. Cook, deceased.
 Gerald W. Reamer, Kendall, N.Y., in place of M. F. Drennan, deceased.
 Raymond D. Ingram, Knowlesville, N.Y., in place of G. B. Clapp, deceased.
 Hazel M. Carr, Lisbon, N.Y., in place of E. E. Jones, deceased.
 Elaine L. Bruce, Molra, N.Y., in place of C. C. Young, deceased.
 Mildred T. Wadsworth, Niverville, N.Y., in place of G. L. Crausway, retired.
 Norman T. Sullivan, Olmstedville, N.Y., in place of E. C. Sullivan, retired.
 Muriel M. Bonini, Oswawana, N.Y., in place of D. L. Clair, deceased.
 Rosoe C. Odell, Pleasantville, N.Y., in place of L. D. Olmsted, deceased.
 George L. Clemons, Port Henry, N.Y., in place of L. J. Hollister, Jr., retired.
 Howard B. Stikney, Prattsburg, N.Y., in place of G. L. Patch, retired.
 David W. Jayne, Remsenburg, N.Y., in place of H. I. Raynor, retired.
 Clifford D. Nellis, Saint Johnsville, N.Y., in place of E. S. Bierman, retired.
 William J. Dunson, Saratoga Springs, N.Y., in place of J. T. Bryant, deceased.

Dorothy E. Burr, Savona, N.Y., in place of E. E. Mulliken, deceased.
 Angelo P. Rizzleri, Seneca Falls, N.Y., in place of T. J. Riley, retired.
 Joseph F. Patrick, Sidney Center, N.Y., in place of D. L. Hoy, removed.
 George H. Martin, Slingerlands, N.Y., in place of W. P. Degenaar, retired.
 Bessie M. Sischo, Stockton, N.Y., in place of B. C. Putnam, transferred.
 Lucy B. Manglass, Tomkins Cove, N.Y., in place of J. M. James, retired.
 Joseph N. Vogel, Walkill, N.Y., in place of C. H. McLean, retired.
 Joseph J. Giordano, West Islip, N.Y., Office established September 15, 1958.
 Dorann E. Oldenburg, West Lebanon, N.Y., in place of R. E. Watkins, resigned.

NORTH CAROLINA

Howard G. Crissman, Aberdeen, N.C., in place of E. E. Maurer, removed.
 Carlyle P. Matheson, Andrews, N.C., in place of Galusha Pullum, removed.
 Guy E. Snyder, Bakersville, N.C., in place of J. F. Greene, resigned.
 Alfred B. Woodard, Bayboro, N.C., in place of H. A. Miller, resigned.
 Glenn O. Pasour, Bessemer City, N.C., in place of R. M. Kiser, deceased.
 Lyle B. Cook, Boone, N.C., in place of J. E. Brown, Jr., removed.
 Melvin H. Crisp, Brasstown, N.C., in place of Iowa Green, retired.
 Vernon P. Fullbright, Brevard, N.C., in place of T. C. Galloway, retired.
 Ray Wright, Bryson City, N.C., in place of W. T. Martin, retired.
 James R. Frady, Candler, N.C., in place of B. E. Brenton, resigned.
 Clarence W. Burrell, Canton, N.C., in place of W. C. Hill, retired.
 Arlie R. Cox, Central Falls, N.C., in place of A. M. York, retired.
 J. Howard Crowell, Concord, N.C., in place of B. E. Harris, resigned.
 Maude M. Gullledge, Culberson, N.C., in place of C. T. Hagood, retired.
 Clifton W. Crispe, Cullowhee, N.C., in place of B. B. Long, retired.
 Jay T. Baker, Dallas, N.C., in place of G. L. Friday, resigned.
 Clifford O. Scott, Dobson, N.C., in place of R. L. Folger, removed.
 Raymond H. Hoots, Edneyville, N.C., in place of J. W. Nesbitt, retired.
 Sion Chester Rogers, Elizabethtown, N.C., in place of J. K. Clark, retired.
 John O. Gettys, Ellenboro, N.C., in place of W. C. Stockton, resigned.
 Alton B. Parker, Fairmont, N.C., in place of T. S. Teague, retired.
 Burl L. Orr, Fontana Dam, N.C., in place of B. Q. Cable, transferred.
 Willard W. Reavis, Hamptonville, N.C., in place of B. F. Gough, retired.
 Wallace K. Crawford, Hayesville, N.C., in place of F. R. Jones, retired.
 Carl L. Talley, Highlands, N.C., in place of C. C. Potts, retired.
 Maude T. Brown, Hillsboro, N.C., in place of T. E. Bivins, resigned.
 Norman A. Randall, Leicester, N.C., in place of M. H. Current, retired.
 Roby J. Maley, Lexington, N.C., in place of S. J. Smith, retired.
 Kirby W. Greene, Jr., Linwood, N.C., in place of F. H. Shoaf, transferred.
 Wayne Jefferson Edwards, Marble, N.C., in place of B. H. Mintz, retired.
 F. Ray Frisby, Marshall, N.C., in place of Grace Freeman, retired.
 Eriean S. Stevens, Mayodan, N.C., in place of J. V. Highfill, retired.
 Harveleigh M. White, Method, N.C., in place of A. T. White, deceased.
 Lucile R. Eagle, Misenheimer, N.C., in place of C. A. Dry, resigned.
 Worth T. Hendricks, Mocksville, N.C., in place of Daisy Holthouser, transferred.

Katie B. Miller, Moyock, N.C., in place of M. F. Dunston, retired.
 Elvin C. Cox, Ramseur, N.C., in place of C. B. Craven, removed.
 Coy S. Lewis, Jr., Robbins, N.C., in place of G. E. Walker, deceased.
 Carroll O. Jenkins, Robbinsville, N.C., in place of W. G. Carver, removed.
 Carl G. Underwood, Sr., St. Pauls, N.C., in place of B. R. Stone, resigned.
 Edward V. Gore, Jr., Shallotte, N.C., in place of I. B. Parker, retired.
 Charles C. Small, Sophia, N.C., in place of D. R. Bulla, retired.
 Maxwell G. Rush, Southern Pines, N.C., in place of A. G. Pierce, resigned.
 William V. Langley, Staley, N.C., in place of M. I. Siler, retired.
 Martin T. Southard, Stokesdale, N.C., in place of H. G. Cook, retired.
 Don D. Cogdill, Jr., Sylva, N.C., in place of T. W. Ashe, retired.
 Enos R. Boyd, Waynesville, N.C., in place of J. H. Howell, retired.
 Howell W. Ratcliff, Weaverville, N.C., in place of Kate Reagan, retired.
 Josiah A. Maultsby, Jr., Whiteville, N.C., in place of A. E. Powell, retired.
 Joseph Howard Revis, Whittier, N.C., in place of M. P. Williams, retired.
 Julius C. Vogt, Wilson, N.C., in place of G. T. Fulghum, retired.
 Charles M. Taylor, Winnabow, N.C., in place of J. J. Henry, resigned.
 M. Vance Hickman, Winston-Salem, N.C., in place of W. B. Boone, resigned.
 Joseph H. Poindexter, Yadkinville, N.C., in place of W. F. Van Hoy, retired.

NORTH DAKOTA

Albert Maier, Ashley, N. Dak., in place of M. B. Johnson, retired.
 Johnnie H. Halvorson, Glenfield, N. Dak., in place of Lottie Posey, retired.
 Dora H. Loeppke, Heaton, N. Dak., in place of J. C. Stuart, resigned.
 Verna L. Becker, Inkster, N. Dak., in place of M. F. Scouton, transferred.
 Louis J. Wanner, New England, N. Dak., in place of F. S. Kenny, retired.
 Albert E. Storhoff, Nome, N. Dak., in place of A. M. Bakke, resigned.
 Frank V. Jansky, Ross, N. Dak., in place of L. T. Breeling, retired.
 Clifford W. Hackett, Sarles, N. Dak., in place of C. L. George, retired.
 Hazel F. Elness, Sterling, N. Dak., in place of E. M. Ryan, resigned.

OHIO

Edward E. Bickhard, Antwerp, Ohio, in place of M. E. Bakke, retired.
 Orlan L. Hines, Ashville, Ohio, in place of S. L. Smith, deceased.
 Gay W. Smyth, Bergholz, Ohio, in place of M. M. Morrow, retired.
 Harriett R. Vasbinder, Brinkhaven, Ohio, in place of M. A. Power, retired.
 Charles A. Roemer, Brunswick, Ohio, in place of Jeanette Long, retired.
 Richard W. Olinger, Dayton, Ohio, in place of G. H. Mundhenk, retired.
 Harold T. Deselms, Freeport, Ohio, in place of K. E. Caldwell, transferred.
 Thomas S. McCrea, Fresno, Ohio, in place of C. H. Barth, transferred.
 Ernest W. Jones, Glouster, Ohio, in place of D. P. Mooney, retired.
 Virginia G. Bortel, Grand Rapids, Ohio, in place of J. P. Minnick, retired.
 Irvn E. Scott, Kinsman, Ohio, in place of J. W. Fulton, Jr., resigned.
 V. Kathryn Whisler, Laurelville, Ohio, in place of L. M. Lappen, retired.
 Richard J. Neuhardt, Lewisville, Ohio, in place of C. R. Pollen, removed.
 Charles R. Scott, Lodi, Ohio, in place of V. A. Miner, retired.
 Frederick B. Gatch, Milford, Ohio, in place of F. W. White, retired.

Paul F. Thomas, Millersport, Ohio, in place of H. D. Bowers, retired.
 Robert J. Davis, Minerva, Ohio, in place of C. A. Hart, retired.
 C. Emil Sidle, Nashport, Ohio, in place of W. A. Braller, retired.
 Dorothy B. Smith, New Burlington, Ohio, in place of E. G. Miller, retired.
 James W. Speakman, Paris, Ohio, in place of E. F. Kintner, retired.
 Leo C. Blackburn, Portsmouth, Ohio, in place of F. E. Smith, resigned.
 Marvin D. Wolford, Rawson, Ohio, in place of Pearl Burket, retired.
 Orvil C. Hoover, Salem, Ohio, in place of L. D. Beardmore, deceased.
 Clarence J. Loch, Salineville, Ohio, in place of M. F. Mulheran, retired.
 Robert L. Rhodes, South Charleston, Ohio, in place of J. L. Carr, retired.
 Vernon J. Burkett, Jr., Sullivan, Ohio, in place of T. U. Kerr, deceased.
 Gordon R. Lanker, Toledo, Ohio, in place of W. P. Kilcorse, deceased.
 Harold H. Haggard, Urbana, Ohio, in place of P. H. Gifford, deceased.
 Clair R. Guthrie, Waynesfield, Ohio, in place of L. L. Newland, deceased.
 Russell H. Miller, Yellow Springs, Ohio, in place of H. J. Grote, retired.
 Chester W. Bailey, Youngstown, Ohio, in place of J. E. Doyle, deceased.

OKLAHOMA

N. Berniece Henderson, Braggs, Okla., in place of L. B. Williams, retired.
 Marguerite L. McDonald, Bokoshe, Okla., in place of O. C. Broking, retired.
 Jetie E. Kirby, Eufaula, Okla., in place of J. L. McKinney, retired.
 David L. Ratliff, Fort Cobb, Okla., in place of T. E. Henderson, transferred.
 E. Herman Evans, Fort Gibson, Okla., in place of L. B. Rogers, deceased.
 Virgil W. Morris, Gotebo, Okla., in place of C. B. Bolat, transferred.
 Tom F. Bonner, Idabel, Okla., in place of Mona Rawlings, transferred.
 Edward E. Weeks, Indianola, Okla., in place of J. H. York, resigned.
 Henry D. Friend, Oklahoma City, Okla., in place of F. M. Shaw, deceased.
 Gerald D. Carlin, Picher, Okla., in place of G. E. Raouls, retired.
 Guy W. Willibey, Sapulpa, Okla., in place of G. B. Grigsby, resigned.
 Isaac L. Thomson, Valliant, Okla., in place of A. M. Mills, resigned.

OREGON

Martha H. Anderson, Gardiner, Oreg., in place of V. A. Grubb, deceased.
 William H. Fair, Stayton, Oreg., in place of G. E. Neibert, retired.

PENNSYLVANIA

Carl J. Tonkin, Akeley, Pa., in place of L. J. Hale, deceased.
 Walter H. Grier, Sr., Beaver Brook, Pa., in place of J. D. McNells, retired.
 Arthur J. Rodgers, Jr., Blue Ball, Pa., in place of H. B. Bower, retired.
 Walter F. Rhine, Canonsburg, Pa., in place of S. J. Bondi, removed.
 Robert J. Talley, Chadds Ford, Pa., in place of W. E. Miller III, transferred.
 Edwin K. Oaks, Cherry Tree, Pa., in place of J. C. Dunlap, retired.
 John M. Harshaw, Jr., Conneaut Lake, Pa., in place of J. I. Cleveland, retired.
 Margaret E. Fink, Conyngham, Pa., in place of R. A. Reisenweaver, resigned.
 Robert G. Burgan, Cresson, Pa., in place of C. R. Tobin, removed.
 Emma Jane Kimmel, Dalmatia, Pa., in place of P. L. Tressler, retired.
 Curtis A. Miller, Dillsburg, Pa., in place of R. K. Hartman, resigned.
 William C. Hoffman, Dingmans Ferry, Pa., in place of L. S. Seymour, deceased.

Stanley H. Ward, East McKeesport, Pa., in place of G. J. Hoke, deceased.
 Lyle T. Streeter, Easton, Pa., in place of H. C. Shultz, retired.
 Warren S. H. Reppert, Egypt, Pa., in place of E. A. Breinig, retired.
 Jacob G. Appler, Gettysburg, Pa., in place of L. E. Oyler, deceased.
 Edna Mae Harrison, Gwynedd, Pa., in place of Elizabeth Tramontina, resigned.
 Robert C. Yeagley, Holtwood, Pa., in place of A. E. LeFever, resigned.
 Leonard Farkas, Hostetter, Pa., in place of C. R. Andros, resigned.
 Carl E. Duble, Hummelstown, Pa., in place of L. W. Flesler, retired.
 Donald R. Springer, Hunkers, Pa., in place of L. J. Biggerstaff, resigned.
 Margaret Jane Knight, Industry, Pa., in place of A. W. Ewing, retired.
 Nancy H. Houston, Jamison, Pa., in place of M. C. DeCurtis, deceased.
 Victor J. Westerberg, Kane, Pa., in place of J. G. O'Connor, deceased.
 Lawrence C. Viehdorfer, Karthaus, Pa., in place of Leslie Ditty, removed.
 Harry E. Himes, Jr., Kittanning, Pa., in place of J. P. King, retired.
 George K. Bilger, Kreamer, Pa., in place of C. G. Hummel, removed.
 Joseph J. Damiano, Lattimer Mines, Pa., in place of W. H. Hunsinger, deceased.
 Donald J. Hart, Laughlinton, Pa., in place of I. M. Ziders, retired.
 Marie J. Schoppa, Locust Gap, Pa., in place of J. J. McDonnell, removed.
 William G. Fultz, Jr., Mammoth, Pa., in place of J. M. Tarosky, removed.
 Charles V. Jones, Marysville, Pa., in place of J. S. Rainsner, removed.
 Steward H. Hartman, Mechanicsburg, Pa., in place of G. C. Dietz, transferred.
 Gorman Lester Dull, Mill Run, Pa., in place of E. S. Colborn, retired.
 L. Ramond Moore, Modena, Pa., in place of E. E. Morris, retired.
 Robert W. Stahl, Mount Pleasant, Pa., in place of Clark Queer, resigned.
 John A. Schultz, Nesheim, Pa., in place of P. M. Severns, retired.
 Eleanor M. Johnston, New Alexandria, Pa., in place of M. H. Miller, retired.
 Miller L. Kerr, New Castle, Pa., in place of W. R. Hanna, deceased.
 Raymond Carlson, New Stanton, Pa., in place of E. A. Cox, retired.
 Samuel H. Auman, Paxinos, Pa., in place of S. F. Snyder, retired.
 Paul R. Buchler, Port Carbon, Pa., in place of E. J. Donahue, retired.
 Glenn I. Gegogelne, Reno, Pa., in place of Susan Breene, retired.
 Robert V. Webster, Roaring Branch, Pa., in place of W. L. Holmes, retired.
 Henry H. Arnold, Robertsdale, Pa., in place of Margaret Truax, resigned.
 Lester I. Helst, Robeson, Pa., in place of B. M. Kintzer, retired.
 Dorothy S. Hull, Rutledge, Pa., in place of Viola Cleland, retired.
 Lisle Robert Johns, Shelocta, Pa., in place of M. E. Thomas, resigned.
 Harry K. Barnett, Sipesville, Pa., in place of C. E. Holder, resigned.
 Rudolph Simitz, Spinnerstown, Pa., in place of Laura Lancaster, resigned.
 John M. Holland, Starrucca, Pa., in place of H. S. Glover, deceased.
 Edgar F. Benner, State College, Pa., in place of R. J. Miller, retired.
 Norman W. Abbott, Sugargrove, Pa., in place of H. A. Rathburn, retired.
 Robert A. Yeager, Sunbury, Pa., in place of Charles Kline, retired.
 Robert C. Guth, Vanderbilt, Pa., in place of G. E. Reed, retired.
 Charles W. J. Whitcroft, Villanova, Pa., in place of M. J. Winters, retired.
 Leona P. Waters, Wiconisco, Pa., in place of S. R. Kilinger, resigned.

Ross P. Petrone, Jr., Wildwood, Pa., in place of E. C. Hardt, retired.
 James J. Brogan, Sr., Woodlyn, Pa., in place of S. C. K. Miecznik, transferred.
 William J. Zepp, York Springs, Pa., in place of P. E. Trump, resigned.

PUERTO RICO

Anardi Agosto Baquero, Canovanas, P.R., in place of Carmen Villalobos, retired.
 Oscar Rios Santiago, Corozal, P.R., in place of A. M. Bou, retired.
 Enrique Pardo, Ensenada, P.R., in place of J. C. de Vidal, retired.

RHODE ISLAND

Robert S. Hirst, Ashaway, R.I., in place of J. E. Murray, deceased.
 Raymond A. Piccolo, Bradford, R.I., in place of T. F. Eldridge, deceased.
 Henry K. Mook, Charlestown, R.I., in place of G. W. Short, resigned.
 Edward C. Borders, Foster Center, R.I., in place of H. A. H. Nichols, deceased.
 Antone Marion, Jr., Little Compton, R.I., in place of P. W. Martin, resigned.
 Donald C. Shemick, North Scituate, R.I., in place of E. L. Clark, retired.
 Reginald L. Campbell, Tiverton, R.I., in place of C. S. Holding, removed.
 Richard J. Vitullo, Warren, R.I., in place of Fred Beauchaine, retired.

SOUTH CAROLINA

Henry F. Rucker, Bath, S.C., in place of M. K. Ricker, resigned.
 H. R. Ford Cherry, Jr., Enoree, S.C., in place of L. O. Thornton, retired.
 W. Robert Cooper, Jr., Lane, S.C., in place of J. A. Montgomery, retired.
 Louise R. McLeod, Rembert, S.C., in place of T. M. Moore, retired.
 Herbert H. Crossland, Jr., York, S.C., in place of G. C. Cartwright, retired.
 Earle W. Crosby, Jr., Smoaks, S.C., in place of W. A. Linder, transferred.

SOUTH DAKOTA

Eldon H. Robbins, Carthage, S. Dak., in place of J. H. Coughlin, retired.
 Ceceli L. Fitzgerald, Rockham, S. Dak., in place of C. R. Dean, retired.
 Clarence L. Grohnke, Warner, S. Dak., in place of C. A. Wulff, retired.

TENNESSEE

Lee N. Ruch, Belvidere, Tenn., in place of Clyde Zimmerman, transferred.
 Allie Louise W. Anderson, Charlotte, Tenn., in place of H. B. Crow, removed.
 Elmer J. Atkinson, Clarkrange, Tenn., in place of E. M. Peters, retired.
 Paul D. Tolley, Decaturville, Tenn., in place of J. W. Stout, retired.
 Reuben P. Taylor, Gleason, Tenn., in place of W. L. Newberry, retired.
 Howard F. Newell, Harrison, Tenn., in place of L. G. Wilson, resigned.
 E. Nell Muzzall, Henry, Tenn., in place of M. B. Curry, transferred.
 Leon W. Crews, Hollow Rock, Tenn., in place of W. R. Rice, retired.
 Dorothy M. Hunter, Huntland, Tenn., in place of A. E. Staples, retired.
 William F. Parrott, LaFollette, Tenn., in place of J. M. Carden, Jr., removed.
 Paul R. Ledbetter, Obion, Tenn., in place of H. B. Fox, deceased.
 M. Frances Long, Palmer, Tenn., in place of E. R. Overturf, retired.
 Basil Hubert Nunley, Riceville, Tenn., in place of W. H. Higginbotham, retired.
 Robert A. Emerson, Saulsberry, Tenn., in place of E. L. Goddard, deceased.
 Clarence H. Davis, Signal Mountain, Tenn., in place of Harry Robinson, retired.
 Thomas R. Carothers, Wartrace, Tenn., in place of A. S. Shriver, retired.

TEXAS

Jasper L. Ellison, Abernathy, Tex., in place of W. A. Richter, resigned.

George D. FitzSimmons, Jr., Alice, Tex., in place of M. A. Mullen, removed.
 Dudley B. Lawson, Alto, Tex., in place of J. B. Thorn, Jr., transferred.
 Albert A. Hubbard, Alvarado, Tex., in place of E. P. Robinson, retired.
 John Clarence Stockton, Alvord, Tex., in place of W. E. Howell, transferred.
 Harold S. Roberts, Andrews, Tex., in place of M. M. Burkett, retired.
 Sam E. Henderson, Atlanta, Tex., in place of W. S. Clements, transferred.
 James Q. Pennington, Bluegrove, Tex., in place of R. O. Childs, removed.
 Earl F. Stubblefield, Bogata, Tex., in place of W. G. King, retired.
 Whittaker D. Bains, Jr., Brookshire, Tex., in place of W. D. Bains, retired.
 Benjamin W. Pearce, Center, Tex., in place of S. E. Burns, deceased.
 Charles L. Jones, Chandler, Tex., in place of B. C. Bass, retired.
 Carroll L. Byrd, Childress, Tex., in place of J. A. Hilburn, retired.
 Homer B. Adams, College Station, Tex., in place of T. O. Walton, retired.
 Arlene M. Morris, Colorado City, Tex., in place of S. A. Palmer, retired.
 Thurmon O. Storey, Deport, Tex., in place of C. H. Nobles, retired.
 Homer R. Granberry, Douglassville, Tex., in place of E. E. McMillan, Jr., removed.
 John D. Zahn, Farwell, Tex., in place of N. N. Lokey, resigned.
 Wilbur W. Mueller, Flatonia, Tex., in place of W. J. Bludworth, retired.
 Howard W. Curtis, Galena Park, Tex., in place of E. P. Minnock, removed.
 James D. Wheeler, Jr., Garland, Tex., in place of F. B. Crush, resigned.
 Grover C. Gibbs, Jr., Glen Rose, Tex., in place of W. E. Porter, retired.
 Charles M. Martinson, Jr., Jasper, Tex., in place of H. R. Hancock, transferred.
 J. Austin Rigney, Keller, Tex., in place of Alex Jones, retired.
 Montie F. Cameron, Kirkland, Tex., in place of R. L. Toft, transferred.
 Percy J. Bergeron, League City, Tex., in place of G. M. Wright, transferred.
 Samuel J. Morse, Jr., Linden, Tex., in place of N. L. Stanley, transferred.
 John H. Garrett, Lone Star, Tex., in place of A. C. Mestayer, resigned.
 Chester E. Maxey, Lorenzo, Tex., in place of L. M. Laird, deceased.
 Eugene Mallory, Mineola, Tex., in place of D. S. Lankford, retired.
 Isaac J. Newman, Moody, Tex., in place of B. W. Newman, transferred.
 Lloyd A. Adams, Mount Pleasant, Tex., in place of A. B. Gilpin, deceased.
 Horace W. McAdams, Muleshoe, Tex., in place of A. J. Gardner, transferred.
 Hugh Clifford Ryan, Pasadena, Tex., in place of C. T. Coolidge, retired.
 Ralph R. Richardson, Pecan Gap, Tex., in place of U. B. Walker, retired.
 Henry W. Lester, Pflugerville, Tex., in place of G. L. Fowler, deceased.
 Kyle C. Elam, Port Arthur, Tex., in place of F. C. Troups, deceased.
 John J. Hanna, Jr., Quanah, Tex., in place of C. G. Conley, deceased.
 Ocie K. Milner, Jr., Quitman, Tex., in place of J. T. Morse, transferred.
 Jess W. Cole, Ranger, Tex., in place of A. E. Crawley, retired.
 William H. Brown, Red Oak, Tex., in place of V. G. Evans, retired.
 Joy S. Morris, Rosenberg, Tex., in place of L. O. Senkel, transferred.
 Corolee J. Wismar, Sabine Pass, Tex., in place of D. F. Wiess, resigned.
 James D. Baldwin, Seagoville, Tex., in place of C. O. Bruce, retired.
 Lenard R. Miller, Talco, Tex., in place of G. L. Barber, retired.
 Edgar Harris, Timpson, Tex., in place of J. J. Compton, retired.

Clara P. Landers, Van Horn, Tex., in place of C. M. Bean, retired.
 Charles Allen, Wellington, Tex., in place of R. F. Curry, retired.
 Raymond J. Hruska, West, Tex., in place of J. D. Wilkinson, removed.
 Viola D. Hamby, Wimberly, Tex., in place of Rena Snodgrass, retired.
 David F. Renfro, Zavalla, Tex., in place of C. A. Barge, Jr., transferred.

UTAH

Mable A. Winstead, Castle Gate, Utah, in place of J. W. Nielsen, retired.
 Myrtle H. Davis, Mexican Hat, Utah, in place of office established March 9, 1957.
 Howard D. Knight, Parowan, Utah, in place of Ivan Decker, removed.

VERMONT

Esther L. Sweatt, Craftsbury Common, Vt., in place of B. W. Farrar, retired.
 William H. Jenks, Danville, Vt., in place of M. R. McDonald, retired.
 Paul T. Williams, East Corinth, Vt., in place of L. L. Worthley, retired.
 Donald R. Dayton, East Middlebury, Vt., in place of C. M. Morgan, retired.
 Winston M. Churchill, Graniteville, Vt., in place of A. J. Carboneau, resigned.
 Velmore O. Forest, Lunenburg, Vt., in place of D. W. Brown, retired.
 Wendell E. Morse, North Ferrisburg, Vt., in place of S. M. Hicks, deceased.
 Alden F. Atwood, Orwell, Vt., in place of M. D. Wolcott, deceased.
 Lyndell C. Wood, South Royalton, Vt., in place of G. M. Goodrich, retired.
 Virginia A. Peterson, South Ryegate, Vt., in place of G. F. Rabaoli, resigned.
 Ellery G. Giles, Wardsboro, Vt., in place of T. P. Staples, deceased.
 Sheridan P. Dow, Waterville, Vt., in place of O. P. Shattuck, deceased.
 Chanley H. May, Wilmington, Vt., in place of C. M. Hall, retired.

VIRGINIA

Winfrey W. Grizzard, Amelia Court House, Va., in place of L. O. Scott, deceased.
 Richard L. Wingfield, Appomattox, Va., in place of E. L. Smith, retired.
 Bessie C. Townshend, Bluemont, Va., in place of R. E. Denny, resigned.
 Mary E. Lynch, Bowling Green, Va., in place of F. G. Beale, retired.
 Carroll D. Harrison, Cartersville, Va., in place of L. A. Baker, retired.
 Wilbur F. Fitzgerald, Cheriton, Va., in place of W. M. Upshur, Jr., deceased.
 Franklin C. Wilson, Churchville, Va., in place of R. H. Bear, retired.
 John M. Corstaphney, Clifton Forge, Va., in place of J. N. Cahoon, retired.
 Beulah J. Skeens, Dante, Va., in place of R. S. Griffith, Jr., resigned.
 Noble Conley Bishop, Duffield, Va., in place of E. P. Tompkins, retired.
 John R. Pritchard, Jr., Emporia, Va., in place of R. M. Owen, deceased.
 Charles W. Harris, Jr., Fairfax, Va., in place of S. S. Swart, retired.
 Jo Pierson Horne, Fort Blackmore, Va., in place of E. C. Turner, resigned.
 William C. Deming, Front Royal, Va., in place of A. O. Haley, retired.
 Harry G. Penley, Gate City, Va., in place of H. B. Quillen, Jr., resigned.
 Martin Luther Garraghty, Goode, Va., in place of J. S. McCauley, retired.
 Virginia G. Kiser, Grundy, Va., in place of P. V. Dennis, Jr., resigned.
 Charles H. Arrington, Haysi, Va., in place of I. M. Baker, retired.
 John C. Raiford, Ivor, Va., in place of E. W. Pittman, transferred.
 Thelma E. Addington, Nickelsville, Va., in place of R. L. McConnell, retired.
 Tecumseh S. Dalton, Pulaski, Va., in place of E. P. Whitman, retired.

Willie W. Smith, Sedley, Va., in place of M. V. Owen, retired.
 James M. Rodgers, Shipman, Va., in place of M. W. Sherman, retired.
 William R. Holt, South Boston, Va., in place of C. B. Lovelace, retired.
 Carl A. Parsons, Jr., Sugar Grove, Va., in place of E. M. Calhoun, deceased.

VIRGIN ISLANDS

Charles E. Clarke, Frederiksted, V.I., in place of Adele Berg, resigned.

WASHINGTON

Cloyce G. Johnson, Dayton, Wash., in place of C. H. McCauley, resigned.
 E. Beth Williams, Hadlock, Wash., in place of M. D. Learned, retired.
 Gordon W. Rux, Lake Stevens, Wash., in place of E. F. Pardee, deceased.
 Elma M. Sarchet, Lamont, Wash., in place of D. J. Sarchet, deceased.
 Harold P. Dow, Sunnyside, Wash., in place of W. K. Munson, deceased.
 John C. Morgan, Jr., Suquamish, Wash., in place of L. C. Tompkins, retired.
 Harvey L. Jones, Tacoma, Wash., in place of G. P. Fishburne, retired.
 Allen H. Grant, Tracyton, Wash., in place of E. E. Riddell, retired.
 Orville K. Allen, Wenatchee, Wash., in place of J. F. Lester, deceased.

WEST VIRGINIA

Margaret M. McCormick, Anawalt, W. Va., in place of Wash Hornick, Jr., resigned.
 Ruby L. Teets, Aurora, W. Va., in place of G. R. Mason, resigned.
 Amos L. Whittington, Buffalo, W. Va., in place of E. K. Beltz, resigned.
 Sally L. Eller, Capels, W. Va., in place of M. A. Arnold, resigned.
 Maurice B. Morrison, Charlton Heights, W. Va., in place of M. S. Robinson, resigned.
 Nettie L. Hurd, Craigsville, W. Va., in place of S. B. Herold, retired.
 Robert F. Wilson, Decota, W. Va., in place of M. I. Jackson, resigned.
 Veon C. Cox, East Rainelle, W. Va., in place of U. W. Grimes, retired.
 Helen L. Buchanan, Gilbert, W. Va., in place of H. A. Buchanan, resigned.
 Mary Virginia Earman, Harpers Ferry, W. Va., in place of M. E. Marquette, retired.
 Edward L. Chrisman, Kearneysville, W. Va., in place of W. B. Hammond, retired.
 Mason H. Myers, McComas, W. Va., in place of B. S. Watts, retired.
 Ernest M. Townsend, Madison, W. Va., in place of A. T. Miller, retired.
 Carl F. Nichols, Middleborne, W. Va., in place of H. H. Crumrine, deceased.
 Erva Winston Cooper, Milton, W. Va., in place of D. J. Blackwood, retired.
 Dodd M. Fisher, Mount Storm, W. Va., in place of T. E. Schaeffer, retired.
 George B. Jordan, Ripley, W. Va., in place of H. E. Starcher, removed.
 Claude G. Pownall, Romney, W. Va., in place of C. J. Powell, retired.
 Dillard R. Walker, Stanaford, W. Va., in place of W. L. Warden, resigned.
 Margaret E. Martin, Stirrat, W. Va., in place of S. S. Goode, retired.
 Victor J. Robinson, Tams, W. Va., in place of R. F. Wildey, resigned.
 Harold R. Wiles, Tunnelton, W. Va., in place of J. F. Graham, retired.
 Robert C. Fenton III, Williamstown, W. Va., in place of J. L. Henderson, retired.
 George O. Mauk, Yolyn, W. Va., in place of Geraldine Chambers, removed.

WISCONSIN

Inez Myrtle Rautio, Amberg, Wis., in place of A. S. Port, retired.
 Milton L. Dickinsen, Augusta, Wis., in place of T. F. Boehrner, retired.
 Ellsworth L. Thompson, Black River Falls, Wis., in place of P. W. Dickey, retired.

Raymond E. Anderson, Deer Park, Wis., in place of L. A. Elden, retired.
 Roy L. Fergot, Edgar, Wis., in place of F. J. Shortner, retired.
 Phoebe J. Pinkley, Fountain City, Wis., in place of W. R. Hartley, retired.
 Matilda J. Loden, Granville, Wis., in place of H. M. Pfeil, resigned.
 Roland J. Anderson, Hazelhurst, Wis., in place of H. C. Lowe, retired.
 Elmer E. Lidicker, Jefferson, Wis., in place of A. F. Hammes, deceased.
 Raymond F. Fredrickson, Junction City, Wis., in place of L. B. Kitowski, resigned.
 Kenneth R. Jacobs, Knapp, Wis., in place of J. D. Purvis, transferred.
 Richard C. Coffen, Lake Tomahawk, Wis., in place of E. L. Saykally, deceased.
 John C. Pribnow, Loyal, Wis., in place of L. M. Meyer, deceased.
 John F. Whitmore, Madison, Wis., in place of E. C. Cooper, retired.
 Shirleigh L. Collins, Melrose, Wis., in place of E. D. Young, resigned.
 Delmer A. Vesely, Milan, Wis., in place of J. J. Schreiber, retired.
 Harley L. Prell, New Richmond, Wis., in place of L. N. Hughes, retired.
 Harry V. Cooper, Patch Grove, Wis., in place of Grace Harper, deceased.
 Beverley J. Farrell, Readstown, Wis., in place of O. L. Prestegard, transferred.
 Arnold W. Langner, Sr., Sheboygan Falls, Wis., in place of R. N. Bowser, failed to return from military duty.
 Sylvester J. Penning, Stockbridge, Wis., in place of K. M. Pottle, retired.
 Robert C. Herman, Thorp, Wis., in place of W. S. Wagner, retired.
 Earl J. Murray, Webster, Wis., in place of R. D. Fahland, retired.

WYOMING

Johnnie A. Thon, Lusk, Wyo., in place of A. B. Mills, retired.
 Charles R. Sheehan, Rawlins, Wyo., in place of H. S. Cashman, resigned.
 Harold V. Baas, Sheridan, Wyo., in place of J. R. Gage, resigned.
 Warren H. Moore, Worland, Wyo., in place of P. F. McClure, deceased.
 Marguerite A. Brazier, Yoder, Wyo., in place of C. V. Malone, transferred.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, JANUARY 11, 1960

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.
 The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Isaiah 40: 8: *The word of our God shall stand forever.*

Almighty God, whatever the duties and responsibilities may be ours during this day, wilt Thou bestow upon us the blessings of Thy constant care and Thy un-failing presence.

Wilt Thou free our minds from anxiety and our hearts from fear, lifting them by Thy grace out of doubt into faith and out of despair into hope.

Help us to see and lay hold of the treasures of each passing hour and inspire us to share them cheerfully with Thy needy children.

When night draws nigh and the evening shadows gather round about us may we have the blessed remembrance of Thy companionship and the joy of knowing that we have had some part in building a better world.

Hear us in Christ's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, January 7, 1960, was read and approved.

THE LATE HONORABLE THOMAS A. JENKINS

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN].

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, it is with extreme sorrow that I announce the death of former Congressman Thomas A. Jenkins, of Ironton, and the 10th Ohio District, on December 21, last.

Mr. Jenkins served for 34 years as a Member of this House, retiring because of ill health at the end of the 85th Congress. It is my understanding he served longer in the House of Representatives than did any other Member from Ohio.

Born in Oak Hill, Jackson County, Ohio, on October 23, 1880, of poor but honest and humble Welsh immigrant parents, Tom Jenkins' life was one of accomplishment, which again demonstrates the opportunity America and our system of government afford to all who wish to work hard and live an honest and upright life.

As a boy, Tom worked in the coal mines to earn money for an education. Graduating from Providence University, he taught school for a while, then studied law at Ohio State University, and was admitted to the bar in 1907. He was elected prosecuting attorney of Lawrence County for two terms, and later—in 1922—was chosen to serve as State senator. It was my honor and my privilege, as Lieutenant Governor, to swear Tom Jenkins into office. Two years later, in 1924, he was elected by the people of the 10th Congressional District of Ohio, to represent them in the 69th Congress, where he continued to serve until his retirement. At that time he was the second ranking member of the Ways and Means Committee of the House. It had long been his desire to live to become chairman of that great committee, and to thus follow in the footsteps of another great Ohioan, once chairman of the Ways and Means Committee—William McKinley.

In his early career in Congress, Mr. Jenkins served as a member of the Immigration and Naturalization Committee and was the author of several legislative measures of importance in connection with our national welfare. He was also a member of the Insular Affairs Committee and for a short time a member of the District of Columbia Committee. He was named chairman of the Food Study Committee, and during the time he served—from 1944 to 1946—did splendid work. At the time of his retirement, Mr. Jenkins was also a member of the very important Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

Always taking a deep interest in his party's affairs, Tom Jenkins served as a delegate to many State conventions in Ohio and to several Republican national conventions. For years he was the beloved dean of the Ohio delegation.