(i) Maritime service employees: The amount of the tips and other cash gratuities received by a maritime service employee shall be deemed to be equal to whichever of the following amounts per day is applicable for each day of full-time employment: bartender, $1.70; bellboy, $1.80; deck steward, $2; headwaiter, $3.35; night steward, $1; room steward, $2.90; salon steward, $1.75; stewardess, $1.65; waiter, $2.50."

Subsection (p) subdivision (4) provides that under certain conditions, no tips shall be included as remuneration for social security purposes. Tips or cash gratuities shall not be included where (a) acceptance of tips or gratuities is not allowed; (b) notice is displayed that tips are not allowed; (c) employer adopts reasonable means to insure that tips or cash gratuities are not received; (d) employer submits to the Secretary a statement setting forth that tips are not allowed and methods to obtain compliance by customers and employees.

Subsection (p) subdivision (5) provides that an employer at his own option or upon the request by the employee may withhold from the employee's base wages the social security taxes due on the actual tips reported or on the estimated tips collected during the month.

Subsection (p) subdivision (6) provides that the Secretary of the Treasury shall prescribe regulations to carry out the provisions of the bill and to prescribe rules for the review of the amount reported.

Section 4 of the bill deals with the effective date of the law and provides that the amendments shall apply only to tips received on and after the first day of the second month which begins more than 10 days after the enactment into law.

The custom of rewarding a person for satisfactory services rendered is an ancient one. This custom has become highly formalized with the development of our social habits. Considerable discussion is devoted to it in our best etiquette books. It has also become a fixed part of our economic system and, as a result, millions of our workers today depend upon the receipt of gratuities or tips in order to earn a living.

We are all aware of this. Each time we eat in a restaurant, get a shoeshine, have our luggage handled, we know that the person serving us must depend upon our tipping him for a substantial portion of his or her daily wages. It is now part of the system governing the relations of these persons with their employers.

As I understand, a great many of these personal service personnel would like to see the system changed. They would prefer to have an assured weekly wage and have the cost of their services taken up in the bill presented by the employer to the customer. This, of course, is a subject which is beyond the power of a legislature to handle.

During my travels throughout Europe, I noted that the employer includes the amount of the employee's tips as part of the bill. The practice is to allocate a percentage of the total bill as tips. The percentage which was most frequently used was 13 percent.

Service employees, however, have another problem, one for which the Congress, and the Committee on Ways and Means in particular, should take responsibility. They are denied the benefit of social security coverage of that portion of their income which comes directly from the customers they serve. Only the low basic wage, which they receive from their employer, may be credited as wages under the present law, except in a small percentage of cases where the employer requires the employee to account to him the amount of tips. The injustice of this treatment is manifest. When these people become eligible to receive their social security benefits, they find themselves entitled to payments which fail to reflect their true earnings histories. This is because the wages which have been credited to them in many cases make up as little as one-half or one-third of their total earnings, counting their tips.

My proposals and proposals similar to mine have met with opposition from only one quarter—the associations of employers of personal service personnel, the restaurant and hotel operators. The reason they have advanced for their position is difficulty of administration—although, one cannot help but recognize that if the proposal were adopted their employer's taxes would be increased. The difficulty, they claim, arises in ascertaining the sums involved in the tips received by their employees.

If difficulty of administration were allowed to prevent the adoption of worthwhile legislation, most of the activities of the Federal Government would never have been undertaken. In this instance, the administration of the bill, while intricate, is not impracticable. The people affected by my bill are entitled to consistent treatment by the Government. We have found ways to collect income taxes based upon their tips. There is no reason why we should deny them social security protection on an equal basis. Simple justice requires that Congress treat service employees fairly and grant these worthy citizens the protection intended for all workers by the Social Security Act.

SENATE

Friday, February 19, 1960

(Legislative day of Monday, February 15, 1960)

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a.m., on the expiration of the recess, and was called to order by Senator Mike Mansfield, of Montana, Acting President pro tempore.

Rev. Richard M. Langsdale, pastor, St. Mark's Lutheran Church, Evansville, Ind., offered the following prayer:

Thou alone, O God, art Lord of life, Creator and Ruler of the universe and of man. We are Thy children—stewards of the community of man and instruments only of Thine eternal purposes.

We thank Thee for the privilege of world leadership to which our Nation has been raised. Forgive us, we pray, when in vanity or folly we sometimes neglect or fall short of the responsibilities this privilege lays upon us.

Give to the Members of this Senate—and to us all—a double portion of Thy spirit, that we may consistently employ the wisdom to discern, the courage to care for, and the integrity to act within Thy holy will for man.

Endow us, Father, with the faith to acknowledge that our Nation's destiny and meaning—together with our acts in its behalf—are weighed ultimately in the balance of Thine eternal purposes.

Ours is the privilege of world leadership, but Thine is the kingdom, and the power, and the glory. In Christ's name. Amen.

DESIGNATION OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

U. S. Senate,
President pro tempore,
Washington, D.C., February 19, 1960.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. Mike Mansfield, a Senator from the State of Montana, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

Carl Hayden,
President pro tempore.

Mr. MANSFIELD thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. Johnson of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, February 18, 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 ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore 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.)

STATE AND LOCAL WITHHOLDING OF INCOME TAXES—CORRECTION

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, during the morning hour yesterday I called attention to H.R. 3151, which authorizes withholding by the Federal Government of certain income or wage taxes imposed by local governments upon Federal employees, and urged favorable consideration of the bill by the Senate.

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

The distinguished senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] then asked me a question to which I regret I gave an answer that was not entirely correct.

He asked me whether the Federal Government does not now extend comity to the States in the matter of withholding and I said it did not. The fact is that it extends comity to the States but not to the local subdivision of the States. H.R. 3151 would extend this principle so that certain local governments, which now withhold Federal income taxes from their employees would receive reciprocity from the Federal Government.

The fact that the States do now receive reciprocal treatment from the Federal Government seems to me to be a further argument why this treatment should be extended to their political subdivisions as well.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there may be the usual morning hour, with statements limited to 3 minutes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

REPORT ON REAPPORTIONMENT OF AN APPROPRIATION

A letter from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, reporting, pursuant to law, that the administrative expense authorization of the Commodity Credit Corp. for the fiscal year 1960 had been reapportioned on a basis which indicates the necessity for a supplemental estimate of administrative expense authorization; to the Committee on Appropriations.

REPORT ON ACTIVITIES AND TRANSACTIONS UNDER MERCHANT SHIP SALES ACT OF 1946

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the Maritime Administration on the activities and transactions under the Merchant Ship Sales Act of 1946, from October 1, 1959, through December 31, 1959 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

TITLE CHANGE OF ASSISTANT DIRECTOR OF COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY

A letter from the Under Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to change the title of the Assistant Director of the Coast and Geodetic Survey (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF CERTAIN ALIENS

Two letters from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of orders suspending deportation of Joseph Bilenco, also known as Joseph Addison Blake, and Pedro Ramirez-Cordova, together with a statement of the facts and pertinent provisions of law pertaining to each alien, and the reasons for ordering such suspension (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT ON ADMINISTRATION OF FAIR LABOR STANDARDS ACT

A letter from the Secretary of Labor, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the administration of the Fair Labor Standards Act, during the fiscal year 1959 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

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

By the ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore:

Resolution of the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts; to the Committee on Armed Services:

"RESOLUTION MEMORIALIZING THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES TO ENACT LEGISLATION INCREASING RETIREMENT BENEFITS OF CERTAIN RETIRED MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES

"Whereas there is now pending before the Congress of the United States a bill relative to the improvement of benefits for members of the U.S. Armed Forces who retired prior to June 1, 1958; Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That the General Court of Massachusetts respectfully urges the Congress of the United States to enact legislation that will increase the retirement benefits payable to those members of the Armed Forces who retired prior to June 1, 1958; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the secretary of the Commonwealth transmit forthwith copies of this resolution to the Presiding Officer of each branch of the Congress of the United States and to each Member thereof from the Commonwealth.

"Adopted by the senate, February 1, 1960.

"IRVING N. HAYDEN,
"*Clerk.*

"Adopted by the house of representatives in concurrence, February 4, 1960.

"LAWRENCE R. GROVE,
"*Clerk.*

"Attest:

"JOSEPH D. WARD,
"*Secretary of the Commonwealth.*"

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

"HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 13

"Concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to extend the time limits of the veterans education program established by the Federal Government pertaining to World War II and Korean conflict veterans

"Whereas millions of veterans of World War II and the Korean conflict have been educated under the provisions of the veterans education program established by the Federal Government; and

"Whereas many veterans were able to obtain further education through the benefits of the veterans education program which would not have been possible otherwise; and

"Whereas the education of millions of veterans has contributed to an increase in the level of education of this country and has produced a major national asset in better and more skilled manpower and has done much to improve the economy of our country; and

"Whereas reliable statistics have proved that increased income to veterans resulting from higher education and improved skills will more than reimburse the national treasury of the entire cost of the GI training program by 1970; and

"Whereas the President of the United States, by Executive order on January 31, 1955, stopped the educational benefits for persons serving in the Armed Forces of the United States after February 1, 1955; and

"Whereas it is believed that as long as the draft is continued that all persons serving in the Armeed Forces should be extended the educational benefits that were granted to veterans serving prior to February 1, 1955; and

"Whereas it has been established by reliable statistics that the investment in education for our own American youth will be more than repaid to the public treasury through increased taxes, resulting from higher incomes earned by such veterans: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Mississippi (the Senate concurring therein)*, That the Legislature of the State of Mississippi does hereby memorialize the Congress of the United States to extend GI education benefits to all veterans who entered or who will enter military service from and after February 1, 1955, and that such educational benefits be extended as long as and provision of the draft law shall exist; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That upon adoption of this resolution, a copy thereof be mailed by the clerk of the house of representatives to the President of the U.S. Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States, and to each Member of the Congress from the State of Mississippi.

"Adopted by the house of representatives February 2, 1960.

"WALTER SILER,
"*Speaker of the House of Representatives.*

"Adopted by the senate February 3, 1960.

"PAUL B. JOHNSON,
"*President of the Senate.*"

Memorials signed by Ross Boling, and sundry citizens of the State of Texas, and Lucy Ann York, and sundry citizens of the State of Wisconsin, remonstrating against the adoption of the resolution (S. Res. 94) relating to the recognition of the jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice in certain disputes hereafter arising; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A resolution adopted at a mass meeting of Americans of Lithuanian descent of the city of Miami, Fla., favoring a firm stand against the expansion of communism in the free world; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A telegram in the nature of a memorial, signed by St. Clair Goolsby, of Cartersville, Ga., remonstrating against the enactment of the pending civil rights bill; ordered to lie on the table.

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION OF SOUTH CAROLINA LEGISLATURE

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and my colleague, the junior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND], I present a concurrent resolution of the South Carolina General Assembly memorializing the Congress of the United States to propose an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to balancing the expenditures and the income of the Government of the United States.

I ask unanimous consent that this resolution be printed in the RECORD, and referred to the appropriate committee.

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and, under the

rule, ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION MEMORIALIZING THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES TO PROPOSE AN AMENDMENT TO THE CONSTITUTION OF THE UNITED STATES RELATIVE TO BALANCING THE EXPENDITURES AND THE INCOME OF THE GOVERNMENT OF THE UNITED STATES

Whereas the U.S. Government is presently indebted in a minimum sum of $295 billion and the debt increases each year; and

Whereas the U.S. Government now pays approximately $9 billion in interest on the present indebtedness each fiscal year; and

Whereas the value of a dollar continues to decrease, particularly since World War II, largely due to the inflationary fiscal policy of the Federal Government; and

Whereas the people of the United States are already bearing a practically confiscatory and excessive burden of taxes, particularly from the Federal Government; and

Whereas the power to tax is the power to destroy, and the present level of taxation on the people has reached the point of diminishing return: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the house of representatives (the senate concurring). That the general assembly hereby urges and memoralizes the Congress of the United States to propose to the States an amendment to the Constitution of the United States as provided by article V of the Constitution, to read as follows, to wit:

"Section 1. On or before the 15th day after the beginning of each regular session of the Congress, the President shall transmit to the Congress a budget which shall set forth his estimate of the receipts of the Government, other than trust funds, during the ensuing fiscal year under the laws then existing and his recommendations with respect to expenditures to be made from funds other than trust funds during such ensuing fiscal year, which shall not exceed such estimate of the receipts. The President in transmitting such budget may recommend measures for raising additional revenue and his recommendations for the expenditure of such additional revenue. If the Congress shall authorize expenditures to be made during such ensuing fiscal year in excess of such estimate of the receipts, it shall not adjourn for more than 3 days at a time until such action has been taken as may be necessary to balance the budget for such ensuing fiscal year. In case of war or other grave national emergency, if the President shall so recommend, the Congress by a vote of three-fourths of all the members of each House may suspend the foregoing provisions for balancing the budget for periods, either successive or otherwise, not exceeding 1 year each.

SEC. 2. This article shall take effect on the first day of the calendar year next following the ratification of this article.

SEC. 3. This article shall be inoperative unless it shall have been ratified as an amendment to the Constitution by the legislature of three-fourths of the several States within 7 years from the date of its submission to the States by the Congress; and be it further

Resolved, That a certified copy of this resolution be furnished to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress, and to each congressional Representative from the State.

RESOLUTION OF TRANS-MISSOURI-KANSAS SHIPPERS BOARD

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, the Trans-Missouri-Kansas Shippers Board at its regular meeting adopted a resolution urging repeal of the remaining excise taxes on transportation of passengers.

The Trans-Missouri-Kansas Shippers is a voluntary organization consisting of a large number of rail shippers located in the States of Missouri and Kansas and portions of Oklahoma, Arkansas, and Illinois.

The excise tax on transportation of persons was placed on our statutes in a time of war and at a time when we were trying to discourage passenger travel. Now that that period is passed, it occurs to me that Congress should give every consideration to repeal of the tax.

I ask unanimous consent that this resolution be printed in the RECORD, and referred to the appropriate committee.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION URGING REPEAL OF EXCISE TAXES UPON THE FOR-HIRE TRANSPORTATION OF PERSONS

Whereas this board has on other occasions adopted resolutions urging repeal of the then existing Federal excise tax upon the transportation of persons and property as being discriminatory and contrary to the best interests of the traveling and shipping public in a sound, adequate and efficient transportation system; and

Whereas the 85th Congress, by Public Law No. 85-475, repealed the Federal excise tax upon the transportation of property but left in effect the 10 percent excise tax on the for-hire transportation of persons; and

Whereas the 85th Congress, by Public Law No. 86-75, provided for reduction of the excise tax upon the for-hire transportation of persons from 10 percent to 5 percent on and after July 1, 1960; and

Whereas in the opinion of this board the continued exaction of excise tax upon the for-hire transportation of persons has had and will continue to have effect adverse to the interests of this country in sound, adequate and efficient public transportation: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Trans-Missouri-Kansas Shippers Board in convention assembled at Kansas City, Mo., That Federal excise taxes upon the for-hire transportation of persons should be repealed as discriminatory, self-defeating and contrary to the best interests of the traveling and shipping public in a sound, adequate and efficient for-hire transportation system; and be it further

Resolved, That the president of this board forward a copy of this resolution to each member of the House Ways and Means Committee, the Senate Finance Committee, and the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committees of both the Senate and House of Representatives of the U.S. Congress.

REPORT ENTITLED "NATIONAL POLICY MACHINERY IN COMMUNIST CHINA" (S. REPT. NO. 1096)

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, from the Committee on Government Operations, pursuant to S. Res. 115, 86th Congress, I submit a report on "National Policy Machinery in Communist China."

I ask that this study, which was prepared by the staff of the Subcommittee on National Policy Machinery, in cooperation with the executive branch, be printed as a Senate report.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The report will be received and printed, as requested by the Senator from Washington.

BILLS INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. KEFAUVER:

S. 3068. A bill for the relief of Zohry Nuby (also known as Zoe Francis); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAGNUSON (by request):

S. 3069. A bill to authorize the Federal Power Commission to delegate its functions; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

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

By Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota:

S. 3070. A bill to provide for the removal of the restriction on use with respect to certain lands in Morton County, N. Dak., conveyed to the State of North Dakota on July 20, 1955; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

S. 3071. A bill to promote the utilization of Indian-owned resources by Indians of the Three Affiliated Tribes of the Fort Berthold Reservation; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. FULBRIGHT (by request):

S. 3072. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to effect the payment of certain claims against the United States; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

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

By Mr. DOUGLAS:

S. 3073. A bill relating to the effective date of the qualification of the Pattern Makers' Pension Trust Fund of Chicago as a qualified trust under section 401(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. FULBRIGHT (by request):

S. 3074. A bill to provide for the participation of the United States in the International Development Association; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

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

By Mr. ALLOTT:

S. 3075. A bill for the relief of Edward T. Paca; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. CLARK:

S. 3076. A bill for the relief of Daisy Pong Hi Tong Li; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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

S. 3077. A bill to provide for the designation, under the provisions of section 1109(b) of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958, of the Port Erie Airport, Erie, Pa., as a port of entry for civil aircraft; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

DELEGATION OF FUNCTIONS BY FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, by request, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to authorize the Federal Power Commission to delegate its functions. I ask unanimous consent that a letter from the Chairman of the Commission, requesting the proposed legislation, be printed in the RECORD.

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

The bill (S. 3069) to authorize the Federal Power Commission to delegate its

functions, introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

The letter presented by Mr. MAGNUSON is as follows:

FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION,
Washington, February 5, 1960.

Hon. WARREN G. MAGNUSON,
Chairman, Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: On April 24, 1959, in compliance with a request from your office, we submitted a draft bill to amend the Natural Gas Act, the text of which, prepared by our staff, was intended to effectuate the Commission's legislative recommendations which appeared in our 38th Annual Report (1958). A draft bill to amend the Federal Power Act, similar in purpose, was sent on May 7.

The Commission's 39th Annual Report (1959) has just been published. It contains the same legislative recommendations as did the 1958 report except for a new item 20 on page 22, recommending that the Commission be given authority to delegate to one or more Commissioners or subordinates any portion of its functions now requiring Commission action under the Federal Power or Natural Gas Acts.

A draft bill to effect that recommendation, patterned after the statute giving delegation authority to the Federal Communications Commission (47 U.S.C. 155 (d)), has been prepared and two copies thereof are enclosed.

Sincerely yours,
JEROME K. KUYKENDALL,
Chairman.

PAYMENT OF CERTAIN CLAIMS AGAINST THE UNITED STATES

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, by request, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to effect the payment of certain claims against the United States.

The proposed legislation has been requested by the Secretary of State in a letter to the Vice President of January 29, 1960, and I am introducing it in order that there may be a specific bill to which Members of the Senate and the public may direct their attention and comments.

I reserve the right to support or oppose this bill as well as any suggested amendments to it. A quick perusal of the bill indicates to me, however, that claims of this nature could be paid directly out of U.S.-owned foreign currencies, and I expect to examine this possibility when the bill is considered by the Committee on Foreign Relations.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed in the RECORD at this point, together with the letter from the Secretary of State and its accompanying report.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill, letter, and report will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 3072) to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to effect the payment of certain claims against the United States, introduced by Mr. FULBRIGHT, by request, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, 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 the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sum as may be necessary to effect full and final settlement of the following claims against the United States:

(a) Claims of the Government of Israel in the sum of NF45,274.25 ($9,190.67) on behalf of Izhaq Cohen and in the sum of NF36,582.12 ($7,426.17) on behalf of Jacob Kashi, arising as a consequence of injuries sustained by Izhaq Cohen and Jacob Kashi in an automobile accident which occurred at Paris, France, on April 22, 1956, involving a Government-owned vehicle of the United States Embassy at Paris;

(b) Claim of the Government of France in the sum of NF16,454.59 ($3,340.28) on behalf of Marie Kerardy arising as a consequence of injuries sustained by Marie Kerardy in an automobile accident which occurred at Paris, France, on January 13, 1954, involving a Government-owned vehicle of the United States Embassy at Paris.

In all, $19,957.12, together with such additional sums due to increases in rates of exchange as may be necessary to pay the claims in the foreign currency specified.

The letter and report presented by Mr. FULBRIGHT are as follows:

Hon. RICHARD M. NIXON,
President of the Senate.

DEAR MR. VICE PRESIDENT: I enclose for your consideration a report and recommendation regarding legislation to enable this Government to effect settlement of claims of the Governments of Israel and France against the United States, in the total sum of approximately $19,957.12.

The claims of the Government of Israel were presented to the U.S. Government through the diplomatic channel on March 12, 1958, and are on behalf of Mr. Izhaq Cohen and Mr. Jacob Kashi, Israeli nationals, in the amounts of NF45,274.25 (French new francs) ($9,190.67), and NF36,582.12 (French new francs) ($7,426.17), respectively. The claims are based on personal injuries and losses sustained by Messrs. Cohen and Kashi in an automobile accident at Paris on April 22, 1956, which was caused by the negligent operation by an employee of the United States of a Government-owned vehicle of the U.S. Embassy at Paris.

The claim of the Government of France was presented to the U.S. Government through the diplomatic channel on October 10, 1958, and is on behalf of Mrs. Marie Kerardy, a French national, in the amount of NF16,454.59 (French new francs) ($3,340.28). The claim is based on personal injuries and losses sustained by Mrs. Kerardy in an automobile accident at Paris on January 13, 1954, which was caused by the negligent operation by an employee of the United States of a Government-owned vehicle of the U.S. Embassy at Paris.

The claims are meritorious and the United States is legally liable for their payment. The amounts asked are not excessive. There is, however, no existing legislative authority for their settlement. I shall, therefore, be gratified if you will cause legislation to be introduced in the U.S. Senate and if you will endeavor to have it enacted as soon as possible. A suggested draft bill is enclosed.

A similar letter is being sent to the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

The Department has been advised by the Bureau of the Budget that there is no objection to the submission of this proposal to the Congress for its consideration.

Sincerely yours,
CHRISTIAN A. HERTER.

REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION CONCERNING CLAIMS OF THE GOVERNMENTS OF ISRAEL AND FRANCE AGAINST THE GOVERNMENT OF THE UNITED STATES

I. CLAIMS OF THE GOVERNMENT OF ISRAEL ON BEHALF OF IZHAQ COHEN AND JACOB KASHI

On March 12, 1958, the Government of Israel presented to the U.S. Government claims on behalf of Izhaq Cohen and Jacob Kashi, Israeli citizens, for 4,527,425 French francs and 3,658,212 French francs, respectively, or a total of 8,185,637 French francs, on account of injuries sustained by them in an accident at Paris on April 22, 1956, involving a Government-owned vehicle of the U.S. Embassy at Paris. Since the date on which the claims were presented, the Government of France has officially converted the franc into a new franc at the rate of 100 old francs to one new franc (effective January 1, 1960). Consequently, the amounts claimed on behalf of Izhaq Cohen and Jacob Kashi when converted into the new French franc are 45,274.25 francs and 36,582.12 francs, respectively, or a total of 81,856.37 francs. All sums in French francs appearing below are expressed in terms of the new French franc.

The accident on which the claims are based occurred under the following circumstances: On April 22, 1956, Jean Funis, a local employee of the U.S. Embassy at Paris, was driving an Embassy vehicle in the performance of official Department of State activities. At a short distance from the intersection of Avenue de l'Opera, a four-lane street, and Rue de l'Echelle, Funis attempted to make a "U" turn from the curbside traffic lane. As the Embassy vehicle crossed the adjacent or inside traffic lane it was struck on the left side by a motor scooter which was proceeding in the same direction. The motor scooter was operated by Izhaq Cohen with Jacob Kashi as a passenger. These facts are substantiated by a report of the Paris police and an investigation by the U.S. Embassy at Paris which includes statements of two disinterested witnesses to the accident. The Embassy concluded that Funis, the Embassy's driver, was responsible for the accident as "he contravened articles 6 and 24 of the French Highway Code and article 10 of the 'Ordonnance Generale du 19 fevrier 1948' published by the 'Prefecture de Police' which set forth the rules regarding the precautions which must necessarily be taken by a driver when he intends to make a turn." The Office of the Legal Adviser for the Department of State has reviewed the entire record and the applicable French traffic laws and is of the same opinion.

In the accident Izhaq Cohen, the operator of the motor scooter, suffered severe traumatic injury to the skull and cervical area and Jacob Kashi suffered a severe contusion of the right knee with a tranverse fracture of the kneecap. Their injuries resulted in findings of permanent partial disability of 25 percent for Cohen and 13 percent for Kashi by a medical expert engaged by the Embassy. The claim on behalf of Cohen is made up of the following general items: medical expenses and repair of motor scooter, 549 francs; 2 months' total loss of wages while totally disabled, 1,750 francs; 1 month's partial loss of wages while partially disabled, 437.50 francs; permanent partial disability of 25 percent (computed in accordance with French law and practice, namely, annual income times 25 percent times an official factor which is derived from the age of the injured party, etc.), 39,537.75 francs; pain and suffering, 3,000 francs, or a grand total of 45,274.25 francs.

The claim on behalf of Kashi is made up of the following general items: medical expenses, 104.32 francs; 10 weeks' total loss of wages while totally disabled, 2,700 francs; 9 weeks' partial loss of wages while partially disabled, 1,215 francs; permanent partial

disability of 13 percent (computed in the manner explained above), 29,062.80 francs; pain and suffering, 3,500 francs, or a grand total of 36,582.12 francs.

The Embassy at Paris investigated and verified the amounts claimed on behalf of Cohen and Kashi and is of the opinion that they are fair and reasonable and should be paid. The Department is of the same opinion.

Accordingly, it is believed that a grant in the sum of 45,274.25 French francs (the equivalent of $9,190.67 at the current exchange rate of 20.3 cents for 1 franc) on behalf of Izhaq Cohen and a grant in the sum of 36,582.12 French francs (the equivalent of $7,426.17 at the current exchange rate of 20.3 cents for 1 franc) on behalf of Jacob Kashi are warranted and it is, therefore, recommended that the Congress appropriate those amounts, or such greater or lesser amounts as may be required if there is a change in the rate of exchange, to effect a final settlement of the claim.

II. CLAIM OF THE GOVERNMENT OF FRANCE ON BEHALF OF MARIE KERARDY

The claim of the Government of France on behalf of Marie Kerardy, a French citizen, for 1,645,459 French francs is based upon injuries and damages sustained by her in an accident at Paris on January 13, 1954, involving a Government-owned vehicle of the U.S. Embassy at Paris. The claim was formally espoused by the Government of France on October 10, 1958. Effective January 1, 1960, the Government of France has officially converted the franc into a new franc at the rate of 100 old francs to 1 new franc. Consequently, the amount claimed on behalf of Marie Kerardy when converted into the new French franc is 16,454.59 francs. All sums in French francs appearing below are expressed in terms of the new French franc.

The accident occurred under the following circumstances: On January 13, 1954, Marcel Revel, a local employee of the U.S. Embassy at Paris, was driving an Embassy vehicle in the performance of official business for the Foreign Operations Administration. Revel was proceeding on Rue d'Aubervilliers. As he approached the intersection with Rue du Departement, a truck operated by Andre Devuldere approached from the right on Rue du Departement. Revel was unable to stop in time to avoid striking the truck and swerved to the left in an effort to pass in front of the truck. He was unsuccessful in this attempt and the truck struck the side of the Embassy's vehicle after which the Embassy's vehicle skidded diagonally across the intersection, crashed into a fish stand and knocked down the claimant, Marie Kerardy, who was on the sidewalk. It was raining at the time of the accident and the streets were wet and slippery. These facts are substantiated by an investigation by the Paris police and by the U.S. Embassy at Paris and the interrogation of witnesses to the accident. From the extent of the damage to the Embassy's vehicle and the distance it traveled after the impact, it is evident that Revel was driving too fast for the condition of the street. It is also evident that Revel failed to yield the right-of-way in contravention of French law and traffic regulations which provide that a vehicle approaching from the right has the right-of-way. The Embassy concluded from its investigation that Revel was primarily responsible for the accident. The Office of the Legal Adviser for the Department of State has reviewed the entire record and is of the same opinion.

In the accident the claimant, Marie Kerardy, suffered severe injury to the right sacroiliac joint, right thigh, and sciatic nerve. Her injuries resulted in a finding of disability of approximately 30 percent by a "sworn physician attached to the Civil Court of the Seine." Her claim as compromised by the Department is made up of the following general items: medical expenses and damage to clothing, 1,137.73 francs; permanent partial disability (computed in the manner explained above), 14,316.86 francs; pain and suffering, 1,000 francs, or a grand total of 16,454.59 francs. The Embassy at Paris has verified these amounts and is of the view that the claim should be paid. The Department is of the same opinion.

Accordingly, it is believed that a grant in the sum of 16,454.59 French francs (the equivalent of $3,340.28 at the current exchange rate of 20.3 cents for 1 franc) on behalf of Marie Kerardy is warranted and it is, therefore, recommended that the Congress appropriate that amount, or such other amount as may be required if there is a change in the rate of exchange, to effect a final settlement of the claim.

REHABILITATION OF NAVAJO AND HOPI TRIBES OF INDIANS—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, on July 28, 1959, I introduced S. 2456, a bill relating to the Navajo Indians in Arizona and New Mexico. The distinguished junior Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER] wishes to be associated with the proposed legislation.

I am delighted to have the Senator join with me on this bill, and therefore, I ask unanimous consent that when S. 2456 is next printed the name of the junior Senator from Arizona may be included as a cosponsor of it.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT OF SECTION 309(a)(1) OF TARIFF ACT OF 1930—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. FONG] may be added as an additional cosponsor of the bill (S. 3021) to amend section 309 (a)(1) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, introduced by me on February 11.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PRESIDENTIAL CONFERENCE TO STUDY MEANS FOR CONTROLLING DISTRIBUTION OF OBSCENE MATTER AND MATERIALS—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF JOINT RESOLUTION

Under authority of the order of the Senate of February 15, 1960, the names of Senators GREEN, PROUTY, KEFAUVER, BIBLE, NEUBERGER, KUCHEL, BUSH, MOSS, KEATING, SCHOEPPEL, MURRAY, YOUNG of North Dakota, FONG, BRIDGES, BENNETT, COOPER, JAVITS, CASE of New Jersey, SPARKMAN, HOLLAND, HUMPHREY, THURMOND, and RANDOLPH were added as additional cosponsors of the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 160) to provide for a conference consisting of Federal, State, and local officials, and members of public and private groups or organizations to consider and propose methods of, and to coordinate action for, combating the traffic in obscene matters and materials, introduced by Mr. SCOTT on February 15, 1960.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF OLIN HATFIELD CHILSON TO BE U.S. DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLORADO, VICE WILLIAM L. KNOUS, DECEASED

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for 10:30 a.m., Friday, February 26, 1960, in room 2228, New Senate Office Building, on the nomination of Olin Hatfield Chilson, of Colorado, to be U.S. district judge for the district of Colorado, vice William F. Knous, deceased.

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

ADDRESSES, EDITORIAL, 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. BUSH:

Statement prepared by him, relating to the growth and development of the University of Hartford.

ALOYSIUS CARDINAL STEPINAC

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I would not like to have this period pass without taking some notice of the passing of a great churchman, Aloysius Cardinal Stepinac.

He was primate of Yugoslavia's 7 million Catholics. He died at the age of 61, after 5 years of Tito's Communist imprisonment and 9 years of "parolee imprisonment."

Mr. President, it is amazing that Tito's government denied the burial of Cardinal Stepinac in his own cathedral in Zagreb. One manifestly must wonder why. I believe the obvious reason is the fear of the anti-Communist strength that is growing in Yugoslavia.

Finally, after world public opinion and strong population resentment everywhere, including Yugoslavia, Tito permitted the ceremony to be held in the cathedral.

As the whole world knows, Cardinal Stepinac was a relentless and unyielding foe of communism. He was elevated to his post of cardinal in 1953, but, notwithstanding that fact, he could not go to Rome, to attend the ceremony there, because the Communist government of Tito threatened not to permit him to return.

People everywhere in the world, and especially the people of Croatia, Slovenia, and Serbia, mourn the passing of this great man. The world has lost a great leader.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CARLSON in the chair). Does the Sen-

ator from Illinois yield to the Senator from Montana?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I desire to join the distinguished minority leader in the remarks he has made just now on the passing of Cardinal Stepinac. A great man has gone to his reward, but the example he has set will live for many decades after his passing.

THOUGHTS ON THE PRESIDENT'S IMPENDING VOYAGE TO LATIN AMERICA

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, within a few days, the President will be leaving on a tour of Latin America. I know that other Members of the Senate join with me in wishing him a most pleasant journey.

There is every reason to believe that we shall not witness, in connection with the President's impending trip, a repetition of the reprehensible vilification that marked an earlier goodwill tour of the distinguished Vice President of the United States [Mr. NIXON]. On the contrary, there is every reason to believe that the President will be welcomed with enthusiasm wherever he goes.

The President is a warm man and he evokes a warm response. I hope that after he leaves the Presidency, he will continue—as a private citizen—to make journeys such as he is now making, to various parts of the world. I hope that the next President will prevail upon Mr. Eisenhower to do so in the interests of the Nation. Journeys by persons of such obvious good will as Mr. Eisenhower can only be welcomed in a world so replete with ill will as the one in which we live.

But, Mr. President, I am bold enough to suggest that, at this moment in time, something more than a journey is needed in our relations with the nations of Latin America. The state of those relations is far from good. Nor are these relations likely to be improved merely by the ritual of good-will tours endlessly repeated.

Travel by the President to other nations is not an end in itself. The President abroad is not just a tourist; he is the personification of the Nation. His appearances on foreign soil can never be casual, nor can they be mere gestures of good will. The President is the fountainhead of action in this Nation in matters of foreign policy. I hope that his appearance in Latin America, particularly at this time, will signify action as regards inter-American policies.

Let us face it: The relations between this Nation and Latin America are plagued with problems and irritants. Unless the impending voyage is a prelude to coming to grips with these problems and irritants, it would be better if it were not made at all. Unless it signifies action, the good-will effects will soon wear off and the aftertaste will be doubly bitter. The pleasant climate which the visit will quickly engender will chill just as quickly.

I emphasize, Mr. President, that it is the followthrough, what comes after, not the good-will tour itself—which will affect the deeper fortunes of this Nation in its relations with the other Latin American Republics. In short, the President, in his person alone, can open doors; but if they are to remain open, it must be clear why they were opened in the first place; and, in subsequent action, the administrative bureaucracy of this Nation must be led firmly by the President to keep them open.

For that reason, once again I commend to the Senate and to the President and his administration a recent report of the distinguished Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] on a trip which he made to Latin America a few months ago. In his report, "Mr. Hemisphere"—for that is a sobriquet which he most justly deserves—outlines a program of far-reaching constructive action with respect to Latin America. In his report, the able Senator points the way to coming to grips with the problems and irritants which have accumulated in inter-American relations. If the President wishes to give to his impending good-will tour a fruitful and lasting value to the Nation, I suggest that he direct his attention to that report and consider its implications in conjunction with the heads of states with whom he will meet; and, subsequently, that he lead the administrative bureaucracy in line with the implications.

At this moment I would add only two other thoughts to what is contained in the report of the Senator from Vermont. I believe that it is time to recognize—in inter-American policy—the growing trend in the world toward regional groupings, toward common markets. This trend is already well advanced in Europe. Indeed, last year, it made its formal appearance in the Western Hemisphere, in an agreement among five Central American Republics, which since has run into certain difficulties. On yesterday, seven additional Latin American nations signed an agreement opening the way to a common market as among themselves. These nations are Argentina, Brazil, Bolivia, Chile, Paraguay, Peru, Uruguay, and, significantly, Mexico. In short, there is a new force operating in the realm of international economics and trade, and we will ignore its meaning to us and to the rest of the Americas only to our detriment. The implications of this new force of regionalism warrant full and joint exploration by all the American Republics. Its potential as a tool for dealing with some of the most unyielding economic problems of inter-American relations should be fully evaluated. We need to think boldly and with fresh inspiration. We need to consider whether a common market for all the Americas, including Canada if it so desires, can serve the interests of the nations of this hemisphere. I can conceive of no better time and place for giving to this exploration a firm political impetus than the occasion of the President's coming good-will tour to Latin America.

In this connection, I am delighted that the President is going to stop in Puerto Rico. The relations between the Puerto Rican Commonwealth and the United States are, in major part, built upon the successful operation of what is, in effect, a common market. This operation has redounded to the immense and pyramiding economic advantage of both the United States and the Commonwealth.

I can think of no man who is better equipped to counsel with the President in this matter, as well as in other aspects of inter-American relations, than the brilliant and distinguished Governor of Puerto Rico, Mr. Muñoz-Marín, and, indeed, I regret that he is not accompanying the President on this good-will tour. During his entire life, Mr. Muñoz-Marín has lived and breathed and pondered the basic problems of Puerto Rico in its relationship with the United States. He has led in the successful search for the solutions to many of these problems. His wealth of experience can provide new insights into almost every facet of inter-American relations on the larger scale of hemispheric relations.

If I may summarize, Mr. President, may I say again that I wish the President a most pleasant and fruitful journey to Latin America. And to make it most useful, I respectfully direct his attention to the recent report of the distinguished Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], to the concept of a common market for the Americas, and to the wise counsel which he can obtain from the outstanding Governor of Puerto Rico, Mr. Muñoz-Marín.

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

Mr. MANSFIELD. I would be delighted to yield to my good friend but I believe I have gone beyond my time.

Mr. AIKEN. May I speak in my own time?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont is recognized.

Mr. AIKEN. I wish to express my appreciation to the Senator from Montana for his generous remarks relating to the report I made on a comparatively short visit to Latin America; but I particularly should like to commend the Senator for pointing out to this body the importance of the agreement signed by eight Latin American countries yesterday setting up a common market.

I believe we are going to hear more about the Common Market from now on. We already have the Sixes and Sevens in Europe. Those countries are setting up agreements and common market programs, not without difficulty. There are bound to be difficulties. As one group sets up a common market, it is bound to come in conflict, perhaps, not only with some of their own internal affairs, but also with other nations and other groups of nations.

However, it is my belief that as more and more groups of nations establish common markets and put themselves in a position to deal as a group with other groups or other nations, we may approach more rapidly than we have the time when it will be possible to greatly expand international commerce and industry, without quite as much difficulty and without quite as much time as has been the case in the past and as is the case at the present time.

The Latin American groups that signed the agreement yesterday for a common market stretch all the way from Mexico to the Argentine. The agreement does not include many of the

smaller nations of Latin America. It does not include 14 other American states. But it will be interesting to watch the outcome of the efforts of these eight states to make it easier to do business with one another than it has been up to the present time.

As they succeed, or as they tend to succeed, in their efforts, it will make it easier for the other American states, including all countries of the Western Hemisphere, to get together in relation to marketing and production of our common commodities. That is one of the basic problems which we are facing today, and one which must be resolved.

Again I express my appreciation to the Senator from Montana for his performance of a service in bringing this matter to the attention of the Senate.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, before the absence of a quorum is suggested, will the Chair ascertain whether there is further morning business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair inquires as to whether there is further morning business? If there is further morning business, morning business is closed.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further proceedings under the quorum call be dispensed with.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LEASING OF PORTION OF FORT CROWDER, MO.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 8315) to authorize the Secretary of the Army to lease a portion of Fort Crowder, Mo., to Stella Reorganized Schools R-I, Missouri.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President——

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendments of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] designated "2-15-60—B," inserting a new title relative to civil rights.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, is the Presiding Officer about to put the question on the amendments? I thought the Senator from Missouri was seeking recognition.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair was waiting for some Senator to address the Chair.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I understood the Senator from Missouri addressed the Chair.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I did address the Chair.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I think the Senator deserves recognition. He is a distinguished candidate and a Senator. I thought surely the Presiding Officer was going to recognize him.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, any time I can get a compliment from the Senator from Arkansas it is appreciated, at least as much as approval from any other Member of the Senate.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Missouri is recognized.

THE STATUS OF OUR NATIONAL DEFENSE

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, there is growing concern on the part of the American people with regard to the status of this Nation's defenses.

This is accompanied, also, I believe, with an increasing sense of confusion, due to conflicting statements and attitudes of various officials.

I wish to address myself to this subject in order that the people's understanding of the facts may be increased; and, as a result, their confusion may be lessened or dispelled.

The Communist military and economic strength has been increasing more rapidly than ours, and consequently the situation today is, and in the years to come will be, more critical than at any time in our history.

While it is always a matter of judgment, rather than a matter of certainty, as to how much strength is adequate, it is wiser to overestimate how much is needed than to take the risk of figuring too close and underestimating.

An overall nuclear deterrent is essential. Likewise, modern and mobile forces are also essential to deter and to prevent the piecemeal or small war efforts by the Communists.

Before proceeding with an assessment of our relative defense posture, there are several important ingredients in the current state of confusion which need to be exposed to the light of public understanding.

The first has to do with the question of release or revelation of secret information.

The executive branch of our Government has the responsibility of classifying, and thereby withholding from the public information the publication of which it believes detrimental to national security.

While it is possible, even probable, that the classification function is misused, in the sense that unpleasant facts well known to the Communists are kept from the American people, this still does not give others the authority to declassify such information.

I do not know of any Member of the Congress who has released, or has threatened to release, classified information.

Last year, on January 12, the Vice President was reported as having told members of the press that the missile gap not only was not widening, but instead was rapidly being closed.

I promptly told the Senate that such a statement, if made, was not true.

Soon thereafter, Secretary of Defense McElroy announced that the Russian superiority in ICBM's would soon reach a point where they would have three times as many of these weapons as we would have.

This 3 to 1 ratio or percentage was an understatement of how wide the gap would go, based upon the official estimates of Soviet capability compared with our own official ICBM schedules, but Secretary McElroy, as the guardian or our national defense secrets, made two points clear: First, that the ICBM gap was expected to widen and: second, that such ratios or percentages were not classified information.

This year, on January 13, and again on January 19, the present Secretary of Defense told the appropriate House and Senate committees that a new type of analysis of intelligence figures on ICBM's was being used for the first time.

He testified:

> The great divergence, based on figures that have been testified to in years past, narrows because we talked before about a different set of comparisons—ones that were based on Soviet capabilities. This present one is an intelligence estimate on what we believe he probably will do, not what he is capable of doing.

By announcing to the public that the previous ratio has been modified downward, the present Secretary has also accepted his predecessor's ruling that ratios as such are not classified data.

The truth is that ratios of United States and Soviet weapons systems have, in other cases as well, been labeled nonclassified by the Pentagon. The current 4 to 1 ratio against us re submarines is an example.

As the record will bear out, I have followed the Secretary of Defense's precedent and have spoken only in terms of ratios or percentages.

The executive branch has the right to classify and declassify information incident to our defenses. However, it does not have the right to give information in secret to the Congress which shows the missile gap is widening in favor of the Soviets—and at the same time inform the public that the gap is narrowing.

That is what was done this year; and that is one of the primary reasons for the present confusion.

Now let me turn briefly to another subject, namely, the history of missile development in this country, particularly long-range missiles.

A factual clarification of the past should help us determine what needs to be done in the future.

In April and June of 1946, Army Air Corps contracts totaling $1,893,000 were granted a private aircraft company for drawing up designs for a new long-range missile. This development was identified as "Project MX-774."

During 1946 and early 1947, the design work on a long-range ballistic missile continued under this contract.

On July 8, 1947, as the missile neared the first testing stage, the project was canceled by the Department of the Army, although the unspent funds which had been made available for the project were authorized for the testing of the first three missile prototypes.

The tests were started in 1947, and completed in December 1948.

When the contracts were placed in 1946, and at the time they were canceled in July 1947, there was no separate Air Force. There was the Army Air Corps, part of the Army.

During 1949 and 1950, the project was kept alive with private funds.

Mr. President, I will say parenthetically I believe I was instrumental in that effort.

In January 1951, the Air Force awarded a new contract for the development of an ICBM. This was identified as Project MX-1593. The missile under development was named the "Atlas."

During 1951 and 1952, progress was made in improving the Atlas design.

By 1952, the United States already had developed other missiles, such as the Terrier, the Sparrow, the Nike, and the Matador. It also had under development the Snark, the Hermes, the Navajo, the Rascal, the Lark, and the Atlas.

On November 1, 1952, the United States tested its first hydrogen bomb, which had been ordered into development by the President in 1950. This successful test, for reasons we all know, had a major impact on future missile development.

Nevertheless it was not until the late fall of 1955 that the Atlas program was assigned a national priority; and at no time has it been put on a full production basis.

Failure to spend funds made available by the Congress during the past 3 years has resulted in far less operational capability for the present and immediate future than would have been the case had the production schedule with respect to this weapon been geared to a sense of urgency.

The amount of money spent on missiles during recent years is far greater than that spent in the late 1940's and the early 1950's. This trend of expenditures, however, is no proper measure of emphasis. Research and development instituted during the earlier years had progressed to the point where, more recently, we have been able to go into the much more expensive portion of any research-development-production cycle—that is, the prototype and production phase itself, combined with the establishment of the bases.

When one is in a position to order quantities of the finished product including bases, obviously the amount of money needed becomes many time greater than that required during the research and development period.

The basic elements essential to the development of a long-range ballistic missile either had been developed, or were in the process of research and development, by 1953.

For example, by that time we had the atomic and hydrogen weapons.

The initial research and design studies for the Atlas missile had been undertaken.

The early testing phase was underway; and the rocket engines, which are now the basic propulsion elements of the Thor, Jupiter, and Atlas had been developed for the Navajo missile project.

The vast majority of the missiles in our operational inventory today were initiated during the previous administration, or have been developed from those earlier programs.

When President Eisenhower took office in 1953, he inherited President Truman's draft for the fiscal year 1954 budget; and one of his first major actions was to cut about $5¼ billion from the money to be requested for the armed services in that budget. This reduction included funds scheduled for missiles.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield, or would he prefer not to yield at this time?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I would prefer questions at the end of my brief address. I will then yield to the Senator.

At the time the reduction to which I have just referred occurred, the Secretary of Defense, Charles E. Wilson, said he was going to cut $5 billion out of the Air Force and give the people of the United States a better Air Force. Then the distinguished senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], who graces us with his presence in the Chamber today, asked him, if he could do that with a $5 billion cut why he did not cut out $10 billion and give us a much better Air Force.

Even after the Soviets exploded their H-bomb in 1953, and our relative military advantage had started to decline rapidly, the long-range ballistic missile requirement was not met with either decision or a sense of urgency.

The most significant point of all, however, is not one of assessing blame or giving credit for the past.

When I see some of the tables of expenditures placed in the RECORD about what was done in the past, I am surprised that those who produce the charts do not put in what was spent on missiles by Franklin Roosevelt or Woodrow Wilson.

I have already explained—I am sure to the entire satisfaction of anyone with an objective viewpoint—why, when we are at the stage of production of missiles and construction of bases, we spend more than when we are only in the research and development stage. As I have said, the hydrogen bomb was first exploded in late 1952. I do not see the point in the continuous but not very constructive effort to pin the blame. Two wrongs do not make a right. I think we should get together and tell the American people the truth, and do whatever is necessary to improve our position.

The pressing problem today is the necessity for revising existing plans and policies before it is too late.

Suffice to say, that with each day and each year that has passed, there has been more evidence of danger and less reason for inaction and complacency.

There is no question that the American people are deeply concerned about the present defense situation as well as about the plans for the future.

There are pertinent facts which should clarify the situation and, if fully understood, should go far toward eliminating the rosy hue which has enveloped far too many official statements on the matter.

The following facts which I present are based upon the official intelligence figures and the official U.S. schedules, and hence are based upon the same data available to, and used by, the President, the Secretary of Defense, and the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

Fact No. 1: The national intelligence figures presented to the Congress last year, as compared with the figures for our own ICBM program, showed that the Soviets would soon have substantially more than the 3 to 1 advantage announced by Secretary of Defense McElroy.

Fact No. 2: The national intelligence figures presented to the Congress this year, as compared with the figures for our own ICBM program, showed that the ratio still is, and will for some time be, higher than 3 to 1. This data revealed also that the ratio of their ICBM's ready to launch, compared with ours ready to launch, this year and for several years to come, exceeds 3 to 1, and is much higher based on this year's figures than based on last year's figures.

Fact No. 3: In addition to conceding to the Soviets many times the number of ICBM's we have programed for the same date, it is also conceded that the much greater thrust of their rocket engines enables the Soviet ICBM to carry a substantially larger payload than our ICBM for the same distance.

Fact No. 4: Between January 19 and January 29, 1960, Senate committees were given two different sets of official figures on the reliability and accuracy of Soviet ICBM's, the more recent figures crediting them with greater reliability and accuracy than the former ones.

Fact No. 5: There is no sound reason and no safe basis for attributing less reliability and less accuracy to Soviet ICBM's than to our own long-range missiles.

Fact No. 6: The Soviets have more modern jet bombers than any other nation in the world, although the United States has more heavy bombers.

Fact No. 7: The United States has not accelerated its ICBM program. Despite official statements which have given the contrary implication, there is no provision for such missile acceleration in the new budget before the Congress. Rather, the funds the administration has requested are for use at the end of the existing programs.

Fact No. 8: Gen. Thomas Power, commander of the Strategic Air Command, stated on January 19, 1960, that the Soviets could at that time destroy 95 percent of all the U.S. retaliatory forces if they had 150 ICBM's and 150 IRBM's and if we had no airborne alert.

The Soviets already have large numbers of IRBM's and will soon have large numbers of ICBM's.

Fact No. 9: We have no airborne alert today. It takes time and funds to get such an alert rolling, and the present budget provides far less than the funds needed for this essential insurance.

Fact No. 10: Except for our strength in heavy bombers, the growing ICBM gap is not offset by our strength in other weapons systems. As an example, in medium range ballistic missiles the Soviets have many more than has this country.

In short-range jet bombers, the Soviets have many more than we do, including those we have available on aircraft carriers.

In submarines, we all know that the Soviets have many times more than this country.

The American people are paying the bill. Their freedom is at stake. Therefore they are entitled to have this summary of the facts. Above all, they are

entitled not to be misled by false statements.

I agree with those who state that, primarily because of the great capability of our SAC bomber fleet, we could probably destroy any nation today which dared attack us.

My concern, and that of everyone who knows and understands the facts, is based on what our relative situation will be next year and the years that follow—if we do not remove the cloak of complacency and get down to work.

I was in Britain during the heavy Nazi bombing of that country. I saw the way the people there could take heavy and continuous bombing raids. I think it is one of the greatest disservices that can be done to the American people to spread the idea that they would be frightened by the truth.

Another disservice, in my opinion, is that when we talk about the facts we are downgrading the United States. We know the people want the truth. The strength of a nation depends upon the will of the people, and in a democratic form of government the people's will can function only if the people are informed.

It is not a question of downgrading our great country. Rather, it is a question of whether the people are sufficiently informed and adequately alerted to insist that their Government act now before it is too late.

It is a disservice to our country to suggest that the facts are as we wish they were, rather than as they are.

We can, however, take specific actions which would help offset what otherwise could become a dangerously wide Soviet advantage.

I recommend the following such actions:

Provide for an adequate airborne alert of SAC bombers.

Accelerate the Polaris and ICBM missile programs.

Speed up the ICBM hardening and dispersal programs.

Increase our anti-submarine warfare capability.

Reverse the decision to, in effect, cancel out the B–70 airplane.

Modernize the equipment and increase the mobility of our Army and Marine Corps.

All of this will cost money.

A country with some $1¼ billion income a day can and must afford it.

Mr. President, I never thought that money would become so all-important in this country, a country with the greatest income in the history of the world, an income of $500 billion a year or an income of $1¼ billion dollars a day. I never thought that in order to save one-third of 1 day's income, or thereabouts, the United States would stop all the research and development on airplanes in this country beyond the Mach II airplane. In this connection, it is important to note that responsible newspaper men have written articles to the effect that the Russians are proceeding to develop an airplane somewhat comparable to the B–70.

Of course, we know that if we can break the heat barrier, which the B–70 is designed to do, the results would be transferred to our naval planes and other planes, including commercial airplanes. Moreover, it might well be the ideal airplane to use nuclear propulsion.

Mr. President, I want to reemphasize that it has become increasingly clear that we should modernize the equipment and increase the mobility of our Army and Marine Corps.

I was in Berlin only last year. There I found that our troops not only are tremendously outnumbered, as we all know they are, but that they are using some weapons which date from World War I. If we have the right to draft boys off the farms and out of the cities to go into uniform during peacetime we have the duty to give them the best equipment and the best training and, in turn, the best chance to come home safely.

As I said, all of this will cost money.

A country with aproximately $1¼ billion income a day can and must afford it.

The necessary additional funds, however, could have been obtained through the elimination of obsolete and duplicating weapons systems; and through reorganization of the Pentagon on the basis of the unprecedented military requirements of this nuclear-space age.

If additional taxes are necessary, and after there has been a real effort to get the maximum defense out of each defense dollar, I am certain the American people will support any sacrifice necessary to preserve our Nation and our freedom.

We can attain permanent world peace only if we are able to negotiate from a position of strength, supported by worldwide knowledge that we have that strength.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed at this point in the RECORD certain published articles and editorials, pertinent to this serious defense situation.

An editorial, entitled "Probability Versus Capability," from the St. Louis Globe-Democrat of February 4, 1960.

An article by Gen. Thomas R. Phillips, from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of January 21, 1960.

An editorial, entitled "Needed: A Mightier Shield," from the February 15, 1960, issue of Life magazine, even though it will appear elsewhere in the RECORD.

A letter by Henry A. Kissinger to the editor of the New York Times on February 15, 1960.

An article by Walter Lippmann from the Denver Post of February 11, 1960.

An article by Holmes Alexander from the Northern Virginia Sun of February 15, 1960.

An article by Gen. Thomas R. Phillips, entitled "The Great Guessing Game," from the Reporter magazine of February 18, 1960.

An editorial, entitled "Keep Defense Debate in the Open," from the Denver Post of February 11, 1960.

An editorial, entitled "So What Must We Do About Our Defense Posture," from the Iron Age of February 18, 1960.

An article by Gen. Carl Spaatz, entitled "America's B–70 Must Fly," from the January 25, 1960, issue of Newsweek magazine.

An editorial, entitled "Bombers in the Air," from the Washington Star of February 17, 1960.

An article by William Hines, entitled "President's Quick Trip Sparks Security Slip," from the Washington Star of February 11, 1960.

An editorial, entitled "Criticism's Critics," from the Washington Post of February 14, 1960.

An editorial, entitled "Catching Up," from the Washington Post of February 16, 1960.

An excerpt from Post Scripts, published in the Washington Post of February 15, 1960.

And an article by Walter Lippmann from the Washington Post of January 26, 1960.

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

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

[From the St. Louis Globe-Democrat, Feb. 4, 1960]

PROBABILITY VERSUS CAPABILITY

Defense Secretary Thomas S. Gates, Jr., testifying before the Senate Appropriations Committee earlier this week, stated, "I do believe his [General Power's] estimate of mathematical probability is unrealistic in relation to the facts."

Secretary Gates has opened an entirely new dimension in military planning and intelligence in his insistence in basing U.S. preparedness on what this Nation believes the enemy probably will do, rather than on estimates of his capabilities.

Estimates of enemy capabilities—that is, the utmost that the enemy is capable of doing with the arms, manpower, and resources at his disposal, including corollary elements such as surprise and deception, have been the yardstick of military experts for at least 4,000 years.

The probability estimate, on the other hand, gives weight to a number of other factors such as the enemy's state of mind, the risks entailed, the gains to be achieved, and the like. The great danger of probabilities is that we can never know what is in the enemy's mind. The danger of great miscalculation continually exists in applying American thought processes to others whose mental attitudes are completely different from our own.

American planning, based on what the enemy may do rather than what he can do, is a dangerous business, fraught with folly and possible disaster for America and the free world.

The history of warfare in the 20th century has been exclusively the undeclared war, the heavy first blow, the attempt to knock out by one lightning stroke the enemy's will to resist. The niceties of older days such as the formal declaration of war, are no longer observed.

If, heaven forbid, war comes to the United States, there is not a single responsible military man who believes that it will be anything except an all-out, coordinated blow, not at one Pearl Harbor but at 30 or 50 or 300 strategic points simultaneously.

This is the reason that we have dispersal and why General Power's Strategic Air Command keeps flights in the air virtually around the clock.

This is why the Senate this week passed an amendment allowing the various State Governors to appoint Congressmen if more than half the Congress should be wiped out.

Examples of this thinking could be multiplied endlessly.

There is no safety for America unless we plan our defenses, including our deterrents to attack, based on the enemy's maximum capability—not on our guess, hopeful or otherwise, of what he might do.

Our strength lies only in being prepared for the worst, recognizing that we are against a cruel and wily foe who will do everything to deceive us, to catch us off guard, to lull us into a sense that all is right and that we have nothing to fear. Secretary Gates comes dangerously close to swallowing this bait.

There can be no gambling with the future of America. We must, if we are to survive, be the strongest Nation in the world—so strong that no foes will dare to attack us, because they would have the sure knowledge that any attack would result in their immediate and total annihilation.

Strength such as this is hardly forecast in the intelligence estimates of the administration which admits a 3-to-1 superiority against us in missiles, and the irrefuted fact that we are not narrowing the gap, but that indeed the gap is widening.

Nor is there reassurance, in this twilight of the airplane age, in the administration reluctantly tossing a paltry $20 million this year and $90 million next year to the Strategic Air Command which will give General Power a dependable first strike of 150 aircraft instead of the first strike requirement of 1,500 aircraft which experts say is necessary. We have no choice but to rely for retaliatory power on manned bombers until our missile strength is sufficient to supplant them.

Nor can the country be reassured by the President's testy insistence that he knows best about these things. The record of Russian accomplishment in the past 5 years is so enormous compared to our own that the Nation cannot afford to place its reliance on the judgment of one man, even that of Mr. Eisenhower.

No man is infallible. The American people should not be asked to base the most vital thing in our lives, the future of America, on the say-so of any one man, especially against the weight of evidence.

Experts believe that the strength necessary for America to remain strong and free can be achieved without a raise in taxes if the administration would unify the purchasing and command of the Armed Forces, on which only a token start has been made, and eliminate the duplication and downright waste of the services bidding against each other without coordination.

The United States can be wrong on a lot of policies and still retrieve its errors. If we are wrong once on the state of our strength relative to the Russians, we shall have forfeited our liberty and freedom for countless ages to come.

With the fate of America hanging in the balance, we can afford nothing less than sufficient strength to meet the enemy's maximum possible capabilities, not an estimate based half on hopeful opinion that he will not hit us as hard as he is capable, or on how much we can afford to spend for that strength.

The question is only how much can we afford not to spend, or can we afford to lose?

[From the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, Jan. 21, 1960]

ADMINISTRATION SLEIGHT-OF-HAND: ARMED FORCES CUT AS BUDGET MAKES STRENGTH SEEM THE SAME—ADMINISTRATIVE ACTION REDUCES MILITARY ESTABLISHMENT BELOW APPROPRIATION FIGURES—CONGRESS LOSES CONTROL

(By Brig. Gen. Thomas R. Phillips, U.S. Army, retired)

WASHINGTON, January 20.—There is some sleight-of-hand in the military budget that makes it look better than it is and even raises questions of good faith in the budget presentation.

In the budget document for the 1960 budget, the planned strength of the Navy, June 10, 1960, is shown as 630,000 men.

The planned strength for the Air Force is given as 845,000 men. In the 1961 budget the strengths planned for 1960 are given as 619,000 men and 850,000 men, a difference of 11,000 and 20,000 respectively. The meaning of this is that although Congress voted funds that it thought would maintain the Forces at a certain size, the administration has proceeded to reduce them without congressional review.

What makes this action seem to be a breach of faith is that it enables the new budget to show that the Navy and Air Force will have the same strength during the 1960 fiscal year, and this is not the case.

There is nothing to prevent the administration from doing the same thing again, that is, to announce certain strengths for 1961 and then to reduce them administratively and to present a new budget for 1961 showing different planned end strengths for 1961 and pretending that no reductions are contemplated.

By continuing to use this trick any administration can take out of the hands of Congress all control over the military posture of the United States. This has been done with naval ships and Air Force wings in the same manner as follows:

	Planned strength June 30, 1960	
	As shown in 1960 budget	As shown in 1961 budget
Navy:		
Commissioned ships in fleet	864	817
Warships	389	383
Other	434	475
Active aircraft inventory	9,200	8,657
Air Force:		
Combat wings	102	96
Strategic wings	43	40
Air defense wings	25	23
Tactical wings	34	33

The end strength projected for June 30, 1961, is 817 naval vessels, the same as the modified figures for June 30, 1960. If more reductions are contemplated there is nothing in the budget message to indicate it. But they can be contemplated and made exactly as is being done in the current fiscal year.

In the case of the Air Force, the figure in the 1961 budget for combat wings June 30, 1961, is 91. In the same document the figure for June 30, 1960, is 96, leading to the conclusion that a reduction of five wings is contemplated. But the 1960 budget gave a planned strength June 30, 1960, of 102 wings. The actual reduction is therefore 11 wings and not 5.

In the case of the Strategic Air Command, the apparent reduction is two wings and the actual reduction five. The 38 wings now planned for June 30, 1961, will include some missile wings, but the numbers and types are not identified.

These actions unquestionably were taken in good faith. With the budget planned more than a year before the beginning of the year in which the money is spent and obligated, inflation may force certain economies. Shifts in emphasis of weapons may dictate certain reductions in one direction to make men available for training for new weapons.

What is disturbing is that no attention is called in the budget document to the change in year-end strength from the 1960 budget figures and no explanation is given as to why forces, ships and wings have been reduced during the current fiscal year below the numbers for which Congress voted and appropriated.

For a change, the Army and Navy do not suffer severely in the 1961 budget. Army spending is increased $34 million and Navy spending $112 million. New appropriations for the Navy are increased $760 million and are decreased $154 million for the Army.

Air Force expenditure is decreased $328 million and new appropriations for the Air Force are decreased $758 million, almost the same as the increase in the Navy.

The Air Force is not complaining loudly yet. It was threatened with decreases of more than a billion dollars in new appropriations. It feels very much like a prisoner who has been on a diet of bread and water and now is allowed austere meals.

While many prized Air Force projects are continued, they are not adequately financed. There is only $20 million in the budget for the Sky Bolt, the airborne ballistic missile. This will enforce slow development.

Although another wing of B-52 intercontinental bombers is provided for, and the necessary tankers, but production is being slowed down to 7 or 8 a month instead of the current 15.

The President's budget message states that the Minuteman solid-propellant intercontinental missile will be operational by mid-1963. The fact is that while there may be a few missiles that could be operational, none will be operational that year under present plans.

The budget squeeze made the Air Force drop the F-108 2,000-mile-an-hour interceptor—and earlier the all-out effort for a nuclear-powered plane—in the hope of saving the B-70 2,000-mile-an-hour bomber. But the B-70 has been funded only for $75 million, enough to make a single prototype and the development of bombing and electric systems needed to make it a military unity has been canceled.

These are hard decisions for the administration as well as for the Air Force. They relate to one of the most difficult problems in these days of revolutionary military change. That is, what should be the proportion of available funds that is spent for the weapons of today and what proportion should be devoted to development of weapons for the future?

[From Life magazine, Feb. 15, 1960]

NEEDED: A MIGHTIER SHIELD

President Eisenhower's defense budget is dangerously deficient. He has great military experience and deep confidence his $41 billion program is adequate. But harsh facts argue it isn't.

The harshest fact is that by the President's own intelligence estimates, the Soviets by 1963 will have twice as many ICBM's as we—enough, by SAC Comdr. Thomas Power's warning, to wipe out all our bases and retaliatory planes in one salvo.

A further glaring fact is that we do not have to accept this inferiority. In the judgment of men closest to the problem, we could double our current rate of missile production just by doing all that we can. By 1963 we could match the 400-missile Soviet stockpile which our own estimates say the Russians will then have. Despite this, the President is taking the calculated gamble of doing less than we are capable of doing during the next 4 critical years. It will take that time to make fully usable our most effective deterrents—the quick-firing, solid-fueled Polaris and Minuteman, one hidden in submarines, the other in hardened underground bases. To understand just how big the gamble is, Americans must also remember that their Government has generally underestimated Soviet capabilities, and that the new figures giving the Soviets only a 2-to-1 lead are themselves much reduced from previous estimates.

The problem is not to match any particular number of Soviet missiles but to make

certain the United States has so much striking power that a Soviet commander cannot dream of knocking it out in one sudden blow. This is necessary not only to deprive the Soviets of any temptation to risk a total attack but to neutralize the campaign of political threat and attrition which a pronounced Soviet military lead would allow Khrushchev to wage. In order to do all that needs to be done we are convinced that the United States must spend on defense, at the very least, $2 billion more than it is now planning. This money should be devoted to the following purposes, in order of priority:

CLOSING THE MISSILE GAP

The production rate of the already proved and operational Atlas can be doubled within a year to give us 150 (against 75 now planned, and a reduced estimate of 100 for the Soviets in 1961). Work should begin at once, with highest priorities, to get these Atlases out of exposed positions and into deep, hardened bases—this can be done in 18 months. Since Atlas works, we should cancel the redundant (and so far inefficient) Titan and apply the remaining funds toward doubling Atlas. And every dollar that can make Polaris and Minuteman operational faster must be spent.

SAFEGUARDING SAC

To preserve our deterrent during this period General Power believes we must have SAC capable of assuming, when the situation requires it, a 24-hour alert with a striking force always aloft. To make this possible a year hence, we must start now to provide the additional B-52's, tankers, crews, fuel, and spare parts which will be necessary. This isn't being done. Moreover, in order to preserve the most effective bomber-missile mix in our deterrent, full production should be begun on the 2,000-mile-per-hour B-70 program.

SPACE AND MISSILE RESEARCH

We need to step up our efforts to develop an effective antimissile missile. We need to extend the electronic early-warning stations to help us spot a Soviet missile's firing anywhere on land or sea. We should step up our space programs with emphasis on satellites for early-warning and reconnaissance. This could be done faster and cheaper if the President would close the artificial separation of peaceful and military space projects. They cannot, in fact, be separated. The Soviets make no such distinction.

SHELTERS

An immediate start should be made at providing shelters from radioactive fallout. Fully developed, a shelter program might save 80 million or more American lives. A serious start on shelters would in itself deter the enemy from trying a knockout blow.

So much for immediate needs for adequate defense. They do not meet the argument which Generals Ridgway, Gavin, and Taylor, in succession, have stressed: That our preoccupation with massive retaliation is leaving us without adequate forces, airlift or new equipment to fight "brush fires" which may have to be met with orthodox forces and weapons. This issue also demands debate, decision and, very likely, action. But since we have committed ourselves, above all, to a strategy of nuclear deterrence, we must certainly make sure that that program is adequate. As of now, it is not.

[From the New York Times, Feb. 15, 1960]

DEBATING MILITARY POLICY—PRESIDENT'S VIEWS ON CRITICISM OF DEFENSE PROGRAM QUESTIONED

(The writer of the following letter is the author of "Nuclear Weapons and Foreign Policy." He is associate director of the Center for International Affairs at Harvard University.)

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

The President says he deplores public argument by military experts regarding our defense policy. Prior to this, he had called his critics parochial and had invoked his superior expertise in the subject. It is impossible, of course, for laymen to pass judgment on a debate of such technical complexity. They have a right to insist, however, that the categories of the debate be properly put.

The charge of parochialism can easily be pushed too far. As currently used it seems to mean that those who most deeply concern themselves with a given problem and who bear the immediate responsibility for it are thereby disqualified from having a valid opinion.

It is, after all, of some significance that two Chiefs of Staff of the Army, the current Chief of Staff of the Air Force and the Commander of the Strategic Air Command have been convinced that our present course is potentially disastrous. To be sure, they are not necessarily right. But in the President's use of the term parochial it seems to mean that the mere fact that they are the senior officers in their services implies that they are inevitably wrong.

One of the very serious problems of the present period is that the expertise acquired in the period up to and through World War II is almost completely irrelevant to the contemporary strategic problem. When weapons can traverse continents in half an hour and can destroy whole nations, rules of thumb learned in a more secure period simply do not apply.

ORDERING AIR ALERT

The President said that it was time to order an air alert when there is an indication of an attack. It is true that with conventional weapons a period of preparation was usually required prior to an attack. In the era of missiles and nuclear weapons, where the forces in being are constantly ready, an aggressor cannot afford to give any warning of surprise attack and does not have to. Whatever the utility of our military program, the President's argument with respect to air alert is dangerous and beside the point.

The President correctly insists that the debate involves essentially a question of judgment. All judgment, even the most lofty, can be wrong. The ordinary citizen, in trying to make up his mind on so technical a subject, may want to keep in mind, however, the penalties of a mistake.

If the proposals of Generals Power and White are accepted and prove to be wrong, we will have spent $500 million too much for a number of years. If the program of the President is adopted and he proves to be mistaken, we will have forfeited our national existence.

HENRY A. KISSINGER.

CAMBRIDGE, MASS., *February 12, 1960.*

[From the Denver Post, Feb. 11, 1960]

FAITH IN AMERICA—IKE ASSAILED FOR DEFEATISM

(By Walter Lippmann)

At his press conference the President replied to his critics who are saying that we are behind the Soviet Union.

At the end, in response to a question by Edward P. Morgan, he went beyond the technical argument about the missile gap and deterrent power to his own philosophical attitude toward the rivalry of the two strongest world powers, the Soviet Union and ourselves.

Eisenhower's philosophy, if I have understood correctly his impromptu remarks, is that our security is in jeopardy and that if the Soviet Union is moving faster than we are in the development of certain elements of national power, that is to be expected and must be accepted.

"For," said Eisenhower, "let's remember that dictatorships have been very efficient."

If we must achieve a greater tempo in our development of national power, we shall have to "take our country and make it an armed camp and regiment it * * * and get people steamed up like you did in wars."

After that explanation of why we have fallen behind, Eisenhower delivered a little lecture on how we should think and talk more about the "values which we do believe"—namely "our own individual freedoms and rights."

He went on to say that "our people ought to have greater faith in their own system." By this he seemed to mean that the critics who think our defenses are inadequate and the critics who say that we are neglecting our children and not keeping up with the needs of our population, have less faith than he has in our system.

With all due respect, Eisenhower is mistaken.

It is he who lacks faith in our system. It is he who is saying that we cannot meet the Soviet challenge without changing our system and giving up our freedom.

It is he who is telling the country that it cannot afford to meet the needs of our rapidly growing and increasingly urbanized population.

It is he who is saying that with a $500 billion economy, the American Nation will lose its freedom if it devotes to public purposes a somewhat larger share than it does today.

It is he who is saying that our system of liberty is so fragile that it is not tough enough to keep up the pace in the great contest of national power.

Again with all due respect, he has sunk into, he has resigned himself to, an attitude of defeatism in which there is no faith that our people have the will, the energy, the resourcefulness, and the capacity to close ranks, if they are summoned to make a greater effort.

Eisenhower is talking like a tired old man who has lost touch with the springs of our national vitality.

The doctrine which the President holds, the doctrine which determines his budget, his program, and his preaching to the Nation is, in the perspective of the world struggle, a most dangerous doctrine.

The central issue of the world struggle is whether the Soviet system or a liberal system can deal best with the problems that beset mankind.

In that struggle we shall surely lose if we tell the world that, though we have the richest economy in all history, our liberal system is such that we cannot afford a sure defense and adequate provision for the civil needs of our people.

If that doctrine goes out into the world, unchallenged and unrefuted here at home, K. will have the ball which we will have fumbled.

We can talk to the end of time about how much we love liberty. But if the masses of mankind understand us to mean that we love liberty in such a way that we cannot keep our place in the world, they will look for guidance and for example to Moscow and not to Washington.

Yet the President's defeatism has no objective justification.

The virtues of our system of society are not inseparably tied up with the Revenue Act of 1954 or with a philosophy of government which, when the President explains it, regards the Federal Government as at best a necessary evil.

The Federal Government is no doubt wasteful, and clumsy, and inflated with bureaucracy, and not wholly immune to the payola.

But the Federal Government is not a necessary evil to be talked down to.

The Federal Government is an indispensable good which must be held to account and be criticized but with respect and appreciation.

For when we talk about our freedoms and our rights, we should not forget the next sentence in the Declaration of Independence which says "that to secure these rights governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed."

[From the Northern Virginia Sun, Feb. 15, 1960]

IKE'S LISTENING TO WRONG PEOPLE

(By Holmes Alexander)

SAN DIEGO.—To visit the "front lines" of the cold war, one must go where the big ballistic missiles are—that is, to the research laboratories, engineering centers, missile-making plants, test and firing sites.

Anybody who makes an up-front tour is likely to read with lifted eyebrows such statements as President Eisenhower made at a recent press conference. In answering a question about America's possible loss of prestige in running behind Russia in the missile-launching race, Mr. Eisenhower said:

"Well, I made a long trip—22,360 miles to 11 nations in 3 continents—and certainly if there wasn't evidence that the prestige of America was high, then I was badly mistaken."

But if Mr. Eisenhower relies on curiosity-seeking crowds in India, Pakistan, Afghanistan, and Morocco to gage America's prestige or position in world affairs, he is going to the wrong oracle for his signs.

In the same conference, the President tried to defend with rhetoric—and not much else—his argument that we are well positioned in the missile race. With obvious reference to the SAC commander, Gen. Thomas Power, and to the Air Research Development chief, Gen. Bernard Schriever, Mr. Eisenhower expostulated that "too many generals have all sorts of ideas."

The President prefers to believe his rear echelon men—Joint Chiefs of Staff Chairman Gen. Nathan Twining and Defense Secretary Thomas Gates. But again the President is going to the wrong people to tell him what's happening up front.

If the Commander in Chief is going to reassure us about the missile race, he ought to do so after he has walked through engine-test facilities, wind-tunnel buildings, aerospace chambers, missile plants, missile sites, and after he has talked to his front-line commanders—Generals Power and Schriever among them. We are not going to get much deterrence or retaliation from the volatile mobs of the uncommitted East.

This is a cold war in which the enemy knows a good deal about our missile power. It is a conflict in which it pays, generally, to exhibit and not to conceal our forces. For these reasons, Mr. Eisenhower ought to give much more attention to the American production lines.

He ought to consult more than he ever has with his operations officers, like Power and Schriever. He ought to put less than total reliance upon rear echelon administrators like Twining and Gates, good men though they be.

Even a lay visitor to the up-front lines is bound to come away with some reservations about preparedness. I have walked through the Convair plant at San Diego where our only operational ICBM is manufactured. Did the plant hum? Did it clang? Was it a scene of urgency and hustle?

No, it was none of these. An official commented by saying that his plant was running on a 5-day week at about 50 percent of capacity.

Well, maybe this is a satisfactory way to compete with the Sino-Soviet colossus. The President, from his far-in-the-rear headquarters seems to think so.

It takes 2 years of leadtime to produce an Atlas and its base. Theoretically, by 1962–63 we will have a whole new generation of strategic missiles on hand and operational—the Titan, which is almost ready, the Polaris, which is seaborne, and the Minuteman, which is concealable and mobile by land. Meanwhile, we have some 2,000 medium and heavy SAC bombers based at home and abroad.

Mr. Eisenhower is counting on the estimates of his headquarters staff. It assures him that we are well prepared for a holding operation until the new missiles come along.

Maybe so. The President must be assumed to know what he's talking about. He is looking not only into the early and middle 1960's, but toward the end of the decade. By that time, the long-term, deliberately-paced program of space flight is counted upon to give us entirely new bases from which to defend and attack.

All this is fine and dandy. If the President can reassure the Nation, well and good. But the reassurances will make better listening after he has made tour of the up-front positions where the real combat is taking place.

[From Reporter magazine, Feb. 18, 1960]

THE GREAT GUESSING GAME

(By Thomas R. Phillip, brigadier general, U.S. Army, retired)

In an attempt to restrain the cries of the spenders for more money and to calm the fears of those who are alarmed about the missile gap, Secretary of Defense Thomas S. Gates, Jr., recently explained that a very significant change had been made in estimating future Soviet strength. "Heretofore," he told the House Defense Appropriations Subcommittee, "we have been giving you intelligence figures that have dealt with the theoretical Soviet capability. This is the first time that we have had an intelligence estimate that says: 'This is what the Soviet Union probably will do.'"

It has been estimated, most notably by Gates' predecessor Neil H. McElroy, that the Russians can produce three times as many missiles as we in the near future, but Gates went on to say that although "The Soviets may enjoy at times a moderate numerical superiority during the next 3 years * * * this new intelligence estimate has narrowed the differences." The McElroy estimate was on a basis of 600 Soviet ICBM's in 1962 to 200 of ours. Gates' estimate for 1961 was also a 3-to-1 ratio, but the actual numbers were reduced to 150 Soviet missiles to our 50 (which probably included 16 Polaris missiles). Gates admits that this "moderate numerical superiority" will be greater in 1962, but it still is not as large in the new estimate as in the one used by McElroy.

At a press conference held 8 days after his appearance before the congressional committee in response to critical questioning Gates admitted that "this is a different set of rules, so to speak," and he confirmed that the new estimate gives more emphasis to the Russians' intentions than to their capabilities.

Gates was apparently not aware that exactly 1 year before, on January 21, 1959, McElroy had testified before the same committee: "I think it would be very dangerous if we did not proceed on this basis [judging the opponent's capabilities rather than his intentions]. I think it should be understood that from the standpoint of the Department of Defense, we are assuming, as I think we should assume, that they will have these numbers [of missiles] in being when the national intelligence estimate says that they could have it."

The new formula Gates described is actually not new at all. By and large, our practice has always been to make an intelligence estimate that ended with a statement of the opponent's probable intentions. This did not mean that you were trying to read his mind, but rather, from what you knew about his situation and about him, judging what he was most likely to do. The estimates that dealt with the opponent's intentions came up with a single course of action aimed at counteracting them, and this was all, so it appeared, that the commander needed to worry about in making his own plans.

It is obviously much more difficult to estimate the opponent's capabilities and plan your own actions so as to thwart any one of them that might endanger your force or plans, but that was the system used, with widely recognized success, by Napoleon. It was his invariable practice of eliminating chance that led Napoleon to write: "Chance remains always a mystery to mediocre spirits and becomes a reality to superior men."

In the change in intellectual climate that took place in the U.S. Army during the 1930's, the Command and General Staff College led a campaign to substitute capabilities for intentions as the basis of military intelligence evaluations. Under a few brilliant officers, notably Col. Joseph A. ("Sandy") McAndrew, all military dogma was questioned, and innumerable historical examples were found to show the disastrous results of basing plans on presumed enemy intentions. Some of these examples were illustrated as part of the school course and compared to the Napoleonic practice of considering all reasonable enemy capabilities.

In a revision of the school texts in 1936, I was given the assignment of revising the intelligence estimating methods to eliminate the use of enemy intentions and to substitute the capabilities system. This system was used at the Command and General Staff College during the 1936–37 school year and then was scheduled for adoption by all Army schools.

At the Infantry School, the new system was considered too complicated. Brig. Gen. Walter C. Short, then commanding, stormed up to Fort Leavenworth and asserted that he would not use it at the Infantry School. Nobody could understand it, he said. He preferred the old and simpler method of determining (or guessing) the enemy's intentions. I was called in to explain the method to him, but to no avail.

REMEMBER PEARL HARBOR?

The same General Short was the Army commander in the Hawaiian Islands in December 1941. He deduced the Japanese intentions in the Hawaiian Islands, as sabotage and collected all the aircraft into a single close grouping, so that they could easily be guarded against sabotage. As a result, on December 7, 1941, Short did not worry about an attack and did not have his radar operating, nor did he have any reconnaissance aircraft out to look for the Japanese. The massed aircraft were a perfect target for the Japanese bombers and most of them were destroyed. Adm. Husband E. Kimmel had also decided that sabotage was the enemy's intention, and the fleet was massed in Pearl Harbor for the weekend, another sitting duck. If Kimmel had been concerned about the Japanese capability of attacking Pearl Harbor, the fleet would have been dispersed over the ocean and his submarines and aircraft would have been reconnoitering hundreds of miles from Honolulu.

But suppose you have more than an estimate to go on. Suppose that, through the use of spies or by other methods, you know the enemy's exact plans and orders. One difficulty, of course, is that he may change his mind. The commander of the German second army, opposing French fifth army at Guise, made four completely different decisions, and issued orders to carry them out, between 5:30 p.m. August 27, 1914, and 9 a.m. August 28.

An instance from the Second World War is also instructive. After the battle for Tunisia had been won, the Allies decided to invade Italy via Sicily. To mislead the Germans, the British planted spurious plans on the body of a fictitious Royal marine courier and dropped the body into the water where it would be washed ashore in Spain. The Germans were tricked by this apparently valid plan into spreading their defense across Europe, even to the extent of removing warships from the Sicily area. The ruse made the invasion of Sicily relatively easy.

The opposite of this case was the capture by the British of a German courier who had been forced down in the Netherlands in a fog and who carried plans for the German invasion of France through Belgium and Holland. Hitler, knowing that this plan had been captured, changed his plans and invaded across the Meuse and through France. The British and French, certain that the invasion would come through the historic route across the northern plains, concentrated their armies to the north and were cut off from France. So much for intentions, or what the opponent probably will do. He can change his mind overnight; and no matter how solid the information you may have today, it can be a trap tomorrow.

These examples of capabilities versus intentions as criteria in making estimates are from combat situations, but the same principles are applicable to the estimate of Soviet missile production. In hearings held last March, Senator SYMINGTON indicated that the estimate of Soviet capabilities then being used was based on knowledge of factory space for the production of intercontinental missiles which, according to our production experts, enabled the Soviet Union to produce 50 missiles a month, probably on a three-shift basis.

Such a capacity could, of course, be depreciated by other estimates indicating, for example, that there was insufficient housing for a three-shift operation, or by doubts about the Russians' capacity to manufacture some intricate components, such as guidance controls, at this rate. Or, it is possible that a high-ranking defector could have given the intelligence services information indicating that it is the Soviets' intention to follow the same policy as the United States and to limit the production of current missiles until improvements in sight are adopted.

This would appear to be an estimate of intentions that could be depended upon, particularly if it seemed to be confirmed by other information. But defectors, as we have seen, are not to be trusted automatically. They may be "plants" to find out how our intelligence operates and to give false information. The questioning of defectors and the evaluation of their reliability ordinarily takes 6 months or longer. By the time the information has been incorporated into the overall intelligence estimate, a year may have passed. Even if the defector's information of intentions was valid when he left, plans could have been changed several times in the interval.

The diehards, however, have never been convinced, and our intelligence estimates may list "if indications justify a conclusion, the relative probability of adoption of enemy capabilities." In other words, if some estimator thinks the indications justify a conclusion, and he lists a No. 1 probability of adoption, the estimate is right back to an estimate of intentions.

Secretary Gates had only a brief briefing before he went before the Appropriations Subcommittee. The complete estimate prepared by intelligence would have taken 2 hours to present to him. He got only 15 minutes' worth. The complete estimate ended with a conclusion of three or four capabilities listed in order of priority. But in the condensed 15-minute version the officer who was briefing Gates also condensed the conclusions and ended with only one most probable line of action. Gates has the reputation in the Pentagon of being somewhat supercilious about intelligence. Certainly he was totally unprepared for the critical question his use of the opponent's intentions brought from Congress and the press. In response to a question about intelligence at his press conference, Gates permitted himself to speak of "the intelligence business, all of which I'm not familiar with, thank heaven."

An honorable and dedicated public servant who would not dream of distorting intelligence for political or budgetary purposes, Gates quite obviously believed, as President Eisenhower said in his press conference on January 26: "We have better estimates than we have in the past in the field." Allen W. Dulles, Director of the Central Intelligence Agency, attempted to come to the rescue a few days later in an address before the Institute of Aeronautical Sciences in New York, saying: "In our estimates we generally stress capabilities in the early stages of Soviet weapons development and then, as more hard facts are available, we estimate their probable programing, sometimes referred to as intentions." But Gates is not yet off the hook. The President remarked in his press conference: "I think Mr. Gates will find ways of clarifying exactly what he had—what he meant." He should certainly be given every chance to do so.

[From the Denver Post, Feb. 11, 1960]

KEEP DEFENSE DEBATE IN THE OPEN

The current debate on American defenses is, in our opinion, one of the healthiest things that has happened to the American people in a long time.

This is one hassle that no thinking citizen can ignore as just politics.

There is no lack of sincerity on either side. And on the decisions that come out of this earnest debate—on whether our defense effort is adequate—will depend our national safety.

Thus when Illinois' EVERETT DIRKSEN, the GOP Senate leader, charges that the defense hearings "may be helping potential enemy nations," we think he is both wrong and shortsighted.

It is doubtful whether any of the statements made to the congressional committees were not rather generally known, both to our own experts and to Russia's.

And in a democracy, where public support is necessary for adequate defense efforts, it is as unwise as it is impossible to keep the facts of our progress, or lack of progress, from public scrutiny.

This may be one of the disadvantages of being a democracy opposed to a police state, but it is still a fact.

Certain security measures are necessary and advisable, but our general defense posture cannot be kept a secret—either from our own people or from our competitors.

DIRKSEN has recommended that the hearings be carried on behind closed doors.

In some circumstances, closed-door hearings are absolutely necessary.

But if the doors are closed when it is not absolutely necessary, the testimony in the hearings has a way of getting out.

It is just too tempting for a Congressman to disclose to the press the parts of the testimony that support his views.

The result is partial and often distorted reports on what the Congressmen were told and what the facts are.

It is far better for the press to be able to report the testimony directly, rather than having to depend on garbled or self-serving versions leaked from behind closed doors.

DIRKSEN was disturbed by testimony by Gen. Thomas Power, the Strategic Air Command chief, who said that 300 Russian missiles could knock out America's retaliatory forces in 30 minutes, and that a warning system adequate to allow us to stop it is not yet in sight.

This was the testimony DIRKSEN said could be "helpful only to the enemy."

On the contrary, its exposure will be more helpful to the American people. Unless we know the facts, we will never learn what we as a Nation must do to keep our deterrent power ample and sharp.

[From the Iron Age, Feb. 18, 1960]

SO WHAT MUST WE DO ABOUT OUR DEFENSE POSTURE?

(By Tom Campbell, editor)

The President has chastised critics of our defense posture. He said we, the people, will make decisions when we have the facts. The critics are not going to be silent. None of us wants that.

We remember that not too long ago the Reds were not supposed to have the A-bomb. But they had it—far ahead of our schedule for them. They were not supposed to have the H-bomb. But they had it far ahead of our schedule for them.

At first we refused to believe their feats in space. News of Sputnik I was a shocker. Then the interest died down.

It was not until much later that any of our top advisers readily admitted that the Reds were far ahead of us. Only now do our highest military men admit that we are far behind in rocketry.

It seems but yesterday that we were told our Government was concentrating on intercontinental ballistic missiles. We did, but the Reds were ahead of us.

This is not to say we have given up. Nor is it to say that we will never get to an advance position on missiles and space apparatus. It is only a recall of those times where in the past we have been treated by Government as children who should be calmed before we slept.

You can spend only so much money. You can go only so far in a democracy if you are to keep from turning it into a dictatorship. And you can either trust the men you put in charge or lose faith in them. But whatever you do in these times must be for keeps. A bad misstep by our leaders could leave us with few, if any, alternatives.

As for the people telling their leaders what to do if they have the facts: Perhaps the people are not getting all the facts. If so many privy to the same intelligence come out with different answers, what can we expect Joe Doakes to believe?

He has no other choice than to hope and trust that our top Government people know what they are doing. The fact that he has not become too aroused suggests that he does trust those he puts in charge.

If the time comes when we don't feel secure against the Reds, we will change the team at the top. Until that time, we can afford a thorough airing of our defense setup no matter who gets angry at whom.

Our people never can agree that what has been done is necessarily the best that can be done. Our defense demands continuing and painful checking, questioning, and criticism.

[From Newsweek, Jan. 25, 1960]

MILITARY TIDES—AMERICA'S B-70 MUST FLY

(Gen. Carl Spaatz, retired, Newsweek's contributing editor on military affairs, was commander of U.S. Strategic Air Forces in Europe during World War II and later Air Force Chief of Staff. A top theoretician in the complex art of destroying strategic targets, General Spaatz in the following article steps into the jet-hot argument over the B-70 bomber. He states an airman's forceful reasons why the United States needs this new strategic weapon.)

The decision to delay indefinitely the development of the B-70 bomber represents, I believe, the most serious mistake in weapons evaluation the United States could make at this juncture in the global armaments contest.

Equipped with this weapon, we could face the next decade confident of our military security. Without it, our present state of nervous apprehension will persist. More than any other weapon now projected, this one answers our basic defense problem.

Yet the administration, in its 1961 fiscal year budget, makes provision only for construction of two B-70 shells. Nothing is provided for development of the complex bombing, navigation, armament, and other equipment that will be required.

To proceed in this halfhearted way is tantamount to shelving the B-70 project, if not the concept.

The trouble seems to be that our military planners are thinking of the B-70 merely as another, faster bomber—an improvement over the B-52. Actually, it is so great an improvement that it represents a wholly new weapon, one which can be even more important than the intercontinental ballistic missile. The B-70 amounts to nothing less than a breakthrough in the science of aerodynamics.

Moreover, it is not a pig in a poke. Enough work already had been done on it to guarantee its performance. It will fly at more than 2,000 miles an hour—three times the speed of sound; cruise at an altitude of 70,000 feet; and have a range of 7,000 miles. Equipped with air-to-ground and air-to-air missiles, it could frustrate any antiaircraft defense system so far devised or likely to be devised in the foreseeable future.

Such a weapon could carry not one but a number of atomic bombs. It could carry weapons and personnel quickly to any part of the world. It would be equally serviceable in small brush-fire wars or in global war. It could serve both as defensive fighter and as offensive vehicle.

Adapted to civilian use, it could give the United States undisputed leadership in air transport for a long time to come.

The alternative to quick development of the B-70 is relegation of the United States to a second-class position in airpower. This is particularly risky in view of the possibility that atomic weapons eventually will be outlawed by international agreement. If we abandon the manned bomber, all our eggs will be in the atomic basket. The Polaris submarine-launched missile and the ICBM, which are touted as the weapons which make the manned bomber obsolete, would be next to useless if atomic warheads were forbidden. The B-70, by contrast, would be a devastating weapon even when carrying only conventional explosives.

With the Russians ahead of us in space, the B-70 represents our best immediate chance of tilting the balance of world power our way. This being so, the decision against developing it with all possible speed is incomprehensible.

[From the Washington Star, Feb. 11, 1960]

PRESIDENT'S QUICK TRIP SPARKS SECURITY SLIP

(By William Hines)

When President Eisenhower left Cape Canaveral, Fla., yesterday after 3 hours and 15 minutes on that desolate sand-and-palmetto heath, he observed that it had been "a very worthwhile trip."

Many of the reporters who made the hurried 1,600-mile round trip wondered from what point of view the President spoke. They thought that as far as increasing his grasp of either science or missilery was concerned, Mr. Eisenhower could have learned as much by staying at home and being briefed, or by looking at any of a spate of recent picture books on the Florida missile site.

About the only thing of any national consequence that occurred was a breach of military security. The effect of this was to spread among perhaps two score reporters information about the Polaris missile that had been known earlier to a relative few on a confidential basis.

BOBBLE ALMOST INEVITABLE

The security leak was nothing more or less than a bobble of the sort almost inevitable in a hastily arranged trip like that Mr. Eisenhower took yesterday. How effectively the fumble was covered up remains to be seen; how serious its import is a matter of opinion.

But the leak was important as a symptom characteristic of what happens when news is created, or "managed," for reasons that apparently have little to do with the national welfare.

President Eisenhower's trip to Canaveral was whipped up on the spur of the moment. Some of the White House aids who normally are "cut in" on trips far in advance say they did not know about this one until 24 hours before the President left for Florida.

This was just about the same time officials at the cape were notified of the forthcoming trip, and 1 hour before reporters were called in by White House Press Secretary James C. Hagerty and given the news.

From all that could be learned in the course of that hectic trip, the Canaveral inspection tour apparently "jus' growed" like Topsy.

"Plan a 4-hour tour for the President," seems to have been about the extent of the instructions sent down by Cape Canaveral. The trip was later cut to 3½ hours by eliminating a luncheon, and finally to 3¼ hours by spinning the convoy's wheels a little faster.

A prime purpose of the tour seemed to be to secure photographs of Mr. Eisenhower in front of some missiles.

In the original tour plan, photographers were given ample opportunity to take pictures, but writers were not granted an equal chance to observe. This plan broke down, however.

DEVIL-MAY-CARE AIR

The whole thing had a gala devil-may-care air about it. Had the President wished to inspect a war-ready missile base, Cape Canaveral is about the last place in the world he should have gone. No shot has ever been, or will ever be, fired in anger from there. It is a test base, pure and simple. Its relationship to actual combat bases is about equivalent to General Motors' test track's relationship to a great metropolitan freeway.

For a meaningful briefing and an actual feel for missile-base operations, Mr. Eisenhower should have gone to some such place as Vandenberg Air Force Base, Calif. He might have done so last month while on the west coast for the "dinner with Ike" at Los Angeles. It would have interrupted his trip for less than the 6 hours and 47 minutes total elapsed time of his absence from Washington yesterday.

At any event, it is unthinkable that the President needs to travel to Cape Canaveral to learn about missiles. The men who have managed the Air Force and Navy missile programs—Lt. Gen. Bernard A. Schriever and Rear Adm. W. A. Raborn, for example—are only minutes away from the President's side, and can fill him in on Atlases, Polarises, and Titans without breaching security.

[From the Washington Star, Feb. 17, 1960]

BOMBERS IN THE AIR

It is difficult to form many firm judgments on the basis of the heavily censored defense testimony that is emerging from the various committees on Capitol Hill. When so much is eliminated for security reasons, that which remains is often almost unintelligible.

One thing seems clear enough, however. And this is that our best insurance against being attacked will rest, now and for some time to come, on the strike-back capacity of our SAC bombers—our B-52's and our B-47's. If, during the period of changeover to missiles, these planes should be surprised and largely destroyed on their bases this country would be at the mercy of the enemy. Pearl Harbor was bad enough and illustrates the point. In 1941 and 1942, however, we had opportunity to recover from the destruction of our Pacific Fleet. We can hardly expect to have such opportunity again.

For these reasons there is much force to the contention that we should be preparing now to maintain a substantial portion of our SAC bombers on an around-the-clock airborne alert. In other words, keep enough of them armed and in the air at all times so the Russians will know that they cannot destroy all of our retaliatory capacity with a sneak attack.

The details are complex. When can we expect that an airborne alert will be necessary? No one seems to be sure, but the best guess is within a year or so. Without preparation, however, an adequate airborne alert could not be maintained for long. If we expect to keep from a fourth to a third of our SAC bombers in the air 2 years from now, we must begin, well in advance, to provide spare engines, more refueling tankers, and perhaps more crews. How much will this cost? The estimate is about $600 million in the first year and $1 billion a year thereafter. The new budget carries $90 million for this purpose—presumably not enough. Other testimony suggests however, that the President has authority to spend what is necessary for an adequate alert, and that Congress is obligated to come up with the money. Still another complicating factor is testimony from General White, Air Force Chief of Staff, that preparation for an airborne alert is desirable, but that institution of such an alert, at least at this time, might provoke the Russians to rash action. His testimony on this point was censored to such an extent, however, that it is hard to tell exactly what he had in mind.

Still, through all of the uncertainties, the basic consideration emerges clearly enough. We will be ruined if our SAC bombers, in a bigger and ghastlier Pearl Harbor, should be destroyed on the ground. We should provide the money and start preparing in time to make certain that this will not happen.

[From the Washington Post, Feb. 14, 1960]

CRITICISM'S CRITICS

President Eisenhower has always disliked wrangles, and it is hardly surprising that he deplores the controversy aroused by criticism of the defense effort. In this criticism no one has questioned the President's own sincerity in doing what he thinks right. What has been questioned is Mr. Eisenhower's judgment about the measures necessary to maintain American primacy and about the military expenditure the country can stand. In contrast with the proposed $41 billion military budget, the United States in fiscal 1953 sustained a military budget of $51 billion when the gross national produce was some $100 billion less than it is today.

The argument frequently advanced by others that such criticism is injuring the country is more serious—and specious. Vice President NIXON—whose condemnation of a "numbers game" in missiles is in interesting contrast, as Senator HUMPHREY has pointed out, to his own performance of a few years ago on loyalty-security cases—has opined that too much talk about the United States becoming a second-class power might cause

a potential enemy to miscalculate. Senate Minority Leader DIRKSEN observed after a White House conference the other day that security "should be safeguarded" and that "the comment on the submarines we have compared to the Soviet Union, the number of ships in different categories compared to the Soviet Union, the discussion of bases—I don't think that these things ought to be paraded across the front page."

Such premises seem to us fallacious on two counts. The first is the notion that the Russians are being treated to a lot of information they do not already have. If their intelligence is half as good as there is reason to think that it is, they have a pretty accurate knowledge of what the United States possesses in military capacity.

The second is the implication, connected with the above notion, that such knowledge should be secreted. It may be important to safeguard the details of weapons, but in the broad sense a deterrent is only as good as a potential adversary believes it to be. Most of the criticism of American defenses concerns inadequacies 2 or 3 years hence, some of which may yet be remedied. If present military power is as great as defense officials say that it is, then the administration ought to want the Russians to know about it. That is the way to prevent miscalculation.

Some of the criticism may indeed be wrongly based or ill-informed. But for administration spokesmen to imply that criticism of the defense program is therefore "destructive"—or to insinuate as General Twining did the other day that there is something disloyal in questioning the performance—is to assume a degree of sacrosanctity and infallibility that Americans have not customarily accorded their national leadership.

How, pray tell, are persons who are just as sincere in their concern for the country as the President is in his to attempt to increase the defense effort except through public comment and discussion? The attempts to stigmatize the exercise of criticism are far more frightening than the bogeys of a garrison state which apologists are so fond of invoking.

[From the Washington Post, Feb. 16, 1960]

CATCHING UP

Tass, the Soviet news agency, announced the first intercontinental missile on August 26, 1957. The first Soviet sputnik took flight on October 4, 1957. On September 13, 1959, a Soviet rocket reached the moon. On January 20, 1960, the Soviet Union reported the successful test in the Pacific of a missile that went nearly 7,800 miles and struck within 1¼ miles of its target.

Following are some of the comments of President Eisenhower during this progression:

"Let's take the earth satellite, as opposed to the missile, because they are related only indirectly in the physical sense, and in our case not at all. Never has it been considered as a race."—October 9, 1957.

"So far as the satellite itself is concerned, that does not raise my apprehensions, not one iota."—October 9, 1957.

"It is my conviction, supported by trusted scientific and military advisers, that, although the Soviets are quite likely ahead in some missile and special areas, and are obviously ahead of us in satellite development, as of today the overall military strength of the free world is distinctly greater than that of Communist countries."—November 7, 1957.

"At this moment the consensus of opinion is that we are probably somewhat behind the Soviets in some areas of long-range ballistic missile development."—January 9, 1958.

"With respect to the thrust * * * I do know that our plans, programs of development, are the kind that will put up any kind of missile or any kind of satellite that we believe will be necessary."—June 18, 1958.

"There has been no place that I can see where there has been any possibility of gaps occurring."—August 27, 1958.

"Today the so-called missile gap is being rapidly filled."—October 20, 1958.

"We are rapidly filling the gap that existed; and in some ways I think that our scientists have already achieved what we would call even more than equality, particularly in types and kinds, even if not in numbers."—October 21, 1958.

"The so-called missile gap of 6 years ago is speedily being filled."—October 22, 1958.

"Today America—and all the world—knows that in less than 4 years we are rapidly closing the missile gap that we inherited. And sputniks have been matched by Explorers, Vanguards, and Pioneers."—October 31, 1958.

"It is absolutely fatuous and futile to try to balance, item by item, the progress of two great nations in their technology of defense. To disturb ourselves too much that we have not yet caught up with another great power and people with technical skill in a particular item, it seems to me to show a loss or a lack of a sense of balance."—January 14, 1959.

"We do not believe that there is a relative increase in their capacity."—February 4, 1959.

"Our military missile program, going forward so successfully, does not suffer from our present lack of very large rocket engines, which are so necessary in distant space exploration. I am assured by experts that the thrust of our present missiles is fully adequate for defense requirements."—January 7, 1960.

"I am always a little bit amazed about this business of catching up. What you want is enough, a thing that is adequate."—February 3, 1960.

"There are too many of these generals with all sorts of ideas. I cannot be particularly disturbed because everybody with a parochial viewpoint all over the place comes along and says that the bosses know nothing about it."—February 3, 1960.

"The biggest problem there is in the United States today is to make sure that her own people * * * understand the basic issues that face us and form their own judgment."—February 11, 1960.

[From the Washington Post, Feb. 15, 1960]

(These footnotes to the week's news have been gathered by reporters of the Washington Post.)

Republicans charge that Democrats are playing politics in talking about the missile gap, but President Eisenhower himself hasn't been above inserting a little politics into the issue.

At a recent news conference he called reporters' attention to a "statement of America's history in missile development" that he had just seen in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Without explaining further, the President gave it this plug: "It's a very comprehensive one, and I commend it to your attention to show what has been done with a very slow start and with a complete neglect for a period."

Reporters found that the account, inserted in the RECORD by Senate Republican Leader EVERETT M. DIRKSEN, of Illinois, who listed Representative LESLIE C. ARENDS, of Illinois, House Republican whip, as author. Copies have been distributed to all congressional GOP members.

Inquiries at ARENDS' office disclosed that it was an updating of a pamphlet distributed to Republicans 2 years ago and endorsed by the national committee for use in campaigning.

Without mentioning former President Truman by name, it cites dates and figures to put the blame for the current missile lag on the former Democratic administration. America, it declared, "turned seriously to long-range ballistic missiles only 7 years ago," and since then "programs have advanced with impressive speed."

[From the Washington Post, Jan. 26, 1960]

TODAY AND TOMORROW

(By Walter Lippmann)

WEAPONS AND SPACE

The argument about our defenses, which is now raging, revolves around what used to be called the missile gap and is now called the deterrent gap. The gap in either version is during the next few years when the Soviet Union will have in operation perhaps three time as many long-range missiles as we have.

In this period of time the Soviet Union will be able, says General Power, the commander of the Strategic Air Force, to "virtually wipe out our entire nuclear (retaliatory) strike capability within a span of 30 minutes." Theoretically then, the Soviet Union would no longer be deterred since it could knock us out before we could answer back.

The administration's view is that this is an abstract theoretical equation—General Power called it "a mathematical probability" which in fact and in reality the Soviet Union could not and would not act upon. For the total retaliatory power of the United States and its allies is to be measured not only in missiles but in manned bombers which can be kept in the air, and by other strategic weapons such as submarines and mobile missile bases.

On the nearer issue of whether we shall soon be at the mercy of the Soviet Union, the administration has, it seems to me, a good case. No doubt General Power is right to insist upon the mathematical probability that 150 long-range missiles and another 150 medium-range missiles could in half an hour destroy the 100 installations and facilities from which we can launch a nuclear reply. But while this is a good and sufficient reason for strengthening our retaliatory force and of spending the money to protect it, there is a bigger issue which we need to ponder and to discuss.

The deep weakness in the administration's position is not that we cannot deter the Soviet Union in 1963. It is that in the general field of rockets and the exploration of space we are not even holding our own. We are falling behind. The administration's case, although good enough on the risks of war in 1963, contains within it a great and quite unfounded assumption.

This assumption is that although the Soviet Union is now ahead of us, we are in the process of catching up. This supposes that we are now moving faster than the Soviet Union is moving. There is no reason to think that this is true. Almost certainly the truth is that they are moving faster than we are.

This is the most serious of all the gaps. It is that despite the genius and talent available our science and technology are less good than that of the Soviet Union.

We have all asked ourselves why. My own view for what it may be worth, is that our second-rateness stems from a false conception of the whole matter and from a fundamentally wrong decision. The false conception is the President's belief that there are two separate and distinct fields—one for military weapons and the other for exploration of space. From this fallacy stems the decision to leave the development of the missiles to the military service and to treat the exploration of space as a form of boondoggling, of no concern to our safety and with no serious claim on the budget.

From this comes, so I am convinced, the fact that the armed services find it very hard

to recruit and to hold on to the very best scientific minds of the country. The very first-rate men will not devote their lives to making a weapon that will soon be obsolete. These same men are often not recruited for the space exploration because the whole effort there is starved for money.

The second-rateness of our performance is due to the fact that our programs—military and for space—do not invite and encourage the very first-rate minds. I am afraid that the reason why the Soviets are ahead of us is that their military weapons and their space rockets are under the control, not of the soldiers and not of the factory managers, but of the scientists.

Men of genius cannot do what they are capable of doing if, as is the case today, they are herded into separate compartments and told to devote themselves to limited aims. They will respond best if they can believe that they are part of a great inquiry and experimentation into the nature of the universe. In all the flourishing periods of discovery and invention the air men breathed stimulated them to look beyond the horizon.

There is no such favoring climate today. Instead we have a Philistinism which supposes that the most original and first-rate minds can be hired for any job that the boss chooses for them. And we have a materialism which regards the exploration of space, and indeed the exploration of the unknown, as less important than the multiplication of consumer goods.

Such Philistinism and materialism are the attributes of a declining and second-rate power, and they are our real cause for concern.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President——

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, at this time I am glad to yield to the able Senator from Alaska.

Mr. GRUENING. I wonder whether the able Senator from Missouri—who has given us so comprehensive and so effective a picture of the defense situation, based on his long experience and his great solicitude in this field—is aware of the fact that he has many supporters, not only among the generals whose names have been mentioned, and who have resigned from the services in protest, and not only among other distinguished and outstanding military experts, but also among many other prominent Americans. For instance, I wonder whether the Senator from Missouri is aware of the series of six articles which Joseph Alsop, a very distinguished and conscientious columnist, has written on the subject "The Missile Gap." The articles have been widely syndicated by the New York Herald Tribune, a Republican organ, and have not, as far as I know been disputed editorially by that newspaper. This, I believe, shows that this issue is a national one, not a partisan one.

A moment ago I saw in the Chamber my friend, the distinguished senior Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN]; and I remember that a very eloquent speech which he made about a year ago contained the statement:

Abraham Lincoln did not balance the budget, but he saved the Union.

I think that is very pertinent to the situation today.

If the Senator from Missouri has not seen this excellent series of Joe Alsop's six articles, he might wish to have them inserted in the RECORD, because they completely buttress his point of view.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I should like to say, here on the floor of the Senate, that I do not think any newspaperman has done more for the security of the United States than has Mr. Alsop in his fearless presentation of one of the real problems in the world today—namely, the necessity for going to the summit conferences with relative strength, instead of going there with relative weakness.

Perhaps the Senator saw the very significant article from Moscow—published yesterday morning on the front page of the Baltimore Sun. It was about our weak negotiating position at the summit. I should like to send it to the Senator, although I do not request that it be printed in the RECORD. I believe this country should be as strong as necessary. Regardless of anyone's belief to the contrary, we must be able to negotiate from psychological and physical strength, as well as from moral strength.

I thank the Senator from Alaska for mentioning the articles by Mr. Alsop; and, Mr. President, I now ask unanimous consent that the six articles by Joseph Alsop be printed at this point in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

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

IS UNITED STATES SAFE OR NOT?—CONFLICTS ON MISSILE GAP

(By Joseph Alsop)

WASHINGTON.—A deeply disturbing conflict of the highest official opinion, on the sole problem which literally involves the survival of the United States, was unobtrusively revealed last week.

The problem of the missile gap was painted in the rosiest, most reassuring colors in congressional testimony by the able new Secretary of Defense, Thomas Gates, and the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, Gen. Nathan Twining. General Twining even suggested that it was downright unpatriotic to regard the missile gap as constituting a problem.

Almost simultaneously, the same problem was painted in the most somber and alarming colors by the Strategic Air Commander, Gen. Thomas Power. Virtually no attention was given to the extraordinary speech, before the New York Economic Club, by the man who has more responsibility than anyone else for bridging the missile gap. Yet the message of SAC's brilliant leader was as grave as possible, as can be seen from the following excerpts:

"If (the Soviets) could effectively threaten us from a position of such military superiority that we would feel unable to defend ourselves, our capability to resist * * * would be greatly reduced, if not nullified. (Such) military superiority would be achieved through accumulation of (enough) ballistic missiles to destroy our retaliatory forces before they could be launched. Surprisingly, this would not take very many missiles under present conditions. * * * The total number of installations and facilities from which we can launch nuclear-armed aircraft or missiles at this moment is only about 100. All of these facilities present soft targets—that is, they could suffer crippling damage even (from) a near miss.

"It would take an average of three missiles, in their current stage of development, to give an aggressor a mathematical probability of 95 percent that he can destroy one given soft target from 5,000 miles away. This means that, with only some 300 ballistic missiles, the Soviets could virtually wipe out our entire nuclear strike capability within a span of 30 minutes. To further heighten this threat, only about half these missiles would have to be ICBM's. The rest could be the smaller intermediate-range ballistic missiles."

These words, so terrible in their implications, as will be seen, were in the hands of the Pentagon censorship for no less than 3 weeks. During this interminable "processing," General Power's speech was extensively pruned and toned down. If General Power's facts could have been attacked, the censors would surely have pruned them, too. Hence, the foregoing must be accepted as the first authoritative statement, from a source commanding absolute belief, of the missile capability the Soviets now need to bring this country to its knees.

As might have been expected, General Power did not overtly challenge the views expressed by Secretary Gates and General Twining. But the challenge is plain enough and terrible enough if you place General Power's statement of facts against its background of theory. The theory of deterrence, which gives the key to General Power's speech, is not merely accepted by General Power and Secretary Gates and General Twining. It is also accepted by Nikita S. Khrushchev, as he disclosed in the most significant passage of his recent speech to the Supreme Soviet.

In brief, true deterrence depends on careful calculations of "first strike capability" and counterstrike capability. The United States today, for instance, has enough nuclear striking power to destroy the Soviet Union 10 times over. But the Soviet Union today also has formidable nuclear striking power. The United States therefore has no "first strike capability," if our first strike cannot take out all the pinpoint targets presented by Soviet panoply of nuclear power. We have, first of all, to destroy this power before it gets off the ground. If we cannot do this, our first strike will merely trigger the Soviet "counterstrike capability." If we are thus faced with the prospect of national destruction by the enemy's counterstrike, we are effectively "deterred." Just this is our present situation, according to Khrushchev.

Furthermore, as General Power admitted, America's nuclear striking power, though vast, is also very vulnerable to missile attack. This is because our power, mainly SAC, is concentrated in a few targets, lacks effective warning, and so on. For these reasons, a small number of Soviet missiles—General Power says 300—will be enough to wipe out virtually all our nuclear power before it can get off the ground. With these missiles in their armory, the Soviets will not need to fear our counterstrike; and our deterrent will then cease to deter.

This was, of course, the exact situation that General Power grimly described. It could be, he implied, the true American situation before very long. His description was so grim for two reasons; his frank admission of our deterrent's extreme vulnerability; and his startlingly low estimate of the number of missiles the Soviets would need to destroy our deterrent.

There is only one way to reconcile General Power's statement of the facts with the interpretation of the facts offered to Congress by Secretary Gates and General Twining. General Power obviously suspects that the Soviets may soon have the smaller number of operational missiles required to destroy our deterrent. But Secretary Gates and General Twining are convinced, as they have testified, that it is absolutely impossible for the Soviets to have this number of missiles within the period of our deterrent's vulnerability.

General Twining and Secretary Gates have derived this comforting conviction, as they have also testified, from the National Intelligence Estimates. Thus two questions immediately present themselves. Are the National Estimates correct? And even if the

estimates are correct, is it permissible to gamble the whole national future on mere estimates? These questions will be examined in the next articles of this series.

IS GATES' OPTIMISM JUSTIFIED?—THE SOVIET MISSILE ARSENAL

(By Joseph Alsop)

WASHINGTON.—"With only some 300 ballistic missiles, the Soviets could virtually wipe out our entire nuclear strike capability within a span of 30 minutes. To further heighten this threat, only about half of these missiles would have to be ICBM's. The rest could be the smaller intermediate-range ballistic missiles." (Speech last week by the U.S. Strategic Air Commander, Gen. Thomas Power.)

This first authoritative statement of the missiles the Soviets need to destroy the American deterrent came straight from the man in charge of the deterrent. But almost simultaneously Secretary of Defense Thomas Gates and the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs, Gen. Nathan Twining, were telling a congressional committee that we hardly need to worry about Soviet missiles, or about a missile gap.

Therefore Secretary Gates and General Twining plainly believe that the Soviets cannot possibly have or produce the missiles General Power says they need. The Secretary and the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs in fact place absolute confidence in the national intelligence estimates—the official guesses at Soviet military capability prepared by the Central Intelligence Agency in cooperation with the State Department and the armed services.

As survival quite literally depends on Secretary Gates being right, it is important to know whether his confidence in the estimate is well founded. The first thing to note is the extreme narrowness of the national estimates' margin of error, beyond which further error may mean national suicide.

According to General Power, the Soviets could destroy our deterrent with 150 intercontinental missiles for our nuclear launching sites in this hemisphere, plus another 150 intermediate-range missiles for our air and missile bases overseas. The national estimates themselves have long granted the Soviets an ample stock of IRBM's. Over 100 IRBM launching pads are known to exist in Eastern Europe alone. Thus everything hangs upon the single question, whether the Soviets now have, or will soon have, only 150 operational intercontinental missiles.

The number is not large. It is, for example, only 10 months of the productive capacity of our own Atlas ICBM plant, if the Atlas production line were working on a three-shift basis instead of a business-as-usual basis. It is also less than the number of operational ICBM's we would now have in this country, if President Eisenhower had ordered an all-out missile effort after the warning of the first sputnik.

Again, 150 ICBM's is only three-fifths of the rockets that Nikita S. Khrushchev has said the Soviets produced last year "in a single factory." From the context, he seemed to be talking about intercontinental rockets. He was hopefully interpreted here, as talking only about IRBM's. At that, the interpretation is not overly comforting, for we have no factory today that is currently producing half Khrushchev's number of major rockets, even in the IRBM range.

Finally, and most important of all, 150 ICBM's is, or at least ought to be, a much smaller number of operational missiles by Soviet standards than by American standards. This is because of the lamentable difference in the histories of the Soviet and American missile programs.

In brief, there was no coherent, sensible American program of long range missile development before 1954. Only in that year were practical recommendations for big missiles presented by the late Dr. John von Neumann, and rammed through the resisting Pentagon by the late Secretary of the Air Force Harold Talbott and former Assistant Secretary Trevor Gardner. This late start is the main reason why the first American ICBM, the Atlas, though operational and efficient, is basically an engineering hybrid.

The Soviet program of missile development, in contrast, began early, always had a high priority, and has been marked by methodical, orderly continuity. In the years after the war, before the United States had managed to build a single Chinese copy of the German V-2, the Soviets produced 1,000 V-2's in the captured underground V-2 plant in East Germany, just to get their hands in, so to say. Development thereafter proceeded by generations; the T-1, an improved V-2; the T-2, an IRBM protoype; the T-3A and T-3B, which are the present Soviet ICBM's, and the new, longer range Soviet missile tested in the Pacific, which is the fourth generation.

If the United States had followed a similar development curve over a similar period of time, there can be no doubt at all that we would have, not a mere 150 ICBM's operational, but 1,500 ICBM's if the requirement were that big. Hence the published facts are dead against Secretary Gates. The problem remains whether the unpublished facts justify the Secretary's confidence that the Soviets certainly do not have what they most certainly ought to be able to have and must greatly want to have. This problem will be examined in the next report in this series.

UNITED STATES SEEN TAKING HUGE GAMBLE—THE MISSILE GAP AND SURVIVAL

(By Joseph Alsop)

WASHINGTON.—The Eisenhower administration is gambling the national future on the assumption that the Soviets cannot possibly have a number of operational ICBM's equivalent to 10 months of capacity output at our own Atlas missile plant.

The fact sounds incredible when stated in this blunt manner. It is a hard fact nonetheless. The man who should know best, the brilliant Strategic Air Commander, Gen. Thomas Power, has flatly said that the Soviets can "virtually wipe out" our nuclear deterrent with no more than 150 intercontinental ballistic misiles, plus the IRBM's they already have in plenty. The Atlas plant has long been capable of turning out 15 ICBM's a month, if ordered into three-shift production.

Yet no serious emergency measures are being taken to forestall the "wiping out" of our nuclear deterrent, on which our national survival depends. According to Secretary of Defense Thomas Gates, such measures are not needed, because the national intelligence estimates do not give the Soviets even the very limited number of ICBM's that General Power says could win the war for the Kremlin.

There are several things to note about this gamble on the micrometric accuracy of the national intelligence estimates. In the first place, it is certainly not justified by the past record. This record shows a consistent series of gross American underestimates of Soviet weapons achievements from 1946 onward.

From the atom bomb, to the first Soviet jet engine for aircraft, to the first Soviet long-range jet bombers, to the ICBM itself, the estimators went on making the same kind of error. On average, the Soviets were always expected to make each major advance a good 2 years later than the actual moment when the advance was made.

Once, and once only, there was an overestimate, of Soviet heavy bomber output. But this belated correction of previous mistakes about Soviet bomber capabilities was only an overestimate because of still another gross underestimate. At that time, the Soviet missile program was being all but ignored. The Soviet changeover from bombers to missiles was therefore wholly unforeseen.

In the second place, these persistent, often-repeated errors have clearly resulted from the very nature of the process by which the national intelligence estimates are still produced. The intelligence collector, the Central Intelligence Agency, does not produce the estimates. The CIA may do, and by every feasible test the CIA apparently does, a remarkable job of intelligence collection. But when data come in, say about the rate of Soviet missile tests, the CIA must go into committee with the armed services and the State Department. The committee decides the meaning of the newly collected data. The committee's interpretation of the data is the "national" estimate.

CIA Director Dulles, a devoted and exceptional public servant, has struggled to overcome the tendency to error in the estimates. But Dulles is not in the weapons producing business, along with the armed services. He hardly has a more effective answer than this reporter had, long ago, when the late Gen. Hoyt Vandenberg angrily insisted that the "Soviets could not possibly be producing more than six jet engines a month, and anyone who says different is a damned liar."

The former Chief of Air Staff was angry because six jet engines a month was the maximum output we had then attained in this country. The true Soviet output at that time is now well known to have been above 200 jet engines a month.

This in turn suggests the main source of error in the estimates. American experience is consistently used to measure current and future Soviet achievements. But the Soviet effort to develop new weapons has always been far more intensive than the American effort. In reality, the Soviet leadtime from drawing board to production line is commonly only half the American leadtime. So errors have obstinately recurred.

Sometimes, It must be added, the Pentagon majority really seems to prefer error to truth. For example, the late Deputy Secretary of Defense Donald Quarles represented the Pentagon majority when he did everything imaginable to obstruct the installation of the missile-watching radars in Turkey. When installed, these radars at once revealed the progress of the Soviet missile program; but even after this sharp lesson the radar evidence has often been poohpoohed. For instance, former Secretary of Defense Charles Wilson publicly ridiculed the radar's proofs that the Soviets were testing their first ICBM's. Long thereafter, the Chairman of the Joint Chief of Staff, Gen. Nathan Twining, continued to insist that the Soviet ICBM's did not have true intercontinental range.

Such is the depressing background against which it is necessary to examine the detailed intelligence estimates which are the basis of the most hair-raising gamble a government has ever made. This analysis will be attempted in the next article in this series.

UNITED STATES PLAYING RUSSIAN ROULETTE?—ESTIMATE OF RED MISSILES

(By Joseph Alsop)

WASHINGTON.—The American intelligence estimate prepared at the time of the first sputnik gave the Soviets about 500 intercontinental missiles by the end of this year. If these first estimates happened to be correct, the Kremlin may already have enough ICBM's to wipe out our nuclear deterrent.

During 1958, however, the first estimates were downgraded. New and lower estimates were conveniently revealed by former Secretary of Defense Neil McElroy, during his presentation of the business-as-usual 1959 defense budget. This second set of esti-

mates gave the Kremlin 500 ICBM's by the end of 1961. If the revised estimates happened to be correct, the Kremlin should be in a position to win the world about 12 months from now.

During 1959, however, the revised estimates were revised yet again. The new and still lower estimates were conveniently revealed by Secretary of Defense Thomas Gates, during his presentation of the business-as-usual 1960 defense budget. If the twice-downgraded estimates happen to be correct, we may perhaps bridge the missile gap without any final catastrophe—provided the Pentagon's highly optimistic schedules for the Minuteman missile and other weapons of the future also happen to be correct.

On the face of it, there is something very fishy about these repeated strikingly convenient downgradings of intelligence estimates. How can anyone be so sure that Nikita S. Khrushchev was lying, in late 1958, when he stated that Soviet ICBM's were already in serial production? How prove that he was being deliberatly misleading, more recently, when he seemed to say that a single Soviet factory had turned out 250 ICBM's last year?

If he was telling the truth, Khrushchev must now have at least 150 operational ICBM's. The highest American authority, the Strategic Air commander, Gen. Thomas Power, has publicly said 150 ICBM's could "virtually wipe out" our nuclear deterrent. And the answer to the questions posed above is, quite simply, that no one in America can possibly be sure Khrushchev was not telling the truth, despite our downgraded estimates.

The proof of that statement lies not merely in the disturbing record of the estimates and the peculiar machinery that produces them, both of which have already been described in this series. In the evidence itself, lies the best proof that the estimates are no more absolutely reliable than their name implies.

The gaps in our evidence on the Soviet ICBM program are quite certainly very great. We do not know whether the Soviets have one, or two, or three, or more ICBM plants comparable to our own Atlas plant, which could turn out 150 ICBM's in 10 months if ordered into 3-shift production. We do not know whether crews have been diverted for ICBM's from the admittedly massive Soviet IRBM program. We do not know about launching pads, since even the doubly downgraded estimates suggested that the Soviet ICBM's are probably rail-mobile.

Such are the vast areas of ignorance, which unchallengable authorities assert are concealed behind the national estimates. There are hints and indications, of course, to garnish the gap. But there is in fact only one main area of certainty. Our missile-watching radars have told us that the Soviets were not running great numbers of ICBM tests—only about three a month until recently. We also have information about the Soviet testing facilities apparently confirming the information about the ICBM tests.

This limited Soviet program of ICBM tests has been almost the only excuse for twice downgrading the estimates. On this point, the Central Intelligence Agency, which is not in the missile business, is ill equipped to argue with the Pentagon, which is very much in the missile business. The Pentagon uses American test requirements as the yardstick—a highly dubious yardstick for many technical reasons. Insisting on this yardstick, the Pentagon has also insisted that the Soviets cannot be engaged in a crash program of ICBM output.

The words "crash program" are doubly revealing. They show first the deforming effect of budgetary pressures. A mere 10 months of capacity output by our own Atlas plant—the Kremlin requirement as stated by General Power—could not be called a "crash program" by anyone who had not lost his grip on reality.

Second, these words, "crash program," also imply a shocking fact that Secretary Gates has now publicly admitted. They show that our estimates are no longer calculations of Soviet capabilities—calculations of the utmost the Soviet can do, by a crash program for instance. They indicate that our estimates are now mere calculations of Soviet intentions. Despite Secretary Gates' subsequent attempts to fuzz the whole thing over, his original testimony on this point was crystal clear:

"Figures (of Soviet ICBM output) that have been testified to in years past * * * were based on Soviet capabilities. This present one is an intelligence estimate of what we believe (the Soviet) will probably do, not what (the Soviets are) capable of doing."

Pearl Harbor was the result, the last time the American Government based its defense posture on what it believed a hostile power would probably do, and not on what the hostile power was capable of doing. If the estimates are wrong by no more than a hairsbreadth, something much worse than Pearl Harbor can now be the result.

In this matter, it is folly to blame the estimators, and, above all, the Central Intelligence Agency. The CIA has never claimed to provide gospel instead of estimates. It has done its best with a bad, difficult business. But those who have pressed for downgraded estimates, and have then used mere estimates as gospel, can certainly be blamed. These sponsors of our business-as-usual defense budgets, headed by the President, are playing a vast game of Russian roulette with the national future.

THE BRIDGE

(By Joseph Alsop)

WASHINGTON.—The incredible thing about the official approach to the missile gap is the needlessness of the hair-raising risk that is being run. In order to save some hundreds of millions of dollars, the Eisenhower administration is literally playing a gigantic game of Russian roulette with the national future.

These are strong statements. They are also factual statements. Their coldly factual character is at once apparent, if you grasp why the American Strategic Air commander, the man who knows most about the problem, Gen. Thomas Power, has now begun to talk about the Soviets' opportunity to wipe out our nuclear deterrent.

The total vulnerability of the American deterrent is obviously General Power's first worry. Here and overseas, there are now about 100 missile bases and launching pads from which we can send nuclear weapons against an enemy. All these bases and launching pads are soft targets. "Soft," in Pentagonese, means capable of being utterly destroyed by the five pounds of blast pressure per square inch which is caused, over a 4-mile radius, by a 1-megaton bomb explosion.

According to General Power, three Soviet ballistic missiles will give the Kremlin a 95-percent chance of destroying any soft target. This is the basis of General Power's estimate of 300 Soviet missiles, half IRBM's, half ICBM's, to wipe out the deterrent. As previously noted in this series, there is no doubt the Soviets already have the intermediate range missiles. They will also have the 150 ICBM's they require with the equivalent of 10 months of capacity production of our own Atlas missile plant.

The lack of any warning against missile attack is clearly General Power's second worry. At present, and until at least the end of 1963, SAC and all the West's other nuclear forces cannot count on any warning against surprise attack with missiles. True, an anti-missile warning system is now being installed. But the eastern sector of this BMEWS system, as it is called, is only just coming into operation. The central sector is still far in the future. The western sector, which has to be based in Scotland, has not even been started. There will be no sure warning until the whole system is completed.

The combination of zero warning and total vulnerability in turn adds up in General Power's mind (and in any other capable of simple arithmetic) to the likelihood of the American deterrent being wiped out—if the Soviets just have or acquire the 150 ICBM's they need. Right here is where the game of Russian roulette begins.

After two budgetarily convenient downgradings, the national intelligence estimates do not credit the Soviets with those 150 ICBM's. One must pray the estimates are right. But no intelligence service on earth can be absolutely certain that the closed Soviet society, using all the resources of the huge Soviet economy, has not produced a number of weapons equal to a mere 10 months of capacity production in a single American factory.

There is at least one chance in six—the normal chance when juvenile delinquents play Russian roulette—that our intelligence estimates are wrong, some say it may be one chance in five, or maybe even one chance in four or three, or two. And if the estimates are wrong by a hair, our power to resist the Kremlin will be nullified, according to General Power.

The macabre roulette game is needless, however, because there are steps that can be taken to solve the problem of the American deterrent's total vulnerability and its total lack of warning. If we take those steps, the missile gap can probably be bridged. They are as follows:

A maximum air-borne alert is the most obvious and urgent need. A plane that is already in the air, with bombs and fuel aboard, is not vulnerable to a 1-megaton explosion, or to a 100-megaton explosion. Before launching his own attack, the enemy must be ready to defend against all planes on airborne alert. Otherwise, if there are enough such planes, a Soviet strike at us will invite the destruction of the Soviet Union.

At present the Strategic Air Command has a 15-minute ground alert, which is useless in condition of zero warning. In the new budget, the administration has reluctantly tossed General Power some peanuts for airborne alert—$20 million this year, and $90 million next year. But this is the old trick of token appropriations to delude the Nation.

A maximum alert is needed, at least of General Power's big B-52 bombers, which are the only suitable planes he has. Even a maximum alert, of 25 percent of his 600 or so B-52's, will give him a dependable first strike of only 150 aircraft. Even after due allowance for the improvement in the bombs carried, a first strike by 150 aircraft is a melancholy contrast with the old SAC requirement for a first strike by about 1,500 aircraft. The contrast is all the more serious because of the recent Soviet installation of a powerful air defense system based on missiles like our Nike-Hercules. But the maximum airborne alert of the B-52's is the only remedy immediately available, and it is a good remedy, too. It would add about $900 million to the budget.

Better warning can be provided within 18 months, in all probability by larger investment in the highly promising Midas missile-seeing satellite. With 18 minutes' warning from Midas, General Power could greatly increase the strength of his first strike. The Pentagon's kept scientists say that it is still a gamble to invest the extra $200 million needed to buy an operational Midas warning system immediately. But the Midas builders say it is a good gamble. It should be taken.

Later dangers can be reduced, too, by buying more Atlas and Titan missiles for the perilous year, 1963. These late-coming missiles will be in "hard" pads. Being hard targets, each of these American ICBM's will add something like 25 Soviet ICBM's to the Kremlin's missile requirement at the very time the Kremlin's missile program is quite sure to be in highest gear. An increased effort to close the far end of the gap in this manner might cost a little more than $1,500 million.

These sums are not trifling. But surely it is not worth playing Russian roulette with the national future to save a total amount no bigger than the invested capital of a single American charitable foundation.

FALLACY SEEN IN BELIEF THAT "IKE KNOWS BEST"

(By Joseph Alsop)

WASHINGTON.—With any other President in the White House, the missile gap and the way it has been neglected and fully misrepresented by the administration would by now constitute a huge, emotion-charged national scandal.

But Dwight D. Eisenhower not only has the curious, often useful political knack of acting as a kind of supertranquilizer, a whole nation's Milltown. He is also, and with justice, remembered as the general who led our men to victory in the last war. Because he is a military hero, the country tells itself, "Ike knows best," while the Eisenhower Defense Department plays its macabre game of Russian roulette with the country's future.

In this way, Eisenhower the man is a key part of the problem of the missile gap. For this reason, no study of the problem can be complete without an attempt to answer the question, whether Ike really does know best.

It is a truism, of course, that military heroes cannot always and forever be trusted to know best. Indeed, the fields of history are whitened by the bones of armies that were prepared for the next war by generals who won the last war. But truisms need not be universally applicable; so one must look at Eisenhower's individual record in order to form a judgment.

In that record, the most significant single episode is surely the part President Eisenhower played in our most disastrous postwar defense budget. This was the budget prepared when President Truman was having his own bout of budget mania, under the Defense Department leadership of the egregious Louis Johnson. This was the budget that invited the Korean aggression. As some predicted, its invitation was quickly accepted.

By Louis Johnson's request, Eisenhower came back to Washington that year, to work with the Joint Chiefs of Staff while the budget was being prepared. Without contradiction from Eisenhower, the budget was then presented to Congress by Johnson as an "Eisenhower budget." Nor was Eisenhower the only great American military figure with a major share of responsibility for this budget that invited disaster.

A wholly different budget had been prepared, with infinite toil, by the great James V. Forrestal; and President Truman had made Gen. George C. Marshall the judge between Forrestal and himself. For the specific reason that the national economy could not support the Forrestal budget (which totaled $18 billion) General Marshall told Truman to go ahead and cut Forrestal's handiwork to the bone. Gen. Omar C. Bradley also testified that if we spent a dollar more for defense than the Eisenhower-Johnson budget (which totaled $13 billion), the national economy would promptly collapse under the strain.

Here we see not just Eisenhower alone, but three of our greatest soldiers of the last war, all making the same appalling mistake for the same reason. It is the very reason that Eisenhower now puts forward, once again, to justify skimping the national defense in the current budget. Our generals, apparently, are taught to regard the economy of the richest nation in history as a sort of sensitive plant, likely to fall into decline at the merest touch. In Eisenhower, of course, this viewpoint has more recently been vastly strengthened by the powerful influence of men like George M. Humphrey.

If you believe, with Humphrey, that paying the full bill for national defense is a quick road to national suicide, it is, of course, tempting to avert the eyes from all the reasons why not paying the defense bill may be suicidal. There is evidence, too, that the President has done just this. If Eisenhower were a less transparently honest man, such Eisenhower defense speeches as the one after the first sputnik would have had to be called something far uglier than grossly misleading. The facts were wrong, and they were wrongly presented as well.

The chief fault lay, perhaps, in the White House staff's constant, sedulous effort to protect their Chief from anything too disturbing or too disagreeable. One thinks of the former Secretary of the National Security Council, Robert Cutler, the greatest of all the President protectors, viciously ridiculing the awe-inspiring, wholly accurate warnings of the Gaither report.

PENTAGON WARNING

One thinks, too, of the Pentagon warning to Gen. Andrew Goodpaster that the President had better not claim our Vanguard satellite would soon match the Soviet sputnik, because the Vanguard project was in a mess. The warning, overly calculated to upset the President, was never transmitted. The claim that we would match the sputnik was duly made. And for many months on end, the United States looked silly among its unsuccessful satellites.

This is no attempt to denigrate the President. It is an effort rather to show why, in this crucial case, a very virtuous king may be claiming to wear all sorts of clothes he has not got on. But perhaps it would have been better to assert, at the outset, that it is always wrong for any nation to trust any leader, instead of trusting the hard facts.

The hard facts say that a very small number of Soviet ICBM's can wipe out the American nuclear deterrent. The hard facts say there is a good chance of error in the intelligence estimates which deny the Soviets this small number of ICBM's. The hard facts say, therefore, that the remedies must be urgently applied that are needed to put an end to the Russian roulette game.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, the Senator from Massachusetts had asked me to yield to him for a question. I asked him to allow me to complete my statement. He has graciously done so, and I now yield to him for a question.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I thank the Senator from Missouri for yielding to me. There are several questions I should like to ask him.

In the first place, is it not true that today the B-52 bomber can carry an amount of destructive power far beyond what was dropped on Germany during World War II?

Mr. SYMINGTON. That is correct. Any bomber or modern fighter plane that is owned by either the United States or Soviet Russia or Communist China or any other nation can do that today.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I should also like to ask the Senator another question. In working out our own overall defense, we must determine the whole mix of weapons, as that term is used today. The Senator has talked mostly about missiles. Is it not true that our B-52 long-range bombers are superior in number today, by a substantial percentage—without disclosing security information—over what the Russians have?

Mr. SYMINGTON. That is correct. That was explained to the Senate committee by General Twining, then Chief of Staff of the Air Force, now Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, on the basis that the Soviets leapfrogged emphasis on their long-range bomber production in order to concentrate on their ICBM production. This was due, in part, to the fact that bombers are especially important to the country which does not plan to attack first, and missiles are relatively more important than bombers to the country which expects to initiate an attack.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Is it not also true that even if there is a greater thrust on the part of the Soviets—and I acknowledge what the Senator from Missouri has said, that it is true that the Soviets have a greater thrust—it is a question of the payload in the ICBM; and if we have a sufficient payload in the ICBM, we do not necessarily need a very much greater thrust.

Mr. SYMINGTON. That is not correct. I know that the Senator wants to have the truth stated. The greater the thrust, the greater the warhead or payload weight can be, and the less the need for accuracy.

The payload, as the information is presented to us, in the present Russian ICBM's is more than the payload of our ICBM's. That means, therefore, that if their ICBM's are as accurate as ours—and there is no reason to believe otherwise—the effect of each of their ICBM's will be greater than the effect of each of ours.

Even if their ICBM's were less accurate than ours, the damage they could do on targets would be at least equal to ours because of their superior thrust and bigger payload.

The people are being misled about this question of thrust. When I went to Alabama last fall, General Medaris told me that the Saturn project had been cut from a requested $130 million to $70 million for the current fiscal year. He also told me that the budget request for Saturn was cut $110 million—from $250 million to $140 million—this fiscal year. At that time General Medaris was so disturbed over the way the matter was being handled that he told me he intended to resign. Two days later I arranged to have breakfast with Dr. von Braun and he confirmed exactly what General Medaris had told me.

Just the other day there was a press release to the effect that the President was now requesting $90 million more for the Saturn program, which is the program which could make us equal with the Soviets in the matter of thrust and, therefore, of payload. But when that press release was issued telling about the President's recommending $90 million for the Saturn program, was anything said about the fact that a great deal more than that had been cut out from

the experts' requests for the last two budgets? The answer is "No."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Missouri yield further for a few more questions?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I am glad to yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Did the Senator see Dr. Glennan's statement on Monday with respect to the thrust of the Russian missiles and the amount needed for our ICBM's in order to carry on successful missile war?

Mr. SYMINGTON. To the best of my knowledge, I have not seen that statement.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. My questions to the Senator on the question of thrust and payload were based on that statement. I should say that the question of the amount of the payload in the end of the ICBM depends on its destructive power; and if the destructive power is enough to deter, that is what we want. Is not that correct?

Mr. SYMINGTON. If Dr. Glennan states that he would not rather have a much larger payload in our ICBM's, something comparable to that of the Russians, then he is in disagreement with what the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff has said. In my opinion, if that is Dr. Glennan's position, then the space program in this country will probably get further mixed up than it is today—and that is saying a lot.

After I got the figures about the Saturn budget reduction from General Medaris and Dr. von Braun, I stated them publicly. A few days later, Dr. Glennan appeared on a national telecast and was asked if he knew what cuts I was talking about. He replied that he did not know anything about any cut which had been made in the space program except $30 million made by Congress. I might point out that cut was made in the other body of the Congress, not in the Senate.

After the telecast was over, Dr. Glennan is reported to have said:

> I guess Senator SYMINGTON was talking about the Saturn project, and not about any cuts in my space program.

Dr. Glennan should have made that admission publicly, not just privately. Of course, he would not have even a technicality upon which to base such a reply today, because the whole Saturn program has been transferred to his agency from the Army and from General Medaris.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Missouri yield for about two more questions? I do not want to monopolize his time.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The Senator talked about an air alert. I listened, as did the Senator, to General Power in open session and, I believe, in closed session. The facts as to the air alert were brought out in the Appropriations Subcommittee. The Senator from Missouri was not able to be present, but I was.

I call the following fact to the Senator's attention: Congress has been requested to enact this year language which was adopted last year as section 612 (a) and (b) of the fiscal 1960 Defense Appropriation Act. Subsections (a) and (b), of section 612 put the air alert into the same category with food, clothing, and subsistence, which are now covered in the general statutes. In other words, if the armed services need more food than the budget provides, they can proceed to buy it, even though there is no appropriation for it. Then the additional amount has to be made up by a supplemental appropriation.

The same situation now obtains as to an air alert. If, in the discretion of the President, on the recommendation of the Secretary of Defense, he wants to spend more money for an airborne alert than is provided in the budget at present, he may proceed to do so, and then come to Congress for any additional money needed. I have that statement confirmed by the Department of Defense. If the Senator from Missouri will permit me to do so, I should like to read it. It is only one paragraph.

Mr. SYMINGTON. So far as I am concerned, the able Senator from Massachusetts may do so.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I read as follows:

> It is the view of the Department of Defense that section 612(b) constitutes the authority under which the Secretary of Defense, upon determination by the President that such action is necessary, may incur deficiencies in any appropriation available to the Department of Defense to finance any or all costs of an airborne alert during fiscal year 1960. This would include the authority to permit the Department, upon determination by the President that such action is necessary, to proceed with the procurement of spare parts and the training of additional crews, at any time during the fiscal year for the purpose of preparing for a possible airborne alert at a subsequent date. Such authority would, of course, be available for fiscal year 1961 in the event the language of section 612(b) is reenacted for fiscal year 1961.
>
> The Bureau of the Budget concurs in the views of the Department of Defense as stated herein.

I mention this because I stated that General White and the Secretary of the Air Force had nothing to say on that subject. I call it to the Senator's attention because I believe he is not familiar with it. I wonder how many Members of Congress are familiar with that section.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I did not follow all the references made by the Senator from Massachusetts. I do not know the details. But the fact that the President has the authority to do something about an air alert is in no way reassuring to me. Time and time again, after being aware of congressional position, the President has impounded the money and not spent it. A recent example, as the Senator may remember, was when, after many of us, including the Senator from Massachusetts, agreed that $382 million additional should be spent this fiscal year for modernization of our Army, the administration impounded most of that money—all but $43 million of it—and decided it would not be spent.

There was a similar case in 1955 when the Senate passed, by one vote, a bill not to allow the executive branch to throw out 20,000 Marine volunteers who wanted to remain in the service, at the same time when we were drafting 10,000 boys a month off the farms and out of the cities who did not want to go into the service. The money available which was authorized by Congress, and had a legislative history behind it, was not utilized and the Marine Corps was reduced by the administration. Some of the money was used for purposes for which it was not intended by the Congress.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The Senator from Missouri realizes, I am sure, as I do, that even if Congress provides for the $600 million that General Power says is necessary this year, Congress cannot force any administration to spend that money.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I agree with the Senator on that.

Is the Senator from Massachusetts giving the Senate and the people of the country the idea that because money has been appropriated and put on the shelf, to be used in case we get into trouble, that the President can use that money just when it is needed?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Oh, no.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I want to be sure we clear up this point in connection with the amount of the expenditure which is being urged now in the public interest. When the term "bomber alert" was used, most people in the country thought it meant "airborne alert"; they did not understand that reference was only to "ground alert." In my opinion the administration does not plan to use anything like the amount of money that General Power says is necessary for the airborne alert, but at the same time the people of the country get the impression that adequate preparation is being made for such alert.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. If Congress appropriates $1 million for food, but if the Army later finds it necessary to spend $1,500,000 for food, the Army can spend the additional $500,000, and subsequently can ask the Congress for that much additional appropriation.

In the last year we included section 612, subsections (a) and (b), which permit the same thing to be done for an airborne alert as for buying food.

Mr. SYMINGTON. If that was done last year, why do we not have an adequate program?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The authority was in the defense appropriation act passed last year.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Should we not have an air alert?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. It is right to give the President the discretion to install an air alert if he thinks it is necessary.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I should like to yield at this time to the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], who has told me that he must soon leave the floor. I told him that at this time I would yield to him.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, if the Senator from Missouri and the Senator from Washington will permit me to do so, I should like to make one more statement.

The obligations program for missile systems was increased from $1,058 million for the fiscal year 1952 to $6,985 million for the fiscal year 1960—or an increase of more than six times.

I ask unanimous consent to have the table printed in the RECORD, if the Senator from Missouri does not object.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I do not object, although I was under the impression that the Senator from Massachusetts had placed the table in the RECORD before.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I do not think so.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Well, the Senator from Massachusetts did place some table on that subject in the RECORD. I noticed that some of the chronological items related back to the time when there was an Army Air Corps and no Air Force. At that time the Chief of Staff of the Army was General Eisenhower.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Massachusetts?

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

Department of Defense, obligational program for missile systems,[1] fiscal years 1946–61

[Millions of dollars]

	IR/ICBM programs	Other surface-to-surface missile programs	All other missile programs	Grand total, all missile programs
Fiscal year 1946 and prior	2.0	19	51	72
Fiscal year 1947	None	20	38	58
Fiscal year 1948	.3	36	45	81
Fiscal year 1949	.1	45	53	98
Fiscal year 1950	None	65	69	134
Fiscal year 1951	.5	185	598	784
Fiscal year 1952	.8	239	818	1,058
Fiscal year 1953	3.0	403	760	1,166
Fiscal year 1954	14.0	336	717	1,067
Fiscal year 1955	159.0	398	911	1,468
Fiscal year 1956	526.0	387	1,368	2,281
Fiscal year 1957	1,401.0	603	2,502	4,506
Fiscal year 1958 (total)	2,150.0	639	2,391	5,80
Fiscal year 1959 (total)	2,946.0	685	3,269	6,900
Fiscal year 1960 (total) [2]	3,303.0	509	3,173	6,985
Fiscal year 1961 [3]	3,424.0	383	3,155	6,962

[1] Program data reflected in this table cover the developmental and capital costs involved in missile programs, i.e., the cost of bringing missile systems to operational status plus the costs of procuring missiles and related equipment for operational purposes. These data include all procurement, construction, and research and development programs directly associated with missile programs. These figures do not include military pay, operation and maintenance costs for operational missile units and sites and include only those shipbuilding and aircraft costs directly associated with providing missile capability.

[2] Fiscal year 1960 data are preliminary estimates; fiscal year 1961 data represent projected programing.

[3] Feb. 19, 1960 (tentative).

NOTE.—Estimates are subject to minor revision due to program adjustments.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President——

Mr. SYMINGTON. I yield to the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. RUSSELL. A few minutes ago the Senator referred to the funds impounded for modernization of the Army. The first statement the Senator made was correct; namely, that less than $50 million of the sum of around $382 million, as I recall, has been obligated.

When the Secretary of the Army appeared before the Senate Committee on Armed Services, he stated that he had just been advised that the Defense Department had requested that $175 million be released. I made the same error—and I think my friend, the Senator from Washington, also made it—in thinking that the $175 million was a part of the $382 million; and I stated that this money had been released, or would be released in due course, since the Department of Defense had requested it.

I wish to say, to justify the statement by the Secretary of the Army, that he stated that the information had just come to him. He had not seen all of the papers.

But later I found out that the $175 million that the Department of Defense requested was a part of the budget estimate submitted by the Department, but that they had likewise impounded it or had failed to obligate it; and therefore the $382 million which Congress appropriated for modernization of the Army, after the most extensive hearings and exhaustive discussions in the committees, is still practically all impounded—all except around $40 million.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I thank the Senator from Georgia for his statement. He is the authority in the Senate on this subject. What he has said just shows again what, in my opinion, could properly be called justifiable apprehension about what will happen after the Congress makes available to the executive branch the funds necessary to get our security in better shape.

Mr. RUSSELL. And the Senator might likewise say that it is a cause of concern to Members of Congress when, in their efforts to measure up to their constitutional obligation to provide for the national defense, they are hampered and hamstrung and negated by the executive branch of the Government and the Bureau of the Budget and the President.

I realize that time and time again we are told that that has been done before, and I agree that it has been done before. But I do not like it, and I do not care who does it.

But it has been done more frequently, and to more different items for the several branches of the armed services, during the last several years than it has ever before been done in the history of the Congress.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I thank the able Senator from Georgia. I know that he agrees that two wrongs do not make a right under any circumstance. This is particularly appropriate to keep in mind when we are dealing with the survival of the United States.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President——

Mr. SYMINGTON. I yield to my friend the Senator from Washington.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I particularly wish to compliment my able colleague the Senator from Missouri for the clarity of his presentation of this important issue. I also wish to say that, as he customarily does, the Senator from Missouri has outlined a constructive program to bolster our national defense efforts.

I think one of the significant statements he made in the course of his remarks has been lost sight of during the debate. The able Senator from Missouri referred to the air alert and its cost. Many persons fail to realize that we are now paying the price of false economy; we are going to have to spend millions and millions of dollars for an air alert because we failed to make the effort to achieve at the earliest possible date, and in sufficient numbers, an invulnerable, retaliatory system.

The air alert may well cost us $1 billion a year just for operational expense including new planes, additional crews, parts, and fuel. This is only for the purpose of insuring the survivability of our retaliatory system. Had we made the effort that General Schriever referred to in hearings before the committee just a few days ago, we would have saved money. He had asked for additional funds for additional Atlases. He was turned down by the administration. Now we are paying the price in additional cost, which will not add to our retaliatory striking power. It is simply an increased cost that we have to pay to maintain our existing deterrent. It is that simple.

Mr. SYMINGTON. The Senator is correct.

Mr. JACKSON. The administration does not want to talk about the cost of the air alert, because it does not add to our retaliatory striking power. It is simply a price we are paying because we failed to provide adequate funds at the time they were needed.

Some of us talked about this subject in a constructive fashion a long time ago and urged that something be done about speeding the ICBM program. We were told the old story that our Nation's overall deterrent ability was adequate to meet the threat.

I want to compliment my distinguished colleague for his constructive presentation; and I wish to add further that there is much discussion about the right of Congress to debate national security. I thought we all took an oath to defend the Constitution. The Constitution provides that Congress shall appropriate the funds necessary to provide for the common security of this country.

The record of this Congress will disclose we have given constructive criticism. The record will disclose that, in the area of Polaris missile submarines,

it is the Congress that has provided for the majority of the Polaris missile submarines which the President, in his speech to the Congress in January, said he is relying on. This is the kind of opposition we should have in the Congress. I think the role of the opposition is one of constructive opposition. The record will disclose that is exactly what we have done.

I was amazed and a bit amused when the Secretary of Defense appeared in executive session before the Armed Services Committee in January to state how they had relied on the additional funds we had made available for the missile program. He stated he had made use of the funds, claiming credit for the additional missiles and for the funds we had provided over and above the amount requested by the administration in its budget, and to which amounts the administration had objected at the time.

My colleague from Missouri has always played the role of loyal, effective, and constructive opposition; and, under our system, it is inescapable that our country must be stronger by having such constructive criticism on the part of Congress.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I shall yield to the majority leader in a moment. First, I wish to say I deeply appreciate the remarks of my friend from Washington. We have been together in this effort for many years. The American people know of his contributions in this area, and there is no one from whom I would rather have those kind remarks.

Now I am glad to yield to the majority leader, who is now conducting hearings to bring out for the people the facts about this serious matter.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, first, I have listened with a great deal of interest and approval to the very fine statement delivered by the able Senator from Missouri. It is one of many statements I have heard from him over a period of 15 years, and I consider him one of the outstanding leaders in this entire field. His efforts have always been constructive and directed toward informing the American people of the needs of this Nation.

A few days ago I placed in the RECORD an article from the New York Times. It contained a letter signed by Mr. Henry A. Kissinger, with whom I know the Senator is familiar. I should like to read the last paragraph of that letter and get the Senator's comments on it:

> If the proposals of Generals Power and White are accepted and prove to be wrong—

Speaking of the air alert—

> we will have spent $500 million too much for a number of years. If the program of the President is adopted and he proves to be mistaken, we will have forfeited our national existence.

Does the Senator agree with that statement, and does he think we can afford a gamble of $500 million in order not to forfeit our national existence?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I agree. The Senator is entirely correct. The letter to which he has referred is one of a group of published items which I have for the RECORD.

May I respectfully call to the attention of the majority leader the fact that $500 million a year is just about one-third of 1 day's income of the United States.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I want to read one paragraph from a very excellent editorial in Life magazine which was put in the RECORD at the same time:

> The harshest fact is that by the President's own intelligence estimates, the Soviets by 1963 will have twice as many ICBM's as we—enough, by SAC Commander Thomas Power's warning, to wipe out all our bases and retaliatory planes in one salvo.

Does not the Senator think that responsible statements like that commend themselves to the immediate attention not only of Congress, but of the American people?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I certainly do. May I say I also have that editorial in my group of items for the RECORD. I agree that it was an excellent editorial.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The Senator is familiar, of course, with the book, "U.S.A.—Second Class Power?"

Mr. SYMINGTON. I am familiar with it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I would like to quote from page 57 of that book, in which it says:

> It was General Eisenhower, then Chief of Staff, who approved the order killing the MX-774 because officials faced cuts in the budget.

The MX-774 was the forerunner of the Atlas, was it not?

Mr. SYMINGTON. The MX-774 is correct.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Does the Senator of his knowledge believe that the MX-774 was killed off because of budget cuts?

Mr. SYMINGTON. There is no question that a shortage of funds was one of the major causes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I want to ask this further question. If that is a fact, is it not true, then, that this Nation was critically delayed 9 agonizing years, 1948–57, because of that action?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I would like to answer the Senator in this way. I do not so much blame those who were under the Chief of Staff at that time for cancelling out that program, because at that time the supersonic Navaho was considered to be the more practical weapon. The reason for that was the hydrogen bomb had not been developed and the scientists and engineers were not thinking of a missile which could carry the weights they thought necessary.

Shortly after the hydrogen bomb was exploded one of the scientists conceived a way to put a fusion bomb on a warhead. I am glad the majority leader has brought this up. The book, to which the majority leader referred was, I believe, written by Drew Pearson and Jack Anderson. It brought out conclusively how the United States has fallen steadily behind over a period of years in its "relative"—that is the important word—in its "relative" strength as against the strength of the possible enemy.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. The Senator is familiar with page 2 of the same book, where it is stated, "Russia will launch the artificial satellite ahead of us. This may be shot into space as early as September 17."

It is now known that Russia did attempt to launch the first satellite on September 17, but because of failure, did not get it into orbit until 17 days later, October 4, 1957. Is that correct?

Mr. SYMINGTON. That is correct.

May I respectfully say at that point, the day I heard that the sputnik was orbiting, I could not help thinking of the fact that when the Navy came to the Congress for a supplementary fund for the Vanguard project for our space program, the justification for that request was on the premise that we would be first to orbit an earth satellite.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I want to remind the Senator that the Senate Committee on Appropriations, the Senate Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences, and the Senate itself, gave Dr. Glennan every single dollar asked for in this field; is that not correct?

Mr. SYMINGTON. The Senator knows that is correct. The Senator is the chairman of the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences, on which I have the honor to serve.

I wish to add, I can remember the Senator saying to the head of that agency, "Are you telling this committee that you have all the money you consider necessary?" The Senator remembers that, does he not? The answer was, "Correct; we have all the money considered necessary."

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I do not want to deprive my colleagues, who have manifested such interest in this very important subject, of the privilege I have enjoyed.

Finally, I desire to commend the Senator for the recommendations which he makes at the end of the page on page 10 of his address, where I believe he makes six recommendations. I think this is a very constructive approach to the subject. I know the Senator recognizes this is not the first time he has made these recommendations, or that the Congress has made these recommendations, or that the committees of Congress have urged upon the administration it follow these recommendations. Is that not correct?

Mr. SYMINGTON. That is correct.

I thank the majority leader for his comments. It has been a privilege to work with him for 15 years as one of those who has always believed it is important to have the United States so strong that regardless of anything else nobody would dare attack this country.

Mr. BUSH, Mr. ENGLE, and Mr. CASE of South Dakota addressed the Chair.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I shall yield to the Senator from Connecticut, who has been on his feet for some time; and then I shall yield to the Senator from California and then to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Missouri.

I certainly agree with the Senator from Washington, who called attention in his colloquy with the Senator from Missouri to the constitutional duties of the Congress in respect to this matter of defense. The Congress has a right to do whatever it thinks should be done in the interest of our defense budget or any other part of the budget, so far as that is concerned.

Mr. President, I am disturbed by the questioning by the Senator from Missouri of the motives of those of us who are in support of General Twining, who are in support of Secretary Gates, and who are in support of the President of the United States in connection with this great argument and this great debate.

The Senator used the phrase a moment ago, "Those who put money ahead of survival." I do not know exactly whom the Senator has in mind, but I object very strongly to any imputation that because I pay attention to General Twining, am impressed by the argument of Secretary Gates, am impressed with the sincerity of the President of the United States and his longtime service to this country in the military field—a statesman such as the world has seldom seen—and am impressed when the President protests publicly to the people that he would not put money ahead of survival, which he has done recently, I might be placed in that category. I wonder whom the Senator is talking about when he refers to those who would put money ahead of survival. The Senator may clear that up if he chooses. I wish to say that I do not put money ahead of survival, and on behalf of those who take the side I do in connection with this argument, I very strongly reject that imputation.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I have great respect for the Senator and considerable affection for him. However, I do not intend to follow the policy of many of the people on the other side of the aisle in speeches and statements by getting into personalities. I think the important thing is issues.

I wish to say to the Senator I was much distressed, after I had finished my statement on the question of national defense, the Senator from Connecticut said in a public hearing that he was sorry politics had gotten into this matter. I do not know whether the Senator was referring to me, or to whom the Senator was referring, but I think it is unfortunate that one cannot attempt to bring out the facts in a committee hearing without being accused of "playing politics." It is most unfortunate that the question of political bias has been dragged into this vital matter.

I have children and grandchildren, as the Senator has. It has been brought out already this morning in the debate that if some of us are incorrect with respect to the importance of some of these items, such as air alert, it will cost the taxpayers of the United States some money. If we are correct, however, and the policy is not changed, all it is going to do is to cost us our country.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, if the Senator will permit me to make an observation, I did not single the Senator out in respect to that statement which I made in the open hearing, as he knows. In fact, I said I did not single anybody out.

For the Senator to protest that politics has not gotten into this debate I fear is to be a little bit naive. There is not a single commentator on the debate who has not recognized the fact that politics has gotten into it. I do not very well see how politics could be kept out of it, unfortunate though it be.

I have not cast any aspersions upon the Senator's position. I am sure he is deeply concerned about the matter, that he feels more should be done, that we have made mistakes, and so forth. The Senator is entitled to his views, and I respect him for holding his views with many of which I disagree. I do not believe, however, that it is a denial of the assertion that politics has gotten into the debate when the Senator speaks of those who put money ahead of survival.

I regard that as a reflection upon the motives and the position of those of us who are defending the President's budget, the Secretary of Defense, and the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. That is all I wish to make clear to the Senator. I do not think it is appropriate for him to reflect upon us in that way. We do not put money ahead of survival.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I have not said that the Senator puts money ahead of survival. He is an able, well-educated man, and he knows that during the steady questioning of witnesses, it is sometimes as difficult to get the facts out in the open as it is to get wisdom teeth out. Often witnesses have been told what the policy line shall be. During the steady questioning of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, when we encounter men of courage, like Admiral Burke, we learn that he has been told "This is the amount of money you can spend, and you cannot spend any more." Unless Admiral Burke pads his budgets to get more than he thinks he needs, he has told us what he believes is necessary for the security of the United States. I have asked the Joint Chiefs of Staff individually if they have padded their budgets, and they say, "No. This is what we believe is necessary for the security of the United States."

The final authority in the matter, according to some of the testimony, is the Bureau of the Budget. On this point, I believe Admiral Burke was right in his testimony, and I believe General Power was right in his testimony. Therefore, I stated on the floor of the Senate, without entering into personalities, that the problem of a balanced budget in this administration today, judging from some of the testimony, seems to be more important than the question of the security of the United States. I base that statement on the testimony. I criticize no one in particular. I simply refer to the record.

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

Mr. SYMINGTON. I am glad to yield to the Senator from California.

Mr. ENGLE. I desire to compliment my distinguished friend from Missouri on a speech which has been fair, objective, and constructive in this field, and, in the main, I should say, except when bearded with provocative questions, a temperate speech, and one which, in my opinion, brings out some of the things which appear to be entering into the problem of really determining what our defense position is.

I read with some interest the President's press conference the other day. I read the press reports on his reaction to questions with respect to the defense posture of the country, and I regret that the President shows irritation when people talk about the defense position of the Nation and implies that his critics are charging that he has deliberately misled the American people.

We all know that the President is a transparently honest and patriotic man. No one can justly say that he is deliberately misleading anyone. But it is very difficult to discuss a problem of this sort in a light which is in the best interests of the American public when it is surrounded by politics, and the President himself shows irritation.

I read an editorial from Life magazine of February 8, 1960. Life magazine is not notoriously friendly to Democrats. I wish to call attention to what the editorial stated, in part, on page 57 of that issue. I shall offer the entire editorial in just a moment. This is what the editorial says in discussing the question of defense. I am sure the Senator is familiar with it:

> And Assistant Secretary of Defense Murray Snyder, who is responsible for Pentagon public relations, has counseled top defense officials to "kick the teeth in" of reporters who dare question U.S. defenses and suggested that critics of the program are undermining national confidence and security.

It seeems to me that we ought to be able to discuss the defense posture of this Nation without being accused of undermining national confidence and security.

The editorial continues:

> Nonetheless, we must ask the question: "Are we strong enough?" The answer is: We are not.

I ask unanimous consent to have the entire editorial printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

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

MISSILE SCOREBOARD

It is time to quit the numbers game. One high defense authority who has studied all the intelligence estimates thinks the United States must stop gearing its own military budget to what we think the Russians are doing. Instead, it should figure out just how many Hound Dogs, ICBM's, missile bases, and bombers it would take to serve as a convincing deterrent to the Russians and go to work building them.

The man is right. However, no one in the administration is supposed to rock the boat on defense. The President has an almost impenetrable reputation for knowing more about the subject than any other American. The team is always more inclined to go along than to criticize or suggest. And Assistant Secretary of Defense Murray Snyder, who is responsible for Pentagon public relations, has counseled top defense officials to "kick the teeth in" of reporters who dare question

U.S. defenses and suggested that critics of the program are undermining national confidence and security.

Nonetheless, we must ask the question: Are we strong enough? The answer is: We are not.

What do we do? We do this:

We hasten the construction of hardened, or dug-in, bases for our ICBM's. We put up enough money—right now—to correct the 2-to-1 imbalance in long-range missiles by the start of 1963 at the latest.

We stop fooling around with a piddling $75 million research program to produce two prototypes of the B–70 supersonic bomber. Instead we spend what is needed for full production of these Mach-3 (2,000 m.p.h.) planes. They form the next generation of manned bombers. They could be used to haul troops, or launch airborne missiles, and could also be redesigned as supersonic transports to keep the United States in the commercial aviation race. If we built 200 B–70's we could get them at a cheaper rate of $27 million each and by 1965 at the latest. As it is, with two prototypes on the back burner, we'll go nowhere.

We put the heat on to make the solid-fuel Minuteman ICBM the real weapon of the future. This probably means opening another plant to turn out the fuel which is quicker firing and easier to handle than the liquid fuels we are using now. Minuteman could be fired instantly from holes in the ground or from railroad cars moving back and forth across the country so the Russians could not pinpoint them.

We should think about stepping up Atlas, which has now proved itself after 17 straight successful firings. At the same time we should be wise and ruthless enough to cancel the Titan ICBM which is still in the development stages but is down on the books for a total of $2 billion. Titan has certain technical advantages over Atlas. But if we really want to catch up fast in ICBM capability we should shed poor Titan and the necessary tears.

We should also underwrite a real air alert for SAC, whose bombers hold the key to our security until the missiles are ready. The new budget provides $90 million as a start toward keeping SAC bombers off the ground where they are sitting ducks for enemy missiles. But a real air alert would cost $1 billion. We should begin budgeting this money in earnest to put a considerable portion of SAC continuously in the air where it belongs.

Finally, let us stop measuring our retaliatory effort by what we guess the Russians may be doing. Last month, Secretary Gates had no sooner deprecated Russian missile accuracy than the Russians—the very next day—laid one down in the Pacific only 1.2 miles from its target. We cannot afford to be outguessed as fast as that.

As we face the blank wall of the police state, let us acknowledge our intelligence gap and plug it with the expenditures needed to bring our defenses to a point of unquestionable deterrence. Some of the necessary money can be found within the defense budget itself, by shifting funds from doubtful programs like Titan, for example, to the more promising investments like the Minuteman.

The Army, Navy, and Air Force have already agreed to forgo their annual international baseball competitions this year. Fine. This will provide a few thousand. There is an Army antimissile defense system called Nike-Zeus which is costing about $300 million this year even though no one is certain it will be effective. It might be wiser to put this money into an offensive capability.

In addition to these intrabudget transfers, the Nation can afford to tighten its belt and cut out nonessentials. We ought to plow back into defense insurance the $4 billion a year we spend on our farm glut, and maybe call a halt to all rivers and harbors and flood control projects for a year, maybe forget about starting to pay off our national debt. And, as a very last resort, maybe even raise our taxes.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, I also ask to have printed in the RECORD at this point, as a part of my remarks, an editorial from Life magazine of February 15, 1960, also in support of the excellent statement made by my distinguished friend from Missouri.

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

NEEDED: A MIGHTIER SHIELD

President Eisenhower's defense budget is dangerously deficient. He has great military experience and deep confidence his $41 billion program is adequate. But harsh facts argue it isn't.

The harshest fact is that by the President's own intelligence estimates, the Soviets by 1963 will have twice as many ICBM's as we—enough, by SAC Commander Thomas Power's warning, to wipe out all our bases and retaliatory planes in one salvo.

A further glaring fact is that we do not have to accept this inferiority. In the judgment of men closest to the problem, we could double our current rate of missile production just by doing all that we can. By 1963 we could match the 400-missile Soviet stockpile which our own estimates say the Russians will then have. Despite this, the President is taking the calculated gamble of doing less than we are capable of doing during the next 4 critical years. It will take that time to make fully usable our most effective deterrents—the quick-firing, solid-fueled Polaris and Minuteman, one hidden in submarines, the other in hardened underground bases. To understand just how big the gamble is, Americans must also remember that their Government has generally underestimated Soviet capabilities, and that the new figures giving the Soviets only a 2-to-1 lead are themselves much reduced from previous estimates.

The problem is not to match any particular number of Soviet missiles but to make certain the United States has so much striking power that a Soviet commander cannot dream of knocking it out in one sudden blow. This is necessary not only to deprive the Soviets of any temptation to risk a total attack but to neutralize the campaign of political threat and attrition which a pronounced Soviet military lead would allow Khrushchev to wage. In order to do all that needs to be done we are convinced that the United States must spend on defense, at the very least, $2 billion more than it is now planning. This money should be devoted to the following purposes, in order of priority:

CLOSING THE MISSILE GAP

The production rate of the already proved and operational Atlas can be doubled within a year to give us 150 (against 75 now planned, and a reduced estimate of 100 for the Soviets in 1961). Work should begin at once, with highest priorities, to get these Atlases out of exposed positions and into deep, hardened bases—this can be done in 18 months. Since Atlas works, we should cancel the redundant (and so far inefficient) Titan and apply the remaining funds toward doubling Atlas. And every dollar that can make Polaris and Minuteman operational faster must be spent.

SAFEGUARDING SAC

To preserve our deterrent during this period General Power believes we must have SAC capable of assuming, when the situation requires it, a 24-hour alert with a striking force always aloft. To make this possible a year hence, we must start now to provide the additional B–52's, tankers, crews, fuel and spare parts which will be necessary. This isn't being done. Moreover, in order to preserve the most effective bomber-missile "mix" in our deterrent, full production should be begun on the 2,000-mile-per-hour B–70 program.

SPACE AND MISSILE RESEARCH

We need to step up our efforts to develop an effective antimissile missile. We need to extend the electronic early warning stations to help us spot a Soviet missile's firing anywhere on land or sea. We should step up our space programs with emphasis on satellites for early warning and reconnaissance. This could be done faster and cheaper if the President would close the artificial separation of peaceful and military space projects. They cannot, in fact, be separated. The Soviets make no such distinction.

SHELTERS

An immediate start should be made at providing shelters from radioactive fallout. Fully developed, a shelter program might save 80 million or more American lives. A serious start on shelters would in itself deter the enemy from trying a knockout blow.

So much for immediate needs for adequate defense. They do not meet the argument which Generals Ridgway, Gavin and Taylor, in succession, have stressed: that our preoccupation with massive retaliation is leaving us without adequate forces, airlift or new equipment to fight brush fires which may have to be met with orthodox forces and weapons. This issue also demands debate, decision and, very likely, action. But since we have committed ourselves, above all, to a strategy of nuclear deterrence, we must certainly make sure that that program is adequate. As of now, it is not.

Mr. ENGLE. The editorial begins with these three sentences:

President Eisenhower's defense budget is dangerously deficient. He has great military experience and deep confidence his $41 billion program is adequate. But harsh facts argue it isn't.

I offer this editorial in order to indicate that this is not a wholly partisan issue. The criticism does not originate exclusively upon this side of the aisle. A number of great generals and admirals support the position taken by the distinguished Senator from Missouri. He happens to be—and properly so because of his great background and experience—a leading spokesman on this subject.

Among the generals and admirals to whom I refer are General Gavin, General Ridgway, General Taylor, General Medaris, General Power, General Spaatz, General White, Admiral Burke, and Admiral Rickover.

All of those officers, to mention only a few, at some time or other, and in connection with some phase or other, have disagreed with and criticized the defense program of the Nation.

This ought to flash a red light somewhere—at the White House or on the other side of the aisle—to indicate that this subject should be discussed in a wholly nonpartisan atmosphere. The criticism comes not only from independent magazines and Republican publications throughout the country, but it comes from the voices of great and distinguished military leaders, men who have had almost as much—and some perhaps more actual military experience

and military background as the President of the United States.

I also have before me, if the Senator will further yield, a statement made by the distinguished Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER], who himself is a jet pilot. He disagrees vigorously with the administration with reference to the B-70 program, one of the items mentioned by the distinguished Senator from Missouri.

I observe also that Representative HIESTAND, of the 21st District of California, has made a statement in which he says that the defense program is in deep confusion.

Representative DONALD L. JACKSON, of the 16th District of California, states that the end result of all this discussion is in effect, one of total confusion.

So the criticisms have not been entirely partisan, and I hope they will not be entirely partisan. I hope that when the President of the United States discusses this subject on Sunday evening, as he says he intends to do, he will discuss it with the same kind of objectivity and in the same constructive manner that the Senator from Missouri has demonstrated here on the floor today. I compliment him again, and I associate myself with the recommendations he has made.

I thank the Senator for yielding.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I thank my able friend from California. In my opinion his presentation of the problem of the B-70 the other day on the floor of the Senate has not been surpassed. He made a clear case against the abandonment, in effect, of research and development on any manned aircraft. I compliment him for what he has said, and I also thank him for his kind remarks about me.

I should like to emphasize that fortunately this is still a free country. With all due respect, we have the right to disagree. The right to dissent is, in my opinion, perhaps one of the most important rights we have.

Under the Constitution, the Congress has the right of final decision. I respectfully state, in my opinion, the nature of the problem of defending this country has changed more significantly since President Eisenhower left the Pentagon Building than it did in any period prior to that time in our history.

I should also like to present that, to the best of my knowledge, there are no persons who served with President Eisenhower in responsible positions in World War II who agree with the present defense policy of this country.

I should also like to present the information, to those who think I have been overemphatic in this matter, that on the 19th of January we received information in the appropriate Senate committee, which was in decided conflict with testimony received only 10 days later on the same subject.

Then, to show the further confusion on this subject, I think it is in order for the Senate and the American people to know that on February 8, 1960, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff came before our committee and said that he had not seen certain very important figures which had been presented to the committee on the 29th of January, at the time he had come before us on January 19.

I want to make clear that I do not in any way question General Twining's integrity or intentions. However, I say it is an extraordinary operation when the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, a man who has his own personal representative on the National Intelligence Committee, does not have knowledge of the figures presented to the Senate and which were at variance with the figures he presented 10 days earlier.

Mr. SCOTT, Mr. CASE of South Dakota, Mr. MONRONEY, and Mr. GRUENING addressed the Chair.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I will yield first to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I am one of those who share the belief that a debate on the security of our country and the steps to be taken to attain it are generally of a constructive nature, and that it is within the responsibility of Congress. I thought that the distinguished Senator from Missouri was speaking on a very high level when he said at page 7 of his statement:

> The most significant point of all, however, is not one of assessing blame or giving credit for the past.

However, in view of the review he made in a substantial part of his speech on project MX-774, and in view of the reference made to it by the distinguished majority leader, and that General Eisenhower was Chief of Staff at the time the MX-774 project was under consideration, I should like to ask the Senator two or three questions. Does he believe that MX-774 was suspended at the instigation of Mr. Eisenhower when he was Chief of Staff?

Mr. SYMINGTON. No; I do not.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Is the Senator aware of the fact that when General Eisenhower, as Chief of Staff, made his presentation to the Appropriations Committees in 1947, he said that the missile field was a most important field for research at that time?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I beg the Senator's pardon. I did not hear the full question.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Is not the Senator aware of the fact that General Eisenhower, in making his presentation to the Appropriations Committees in 1947, stressed the importance of the missile program?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I do not want to get into personalities in this situation. We should not get into personalities.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. No; except that the Senator from Missouri has made an important statement on the subject, and pointed out that General Eisenhower was then Chief of Staff.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I have the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. YOUNG of Ohio in the chair). The Senator from Missouri has the floor.

Mr. SYMINGTON. If the Senator wishes to continue, I am perfectly willing that he do so. However, I do not think it will come out the way the Senator anticipates.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The Senator from South Dakota is willing to take the chance in view of what the Senator has said.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I will try to answer the questions the Senator asks.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Is the Senator aware of the fact that Gen. Carl Spaatz stressed the importance of the missile program in his presentation to the Appropriations Committee in 1947?

Mr. SYMINGTON. The Senator from Missouri is aware that General Spaatz thought it was very important to go ahead with the missile program. The Senator is also aware of the fact that neither General Spaatz nor General Eisenhower put the same stress on the missile program as that research and development authority—Gen. Donald Putt—put on the missile program. The Senator is aware that many times in many administrations, including the present one, some officials stress the importance of something when they make speeches, but when they come before the Congress they state that they believe the budget is adequate. The Senator also knows that many times it is a question of what has to be cut out, based on the instructions of the Bureau of the Budget, which is a part of the White House organization.

I stress the fact that the Atlas missile project was cancelled largely because something had to be cut out, although the scientists' recommendations had much to do with what project was cut. If the Senator wishes to pursue the matter any further, I shall be glad to pursue it.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Is the Senator aware of the fact that in the hearings in 1947, General LeMay testified about the suspension of the MX-774 program, though I do not know whether it was so identified in the record at that time; at any rate, it was the precursor of the Atlas missile. General LeMay testified that a year and a half had been lost by the suspension of the program and by the transfer of the research funds "to pay for the Army," did he not?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I am aware of that fact. I do not necessarily say that that is the fault of the Chief of Staff of the Army, if that is the point the Senator is getting to. Moreover, no civilian in the Defense Establishment makes any final decision on a weapons system, with the exception of the Secretary of Defense. I do not remember the great late Secretary of War, for whom I worked, ever getting into any final position as to what the weapons should be. When people talk about the Truman administration's responsibility in respect to the MX-774 program, let me tell the Senator that I am sure that the decision never went to the White House. I will tell the Senator also something else. I do not believe that the decision could have been made without the final approval of somebody who was reporting to the Chief of Staff of the Army. If it happened in any other way, it was against the established procedures.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Would the Senator object to my asking unanimous consent to place in the RECORD

excerpts from the 1947 hearings on the appropriations for the War Department, including a portion of the statements of General Eisenhower, then Chief of Staff; of Gen. Carl Spaatz, of the Air Force; of Gen. Curtis LeMay, then in charge of air research, about the time lost; and of Gen. George Richards, budget officer for the War Department at that time, as to where the responsibility did rest for the transfer of money from research to pay for the Army; also an excerpt from the report of the Appropriations Committee of the House of Representatives condemning the suspension of the research program and the transfer of money, and expressing the hope that it would not be done again?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. SYMINGTON. There is no objection on my part. I think it is fair to say that in 1947 the great danger of the Communist conspiracy was neither as clear nor as great as it became in later years. This was brought out in the testimony before the Senate Committee on Appropriations, under the chairmanship of the late great Senator McKellar, on March 29, 1950. I therefore ask unanimous consent that pertinent excerpts from that testimony be inserted right after the testimony which the distinguished Senator from South Dakota asked to have inserted.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, under that permission to insert excerpts from testimony in the hearings of the House Appropriations for the War Department in the spring of 1947, I submit the following:

First, the statement of then Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower as Chief of Staff, made on the 19th of February, exactly 13 years ago, exhibiting his concern that the requests for missile research should be approved and not curtailed. Some of the statements made on the Senate floor today would seem to imply that Chief of Staff Eisenhower sanctioned the cutback on the MX-774 program or approved the impounding or transfer of funds from the missile program to something else. But here is the position of General Eisenhower as printed in the hearings for February 19, 1947:

THE EISENHOWER POSITION IN 1947

Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower, Chief of Staff:

"In the field of guided missiles, electronics, and supersonic aircraft, we have no more than scratched the surface of possibilities which we must explore in order to keep abreast of the rest of the world. Neglect to do so could bring our country to ruin and defeat in an appallingly few hours. Those of us who were in Europe in the black days when Hitler was making his last desperate gamble with the V-1 and the V-2 know how close to success that gamble came. Yet those weapons, terrible and effective as they were, were child's toys in comparison with those which can be produced."

THE ADVICE OF GENERAL SPAATZ

And here, Mr. President, is the statement of General Carl Spaatz, a commanding general of the Army Air Corps of that day, as it appears in the public hearings for March 6, 1947:

General SPAATZ. In the future, as we visualize world conditions and modern weapons, this situation will not pertain. The enemy will for the first time have weapons with which he can directly depreciate the manpower and destroy the industrial resources of the United States from the very moment he launches his attack. * * * It is certain that the weapon of the future which will immediately attack us and which must give us the greatest concern is the long-range bomber or the long-range guided missile. Either of these weapons will follow great circle courses. * * * With the advent of the new weapon, it is quite obvious that warfare will follow more nearly meridians of longitude and come over the Arctic frontier. This changes our whole defensive picture; it means, for example, that we must have a chain of radar stations looking northward to discover the enemy weapons and we must have a means of intercepting and destroying them. * * *

If I could give but one thought of counsel and advice to the leaders of our country, I would say—make certain you put enough into experimental development to have the most modern weapon, and make equally certain that you buy enough of them, year by year, always to have an up-to-date Air Force. There alone lie security and safety for the country.

DELAY COST YEAR AND HALF

And here, Mr. President, is additional testimony of General Spaatz as developed in the hearings of that House Appropriations Committee relative to a transfer of research funds away from the missile program to "pay of the Army." It will be noted that the questioning of General Spaatz developed an estimate of a year and a half of delay, concurred in by General Rawlings, the comptroller, and by Gen. Curtis LeMay, who was then the Assistant Chief of Staff in charge of research and development:

Congressman ENGEL (Michigan, subcommittee chairman 1947-48). I think we all agree on the research and development program. As a matter of fact, I think the President took $75 million of the research money away from you that we gave you last year, asking to have it transferred to the Finance Service of the Army; is that not right?

General SPAATZ. We were reduced $75 million.

Congressman ENGEL. They took about $135 million away from you all told, including the $75 million for research and development that this committee gave you last year.

* * * * *

Congressman CASE (South Dakota). Referring to this $135 million proposed for transfer to "pay of the Army" or other objects, if that transfer is approved by the Congress, what does it mean as far as your current 1947 program is concerned?

General SPAATZ. That $135 million would take $75 million from research and development definitely. General Rawlings can give you the breakdown.

General RAWLINGS (Air Comptroller). For research and development $75 million was cut out and in our opinion that has delayed the program probably a year or a year and a half. Do you agree with that, General LeMay?

General LEMAY. Yes, sir.

General RAWLINGS. At this point it would probably be impossible for us to spend the money wisely during the balance of the fiscal year for research and development, so what has happened is that we have lost time on the program probably to the extent of a year or a year and a half in research and development.

AIR CORPS DID NOT ASK DELAY

Further questioning by Chairman Engel then developed the following testimony on the initiative behind the transfer of funds which lost the research funds for the missile and rocket program back in those crucial pioneering days. In accord with the permission granted, I submit for the RECORD at this point the excerpts from the printed transcript of the testimony at the same hearings previously cited:

Congressman ENGEL. * * * I think the record of this committee since 1939 at least has been very strongly in favor of research and development. I think the record will show that when we were trying to build up our Air Force to 2,900 planes we figured 18 months was the time required from the start to get the plane on the assembly line, and you were building small planes. From that time the members of this committee have continually been in favor of research and development. * * * If money is allocated for research and development, I want it to stay. I do not want any deficiency because of a transfer from research and development. I think the record should show that.

General RAWLINGS. I would like to put in the record, however, that if we should get this money back we would be unable intelligently to spend it for research and development this year because of the time.

Congressman ENGEL. That is exactly it. It is frozen so you cannot use it. You cannot use those funds because of the transfer.

Congressman CASE. I am sure the chairman has stated the position which he has consistently taken all the way through. * * * Was the postponement of this procurement reflected in this $135 million on the initiative of the Air Forces?"

General RAWLINGS. No, sir, it was not.

(Discussion off the record.)

TIME LOST WAS GONE

Then, Mr. President, on the effect of this transfer of funds away from rocket-missile research, here is further testimony of General Spaatz and General LeMay at that time, March 6, 1947, as to the delay which that action would cause:

Congressman ENGEL. Will this transfer from the Air Corps to other services result in increasing the 1948 appropriation? In other words, are we being asked to reappropriate money in 1948 for the purpose for which that money that is being transferred had been appropriated for 1947?

General SPAATZ. The answer to that, Mr. Chairman, is that the research and development money is at a certain level in 1948, and what we have lost is time. We are not trying to make up that loss in the 1948 appropriation. But we have taken the loss in time, so instead of the 5-year research and development program that would be finished in 1952, that project will now end in 1953 or 1954.

Maj. Gen. C. E. LEMAY (Assistant Chief of Air Staff, Research and Development). * * * When the $75 million cut came it was the straw that broke the camel's back. It meant a cut of from 20 to 30 percent. So the people who had been working on the program to get the money obligated had to stop that, because we did not want to let any contracts that were not necessary in the revised program. The $75 million cut delayed our program, but even if you gave it back we could not spend the money wisely for research and development before the end of the year because of the time lost in reprograming.

* * * * *

Congressman CASE. You had no notice of any cut in the research and development fund until when?

General LEMAY. Not until about the middle of the year. We had very little warning notice and no cut until about the middle of the year.

PROTESTS WENT TO PRESIDENT

And, finally, Mr. President, on the point as to where the transfer of funds away from the rocket-missile research program originated, there were, as I recall, some very pertinent testimony which was taken "off the record" as those words from the printed hearings above indicate.

There does remain in the printed hearings, however, testimony by Gen. George Richards, budget official for the War Department, which is very significant and the import of which will be evident to all Senators, I am sure:

(March 6, 1947:)

General RICHARDS. The War Department was notified by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget that we would have a cut of 100 million in research and development appropriation.

The Army Air Forces protested to the Bureau of the Budget, and I think to the President; and as a result, it is my understanding that at least one member of the Bureau of the Budget and one member of the Army Air Forces went to Wright Field and examined the research and development program. After that the Bureau of the Budget reduced the reduction from $100 million to $75 million.

This was the research program on which long-range rockets for missile development was based. So the Air Force's project MX-774 started in 1946 was dropped except that the contractor, Consolidated Vultee—Convair—did some limited research on its own account, as the Senator from Missouri has stated.

COMMITTEE DISAVOWS BUDGET TRANSFER

As a result of this testimony, Mr. President, the House Appropriations Subcommittee for War Department Appropriations in that day of the Air Corps, pinned the responsibility on the Budget Bureau by the following paragraph which appears at page 4 of its report accompanying the Military Establishment appropriation bill, 1948:

HOUSE REPORT—MILITARY ESTABLISHMENT APPROPRIATION BILL, 1948

RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

The bill provides $222,216,400 for research and development. The committee made no reduction in this amount. It feels that a research program must be planned on a long-range basis and that research money should flow evenly year after year in order to retain the maximum results from a minimum of funds. The committee recommended and Congress appropriated $185 million for research and development for the Army Air Corps for 1947, the current fiscal year. This amount was appropriated with a long-range program in view. The committee is not in accord with the action taken by the Bureau of the Budget in transferring $75 million of such funds to the "Pay of the Army."

As has been remarked here this afternoon, the Budget Bureau is an arm of the President and that was true in 1947 as well as today. Thus it was not the Chief of Staff of that day, General Eisenhower, whose statement on the urgency of the rocket-missile-research program opened the hearings as cited above, but the Budget Bureau, acting as an agent of the President of that day, which crippled the MX-774 project and caused the critical year and a half of delay in development of the long-range rockets and missiles.

GENERAL EISENHOWER'S TESTIMONY, MARCH 29, 1950 (SENATE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE)—THE 1951 DEFENSE BUDGET

In the fall of 1948, General Eisenhower was asked by President Truman and Secretary Forrestal to undertake to study the defense needs for the fiscal year 1951 budget. More specifically he was asked "to try to relate the strengths of our forces to the probable situations we might encounter in a war and out of that to develop a budget that would be presented for fiscal year 1951." (P. 680.)

"Out of my personal regard for the economy of the country, I have strongly urged that that figure [$14.6 billion] not be exceeded. I believed we could work out an effective defense at that level * * *. We worked on that problem for 6 months. (P. 680.)

"I thought [it] was a very wise decision * * * that not over $15 billion should be devoted to defense including stockpiling. (P. 682.)

"I believe within that amount you can do it. And I still believe it." (P. 686.)

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I appreciate the Senator's yielding to me and also for letting me put my material in the RECORD.

If the Senator will indulge me for one further observation, I should like to say that I thoroughly agree that the most important part of this whole debate is not the assessment of blame for the past. With respect to the MX-774 program, which was brought into the debate, I thought the record should be kept clear. I believe that the military posture of the country ought to be under constant review. That means at anytime, even after the budget has been submitted and after the appropriation request has been passed on, if it develops that we should revise, or add more here, put more emphasis there, change this, cut back here, add more there, we ought to be flexible enough to do it. That is the way to conserve the strength of the country, not merely moneywise but materialwise and expertwise and scientificwise, and so forth.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Does the Senator from South Dakota believe that what we now have is adequate?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I believe that on an overall basis, we are in a good position. With respect to some details, I might make some changes.

Mr. SYMINGTON. What does the Senator mean by "overall"?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I think that as of today I would stand with General Twining and General Norstad, who have said that they would worry more if they were in the Russian position than they would being in our own position. I do not believe that means we have attained perfection in every department; but we must realize the correctness of what General Marshall said during the war: That there are problems of "localitis," in which every service chief and every theater commander looks at the situation from his own point of view or considers his own particular problem, which to him is the most important, as it should be.

But someone—the President, Congress, the Committees on Appropriations—has to take a look at the whole picture and strive to achieve the best balance and make the best deployment of our funds, our scientific talent, and our material which their judgment permits them to make.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I thank the Senator from South Dakota for his observation. Ever since I first knew him—and that was many years ago, when he was a member of the House Committee on Appropriations—he has been a stickler for detail. Does the Senator remember the plan which the administration announced, that it would not allow the Russians to obtain a long lead in the ICBM missile gap?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Since the Senator has asked that question, I wonder if he would let me tell, briefly and quickly, a story to illustrate the point of my answer.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I would be glad to have the Senator do it at some other time, since many other Senators have asked me to yield to them. I would like to have him give me his own answer.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The story will be my answer to the question.

When he was a boy, Benjamin Franklin went to a county fair. When he went inside the gate, he saw someone selling whistles. They were nice, shiny whistles, the best he had ever seen. He took all the pennies he had and bought whistles.

He went on his way and soon saw someone else selling whistles which were a little bit better and gave a louder toot. But he was out of money. Then he wished he had bought only some of the first whistles and had saved some money to buy the others.

I believe the position of this administration is that it wants to keep itself in such a position that it will not have to spend all its money on the first generation of missiles, but rather to keep itself constantly in a position to take advantage of improvements as they come along.

I myself would like to see our Government have the best possible stock of the latest type missiles it can get in relation to the overall situation. That means not spending so much money on Atlas or so much scientific talent or production ability on Atlas, as to prevent getting a better generation of Titans and a better generation of Minuteman. I would take an inventory and try to keep myself in a strong position, but at the same time would look ahead and not stock up on obsolescence.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I thank the able Senator from South Dakota for his comments. I most respectfully say, though, that we are not talking about whistles; we are talking about the survival of the United States. One of the quickest ways to cut defense expenditures is to talk about what we will have in the future, add a small amount for that, and then cut a large amount out for current production of something already proven out.

I know the Senator agrees with me that we cannot defend with blueprints. Regardless of the intelligence and the ability of our youth, they must have actual operational weapons on hand. He cannot fight with future plans.

I remember another quotation from Benjamin Franklin, which I think is apt

at this point, considering the increasing dissension which is taking place in the United States. Franklin said that if we do not all hang together, we are likely to hang separately.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator from Missouri permit me to make another comment?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I am glad to yield to the Senator from South Dakota. In the Senator from South Dakota we have an able, sincere advocate of a strong national defense. I have respected his position in that respect for many years.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I appreciate the Senator's saying that, because I was about to refer to one incident which I think the Senator will remember.

The Senator may recall the proposal which was made when he was Secretary of the Air Force that we expedite our airplane program by, I believe, some $800 million after the budget had been originally adopted. That was to implement the 70-group Air Force. I did not hesitate to cooperate toward that end if it meant revising an appropriation program. I believe we should keep alert to the situation. I do not regard budget estimates as sacrosanct, although I think we ought to be prudent about our use of the public funds, as well as anything else.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I should like to ask the Senator one more question. Why has there been no effort to carry out the program of true unification of the services, if money is so important? This was advocated 15 years ago so strongly by General Marshall, by Secretary Stimson, by Secretary Patterson, by President Truman, and by General Eisenhower.

With the development of missiles and other modern weapons, the fictitious, arbitrary differentiation between air, sea, and land, involving so tremendous an amount of duplication and waste, is even less justifiable to the American people now than it was when our defense budget was only a small fraction of what it is today.

If money is so important, I wonder why something is not done to streamline the Pentagon on the basis of progress, instead of letting conditions drift further into dissension and duplication, on the basis of tradition.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I will join with the Senator from Missouri in that effort at any time he wants to start.

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

Mr. SYMINGTON. I yield.

Mr. MONRONEY. I have been greatly stimulated and enlightened by this deep, searching discourse on the state of American security. I compliment the Senator from Missouri, not only upon the speech he has made today, but upon the speeches he has made over the past 15 years, warning against the growing power of Russia, and the danger that Russia may become the foremost military power in the world.

For many years, the Senator's has been a voice crying in the wilderness. Those who have been associated with him when he served as the first Secretary of the Air Force, and built up that great organization, and later as a distinguished Member of the Senate recognize the importance of the Senator's views about this subject. Gradually, because of his insistence and because of his unwillingness to be silenced, even by the great power of a Chief Executive having an outstanding military background, the Senator from Missouri has come to be recognized as an authority on this subject. His logic will not be overcome by the President's effort to wrap the robe of military security around himself, and to say that no one in Congress is fully advised of the information from which I speak.

I must confess that I am less than sympathetic with the attitude of the Chief Executive. He has been given the cooperation of the opposite party through his entire term of office on so many matters. I regret that he has become so irritable and has felt it necessary to deprecate the value of the advice of anyone else in the United States concerning our defense posture. I regret that the President sees fit to engage in deprecation of Congress, which has a proper part to play in the scheme of military affairs. Certainly the framers of the Constitution intended that Congress should have something to say. Section 8 of article I of the Constitution provides:

> The Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts, and excises, to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States.
>
> To raise and support armies.
>
> To provide and maintain a Navy.
>
> To make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces.
>
> To provide for calling forth the militia to execute the laws of the Union, suppress insurrections and repel invasions.
>
> To provide for organizing, arming, and disciplining the militia, and for governing such part of them as may be employed in the service of the United States.

Those six paragraphs of the Constitution specifically provide the authority of Congress in this field.

Therefore, to say at this time that Congress is "sniping" when it chooses to discuss on a high level, as the Senator from Missouri has done today, the dangers and the problems which lie ahead is less than respectful of this branch of the Government, which historically has performed admirably these duties.

The broad implications of the six recommendations or the six-point program presented by the Senator from Missouri—to accelerate the Polaris and other missiles, to provide an adequate airborne alert of SAC bombers, to speed up the ICBM hardening and dispersal programs, to increase our antisubmarine warfare capability, to reverse the decision to cancel out the B-70 airplane, and to modernize the equipment and increase the mobility of our Army and Marine Corps—encompass the whole range of military possibilities, not only for the unexpected "sudden death" attack that might come through outer space, but also for the threat which is probably 80 percent of our exposure at this time—namely, the threat of limited war.

This is the reason why both General Ridgway and General Taylor resigned—because they could not carry out their obligations under the budgetary limitations imposed upon them.

I know the extent to which the Senator from Missouri has gone in his efforts to correct the very serious imbalance in our defense posture. I agree with his statement—this is virtually what he said in answer to the Senator from Connecticut—that we have seen this administration put a balanced budget ahead of a balanced national defense. I think that is undebatable; it has been proven time and time again. If that policy results in a catastrophe, then those who have preferred a balanced budget to a balanced national defense will have a heavy reckoning. Does the Senator from Missouri agree that is the real situation?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I agree with what my able friend, the Senator from Oklahoma, says. I agree with him about the high priority given the status of the budget, as against the lesser priority given the question of our national security. I thank him for his wise, able, and precise presentation.

Mr. MONRONEY. This administration says we cannot afford to add the necessary funds in order to provide for a defense against what will be an uncontrollable terror unless it is met by adequate defense means. Is that a correct statement?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I think it is entirely correct.

Mr. MONRONEY. But the Senator from Missouri is aware, as I think all the rest of us are, that this administration believes our country can afford to devote added billions of dollars—$4 billion, to date—to the expense of the escalating cost of interest on the public debt. This added cost of $4 billion a year, is controllable by this administration and could be adjusted downward to provide us with the funds we need in the budget, so we could have an adequate defense.

Mr. SYMINGTON. The Senator from Oklahoma is correct. In the last 6 years the interest burden has practically doubled. The cost of that unnecessary and unwarranted development must be paid by the same taxpayers.

Mr. MONRONEY. And from the same budget.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, when some persons talk about how future generations are going to be enslaved with debt, I should like to ask my 7-year-old grandson what kind of a slave he would rather be 10 or 15 years from now: one with a debt, but otherwise free, or one without any freedom at all.

I thank the Senator from Oklahoma very much for his contributions.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President——

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Missouri yield?

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I previously promised to yield to the Senator from Mississippi; and I now yield to him.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President——

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri may not be removed from the floor. He has yielded to the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Missouri for yielding to me. I have been present since the start of his address. I have remained throughout his remarks except for a short time when I had to leave to answer a phone call of urgent necessity.

Mr. President, I commend the Senator from Missouri for what I believe has been a very forceful and factually correct presentation of a most serious problem. He is not only a student in that field, but he has made careful research into the question, and I can see that the address has been very carefully prepared.

In my humble opinion, I would not accept all his conclusions, but I certainly think the address has been very constructive, and he is to be highly commended.

I want especially to commend him on three points. One is with reference to what he has said with respect to assessing blame. I think I heard virtually all of the briefings given to the Armed Services Committee and the Aeronautical and Space Sciences Committee. I think we have heard enough from every source with respect to trying to assess blame, who is to blame, and when.

The question now is, What can be done about it? I think the American people have had enough of trying to assess blame. What they are interested in, and what we have a responsibility in, is, What can be done about these things, and what will be done about it? We wake up year after year to the realization that for the next 3 or 4, or even 5 years, we shall be involved in this very far-reaching, complicated military program.

I also want to particularly commend the Senator next for what he has said with reference to the B-70 bomber. I am certainly not in a position to pit my judgment against that of an expert on airpower. However, from merely the standpoint of commonsense, I am firmly convinced that for a long time to come manned bombers will be a substantial part of our frontline defense. There is no way to get away from that fact. In spite of the terrible destruction that missiles can impose, I believe the logic of the situation is that probably neither side will turn loose a weapon it could not call back.

I certainly believe we would make the gravest kind of error if we failed to pursue pioneering efforts to obtain the ultimate in manned bombers. That is what the B-70 bombers are. If we do not utilize such bombers, a few years from now we shall find we are literally out of business so far as a manned modern bomber is concerned.

As the Senator from Missouri has said, this question goes into the next plateau of speed, and opens up all kinds of new fields of possibility for all weapons, including naval weapons.

Having had briefings on the subject, as the Senator from Missouri has had, I do not see why we do not modernize our Army, Navy, and Marine Corps with the ultimate in weapons and capability of airlift.

Last year it was my privilege to be in the Pacific area for the first time. After being in that area, I realized how really helpless those nations are, and the fact that they cannot possibly defend themselves, and that their defense depends entirely on what we do. That is a great area of possible limited war or trouble spots or brush fires, where the factor of distance itself proves the case of the need for the ultimate in modern airlift and also the need, when the fighting starts, to have the most modern equipment in tanks and other weapons, including rifles, which we lack in terms of being modern.

I commend the Senator again for his fine address, and commend him particularly for the three points I have mentioned.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I thank the Senator from Mississippi. I am particularly impressed with what he has said, because, as chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee on Military Construction, there is no one who tries harder to give the taxpayer the most return for his dollars than does the Senator from Mississippi. His high character and his understanding of the problems are so well brought to bear out the work of his subcommittee. I thank him for his kind remarks.

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

Mr. SYMINGTON. I apologize to the Senator from Kentucky for this delay. There is no one for whom I have greater respect. I had promised to yield to the other Senators. I am happy now to yield to him.

Mr. COOPER. I shall be brief. Like other Members present, I have been very much interested in the Senator's address. I have recognized his great interest in the problems of defense, and that also his experience and knowledge qualify him to speak on the subject in this body. I am a Senator in the category of those who are not members of the Armed Services Committee, or the Appropriations Subcommittee on Defense, or the Space and Aeronautic Sciences Committee, or other committees which receive information from various departments of the Government concerning our defense situation. Nevertheless, on my own responsibility, I do talk with members of these committees, and I go to the Department of Defense and talk there to officials in whom I have confidence.

The fact that the Senator speaks on this subject—and I have great respect for him—or the fact that another Senator who is interested in this subject speaks on it, does not mean ipso facto that his judgments are correct. One of the great difficulties in this field is that admirals and generals and other military persons in the Department of Defense and those who have retired, who are supposed to have knowledge of it, are also giving judgments on this subject. I do not refer to the Senator from Missouri, because he has had experience in this field as have the junior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] and other Senators. But many in this body who came here from civilian life, as lawyers, farmers or from other fields, cannot be supposed to have become at once great military experts whose judgment is superior to that of the experts.

In addition, we are confused by "leaks" of supposed important information which come out of committees and which are not given in context. And, of course, politics enters into a discussion of the defense issue. I am not saying this is unusual. It is inevitable that politics should enter into the consideration of the subject, but I think that fact confuses the situation.

We have to ascertain what the facts are, and as best we can, make judgments on the facts. Let me say that my own mind is free in this matter. I do not care what is recommended in the budget. When it comes to voting, on defense expenditures, I am going to vote for what I think is necessary to properly defend this country, now and in the future. I do not care what other interests are involved.

With respect for my friend, for we have been friends for 40 years, I desire to question him about certain facts set forth in his address. The Senator stated in his speech that, so far as the present is concerned, he considers our strength sufficient to deter aggression and to protect the country. I refer to page 10 of his statement:

> I agree with those who state that, primarily because of the great capability of our SAC bomber fleet, we could probably destroy any nation which dared attack us.

My first question is, and this question is asked to get the facts: Does the Senator, from his knowledge, inquiry, and study, say that we are in a position to deter aggression and protect this country and make it secure—today?

Mr. SYMINGTON. The Senator has brought up a very good point.

The reason some of us want the air alert so badly is that the whole defense of the United States is based on the premise that, if there is an attack, we will be attacked first. I, for one, cannot conceive of our starting a nuclear war. Therefore the question is: Would our capacity to retaliate, our deterrent capacity, be destroyed in a surprise attack? After listening to the testimony of probably the greatest expert in the world on the matter—General Power—I am not sure whether we would have the capacity to retaliate unless we had sufficient bombers on air alert.

Mr. COOPER. Looking at fact No. 9 in the Senator's address, the Senator says: "We have no airborne alert today." The statement would imply there is none whatever today.

Mr. SYMINGTON. That is correct.

Mr. COOPER. I have made an inquiry in this regard at the Department of Defense. I have also made inquiry of a member of the Committee on Armed Services in whom I have great faith, and I have been informed that we do have an airborne alert today.

Mr. SYMINGTON. What kind?

Mr. COOPER. In the air.

Mr. SYMINGTON. What is the nature of the alert?

Mr. COOPER. I do not know its magnitude. The Senator said we had no airborne alert today.

Mr. SYMINGTON. The Senator knows my respect for him——

Mr. COOPER. I know that; I am simply trying to get the facts.

Mr. SYMINGTON. The Senator knows of my desire to have him return to the Committee on Armed Services, because of his constructive position on the committee when we had the honor of serving there together some years ago.

The Senator does not mean to imply by "alert" that our planes are ready to go, with weapons, in the air today, does he?

Mr. COOPER. I do not know. I can only say, from reading the Senator's speech, that he says we have no air alert today.

Mr. SYMINGTON. My statement stands.

Mr. COOPER. I have been told by members of the Defense Department and the committee that there is an alert of some scope.

Mr. SYMINGTON. My statement stands. We have no real air alert today.

I have been abroad where far more instantaneous reaction is needed than in the United States, because the areas are so close to Russia. Yet we have no organized air alert today. We may have some planes flying from this country to Europe in rotation or for training, but I repeat there is no organized plan for them to go. There is a ground alert, but there is not an air alert.

Mr. COOPER. I know the difference between a ground alert and an air alert, and not in the magnitude of an air alert. I must say I have been informed that there are some planes in an airborne alert.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I deeply appreciate the Senator's bringing the point up. The Senator well remembers Pearl Harbor, and more specifically he remembers Clark Field, where our capacity to retaliate in that part of the world was completely destroyed as the result of the fact that our planes were altogether parked close together without even a ground alert. This was a case where we tried to guess intentions of an enemy, instead of preparing against the enemy's capabilities.

Mr. COOPER. Is it not true that if all our planes or a substantial part were in the air, we would have a problem of plane deterioration and of personnel?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I did not hear the Senator's question.

Mr. COOPER. I say, is it not true that if a great number of planes were in the air at all times, we would face the problem of deteriorating planes and equipment, and manpower problems which could affect the capability of the SAC to complete its mission.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I wish to tell my friend from Kentucky that the testimony we had before the committee was not in accord with that view. It was said that if we had an air alert the number of planes which General Power recommends would not result in a decreased efficiency of SAC. Specifically, except for the wear on certain parts, including engines, an air alert improves the overall efficiency of the aircraft as compared with keeping the aircraft on the ground. It was also said that the air alert would increase the efficiency of the crews.

Therefore, the only obstacle to an adequate air alert is money. I read an illuminating book which points out that we spend hundreds of millions of dollars a year for new swimming pools—an amount greatly in excess of what is needed for an adequate air alert for the United States.

Mr. COOPER. Fact No. 7 stated in the Senator's address is that the United States has not accelerated the ICBM program. I do not know to what period the Senator refers. It is obvious that from 1953 to date the program has been accelerated by thousands of percent, from nothing to about $3 billion plus other funds for research.

I have talked to officials of the Defense Department this year, who have charge of the program, and they say the program has been accelerated and in this year. What does the Senator mean by the statement that it has not been accelerated?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I am glad the Senator brought that question up. At the time the Secretary of Defense and the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff came before the Senate committee I had seen statements in the papers and in their testimony that there was going to be a lot more money for speeding up the program and increasing the number of intercontinental ballistic missiles. I was under the impression that there was not going to be any more money for acceleration. So in an effort to clarify my understanding of the matter I asked the Secretary of Defense whether the new money which was being talked about was for an acceleration of the present production schedules or whether it was simply to be used to add more missiles at the end of the current programs we will say, in the year 1962 or 1963. The Secretary of Defense said he did not know. The officials did not know whether the additional money which was being talked about was to be used to accelerate the production schedules in the coming year or whether it was simply for an addition to the already planned schedules.

We were advised later that the money in the fiscal year 1961 budget was not to be used to accelerate the ICBM production program at all.

Mr. COOPER. I will say to the Senator, I have talked to people who have told me the program has been accelerated, and I will give the Senator their names. I hope the Senator will talk to them. I think these people know more than some of the generals, and more than we know in the Congress.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I will add that the Secretary of Defense has sent to me in writing a statement that no acceleration was planned under this money; it was simply an addition at the end of the schedule.

Mr. COOPER. I have one other question, and then I shall close, because the Senator has been very generous.

In the last several years when we talk about defense we become engrossed about one type of missile, or one system of weapons. Today most of the talk and thought is based upon the idea that the ICBM is the one weapon which we have to push to the very limit.

I agree with the Senator that we should push the ICBM ahead, but is it not also correct to say that the experts in the Department of Defense and, more important, the men who are developing the weapons—the scientists, the men who have the knowledge to develop weapons—foresee that the best weapon eventually will be lighter missiles, which can be moved quickly from point to point, which will not require the heavy protection the present ICBM's require, and which will not be vulnerable to discovery and to attack.

I say that we have to have the ICBM's. In fact, we have some of these missiles. The point I am making with regard to the current debate is that, looking ahead, is it not true that insufficient attention is being given in this debate to the importance of lighter and more advanced missiles—which can be moved quickly, are not as susceptible to discovery and vulnerable to attack as the ICBM's we have now and which are a deterrent to attack and aggression.

Mr. SYMINGTON. The Senator is correct. That attention must be given to futures, but we must not fail to be alert and strong in the interims also.

Mr. COOPER. I thank the Senator. I have asked these questions to bring into focus some of the statements the Senator made. I have tried to place the issue in better perspective.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I thank the able Senator from Kentucky. He is constructive and forthright, and always takes a positive and clear position in debate on the floor of the Senate. It is a privilege to discuss this subject with him.

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

Mr. SYMINGTON. I yield to the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I enthusiastically commend the distinguished Senator from Missouri on a very important statement, and on what I think is a devastating indictment. It seems to me that he has stressed in his speech primarily that, in spite of public impression to the contrary, these are the facts:

First, the U.S.S.R. has more than a 3-to-1 advantage over this country in ICBM's.

Second, each of their ICBM's is far more destructive than our ICBM's.

Third, their ICBM's are probably as accurate as ours.

Fourth, we have not accelerated our ICBM program, and the budget shows it.

Our good friends on the other side of the aisle have debated the history and politics of the defense dispute. But only the distinguished Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] has raised any challenge to the factual indictment, and I think the Senator from Missouri has met that challenge. His facts remain unshaken, and now undisputed. I believe that the action of the Senator from Missouri in calling these facts to the attention of the people is a significant national service. I thank him for it.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I thank my able colleague from Wisconsin. He knows that he has my respect. I have the honor of serving on the same committee with him. He is thorough in his analysis and constructive in his criticism. I appreciate what he has said.

I want to make one point to keep the RECORD clear. I did not say that our ICBM's were less reliable than those of the Russians. What I said was that there is no evidence to justify the belief that the Russian ICBM's were any less reliable than ours.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The junior Senator from Wisconsin simply said that their ICBM's would seem to be as accurate as ours.

Mr. SYMINGTON. That is correct.

The Senator brings up a pertinent point. As the able senior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], who is a real authority in this field of rocket thrust, knows, each time the Russians have exceeded what we have done, to the point where they actually put into orbit a missile in which the payload was greater than everything combined we had put into orbit. Each time that happened. Some spokesmen and high officials would say, "They got their first, but our developments are more accurate than theirs."

No one has shown me any evidence which justifies the statements which we have heard dogmatically stated at times and implied at other times that there is any reason to believe that the Russian rockets and missiles are less accurate than ours.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Is it not true that the shots in the Pacific suggest that the Russians have an accuracy which is equivalent to ours?

Mr. SYMINGTON. The shots in the Pacific, plus the lunar shot which hit the moon, plus the shot which went around the moon and photographed the moon, reveal great accuracy.

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

Mr. SYMINGTON. I yield to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. ANDERSON. Is it not correct that the shot in the Pacific, which traveled 7,700 miles plus, landed at a spot which indicated that there was accuracy of the highest degree? Whether our percentage of accuracy is 1 percent higher or 1 percent lower does not matter. So long as anyone can shoot 7,000 miles and put a shot within a 2-mile circle, he is pretty accurate. Whatever their actual figure was, they put the shot sufficiently close so that we are satisfied, at least, that it is a dangerous weapon.

Mr. SYMINGTON. The Senator is correct. He is a great authority in this field. The Russians shot a missile 7,762 miles, I believe. It is believed to be a very accurate accomplishment.

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

Mr. SYMINGTON. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I commend the Senator from Missouri for the very brave speech he has made.

As I listened to him I found my mind going back to the period between 1934 and 1939 in England. At that time Hitler had taken power in Germany, and was rearming Germany. There was a question as to what Great Britain should do.

Two successive Prime Ministers of Great Britain, Mr. Baldwin and Mr. Chamberlain, kept insisting that Hitler did not have designs on the West, and refused to rearm Great Britain. The result was that Hitler did attack the West. Great Britain was relatively unprepared.

There was a voice in the wilderness crying at that time—a discredited man by the name of Winston Churchill, who had been ousted from the Conservative Party because he was warning Great Britain. He was more or less in disgrace. The people would not listen to him.

As I listened to the Senator from Missouri, without being an expert on this subject, I found an old saying going through my mind, namely, that those who will not learn from history are destined to repeat it. I only hope that we can learn from the experience of the 1930's, and from the facts about us, and can rearm adequately. Otherwise we may find ourselves in much the same position that Britain and France found themselves in in 1939 and 1940, when the storm really broke upon them.

I think the Senator from Missouri has performed an extremely valuable service in alerting us. Without knowing the details involved, from the information we get in the newspapers it is obvious that the United States is exposed to great danger. If we lose military supremacy, in my judgment there is great danger that our military alliances will disintegrate. Those alliances have been partially held together by economic bonds, but they have also been partially held together by the belief of the Allies that we had military superiority. Once that is lost, or once the Allies believe it is lost, they are likely to drift into the camp of the neutrals, and many of them who are now neutrals will drift into the Soviet constellation. So I hope very much that the statements of the Senator from Missouri may be taken to heart by public opinion, and that we may adequately defend ourselves.

The Senator from Missouri has made a great contribution.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I thank the able senior Senator from Illinois for his remarks. He is one of those Members of the Senate who have demonstrated, in a very practical fashion, their patriotism. He has followed the subject of defense with care over the years. I do not agree with him that he is not an expert. I am very grateful for what he says.

The position of the United States today, as against the position of Great Britain in the early 1930's, is remarkably comparable. There is one great exception however. When the British people finally woke up to what the Hitler danger was, it was too late. They fought bravely, but they would have been defeated if we had not come in to support them. I think it is in order for us to ask ourselves today who is behind us as we were behind England.

Only yesterday I received an amazingly frank quotation. It consists of an admission which was made on the floor of the House of Commons by the then Prime Minister of England, Mr. Stanley Baldwin. I ask unanimous consent that I be permitted to insert that statement in the RECORD. It was made on the floor of the House of Commons by Stanley Baldwin in the year 1936.

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

> Supposing I had gone to the country and said that Germany was rearming and that we must rearm; does anyone think that this pacific democracy would have rallied to that cry at that moment? I cannot think of anything that would have made the loss of the election from my point of view more certain. (Stanley Baldwin in House of Commons Debates, Nov. 12, 1936, vol. 317, col. 1144.)

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

Mr. SYMINGTON. I yield to the Senator from New York, who has been on his feet for some time.

Mr. KEATING. I appreciate the courtesy of the distinguished Senator, and will be very brief.

I believe that a high-level debate on our Nation's defenses is always good. I certainly am vitally concerned about our defenses. I share the views of the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER]. I do not propose to be completely bound by anyone's recommendations in arriving at a final judgment. I wonder if the Senator is able to be a little more specific—and I rather think he is—as to the total amount which he believes should be added to the defense budget in order to achieve the objective of an adequate national defense.

Mr. SYMINGTON. That is a constructive question. About 2 years ago a friend of the Senator's made an outstanding report to the Government. It was the Rockefeller report.

That report said that for the first year $3 billion should be added to the defense budget; for the second year, $6 billion; for the third year, $9 billion.

I realize how vitally important it is to preserve the Treasury of the United States, to balance our budget, to cut our taxes, and to reduce our debt. We have gone over the budget, and we have gone over it very carefully. In our opinion, the money required to do what we think is absolutely vital to our future security would be to add between $2½ and $3 billion to this year's budget request for defense.

Mr. KEATING. The Senator means in the coming fiscal year, does he?

Mr. SYMINGTON. That is correct.

Mr. KEATING. I have a very high regard and great respect for my former colleague in the House, Representative MAHON, of Texas, who is the chairman of the House Subcommittee on Defense Appropriations.

About 2 weeks ago, on a nationally televised program called "Face the Nation," he was asked whether the United States should not spend billions of dollars more for its defense programs. He replied, in effect, that he favored some increases in our defense and a some-

what different structuring of our military program. In addressing himself to the question of whether we need billions more for defense, he called for millions, not billions. Let me emphasize that point: Not billions but millions more for our defense at the present time. He also said that we have a greater overall striking ability than the Soviet Union, and said this Nation is stronger than any nation in the world today. He also said that we have the Polaris submarine which will come in, and that with the ballistic missile submarine and with our Navy carriers we have more power than the Soviet Union.

Apparently the distinguished Senator from Missouri does not agree with Representative MAHON's comments that we do not at the moment need to expand our military program by billions of dollars.

Mr. SYMINGTON. The implication in the press reports, prior to the broadcast to which you refer, were that Representative MAHON thought things were "rosy." I believe the statement was "rosy hued." The Congressman wrote me a letter to make it emphatically clear that he did not believe that things were rosy. He wanted to assure me that there had been a misinterpretation of what he had said. What he had actually said was that the testimony was "rosy." In that connection I notice that he said in reply to a question on the CBS television broadcast of February 7, 1960:

> We are in the most frighteningly important situation that we have ever been in our lives. Any town in this country could be hit in the next 30 minutes. I am not trying to be an alarmist, but I am saying that at last we have come to this point of very great danger, and under those circumstances it is not surprising that we have a battle over the defense budget, Mr. Finney.

I will say to my friend it may be that my estimate of $2½ billion to $3 billion may be wrong and that Governor Rockefeller was right in recommending that in the next budget we should include $9 billion more.

It may be that my estimate is wrong and that Representative MAHON's estimates are more nearly correct. However, before I either agreed or disagreed with him, I think it would be important to find out exactly what he thinks and for him to find out exactly what I think. Then I would take a position in agreement with him or in disagreement with him based on the facts as I see them.

Mr. KEATING. If we could narrow my question a little, I meant only to find out whether the distinguished Senator from Missouri was in disagreement with the statement that millions, not billions, more are needed for our national defense in the next fiscal year.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Of course Mr. MAHON has heard a great deal of testimony that I have not heard and I have heard some he has not. We are getting along fairly close to the end of this fiscal year. It may be that he is talking about a thousand million instead of twenty million. I shall take the liberty of inserting in the RECORD how he feels about this matter, after we have had a chance to discuss it together. The important thing is to get the right national defense.

Mr. KEATING. I entirely agree.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Therefore, as I said, I believe under all the circumstances, based on the testimony that has come to the Senate—I do not know what the testimony has been in the House—we cannot do this job unless we appropriate as an absolute minimum $2 billion more. I have great respect for Representative MAHON. There is no one in the House for whom I have greater respect. I shall be glad to put his views in the RECORD after we have discussed it.

Mr. KEATING. I think that is a very constructive suggestion. It may be that Representative MAHON has not completed his hearings to the extent necessary to have a final judgment on the matter.

I appreciate the fact that the Senator has yielded to me. I do not believe the debate should end without my extending my commendation to the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] for his active leadership in this field. I very much admire his sincere efforts in pursuing his duties as the ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services. Because of my high regard for his judgment and ability in this field, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD at this point what appears to me to be a very constructive summary—and it is very difficult to summarize the subject of our national defense posture—contained in the Senator's newsletter of February 11, entitled "The Defense Debate—Details on Deterrence."

I ask unanimous consent that this summary be inserted in the RECORD at this point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I am sure there is no objection.

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

THE DEFENSE DEBATE—DETAILS ON DETERRENCE

(By Senator LEVERETT SALTONSTALL)

The strategic retaliatory power of the United States is strong enough and will remain strong enough to deter Russia from a nuclear attack.

This is the belief of the President of the United States and his chief military advisers.

But the perpetual debate on the adequacy of U.S. military preparedness has flared up again after relative quiet in the congressional recess. We hear charges that the administration's defense budget and preparedness policies are inadequate. We read about "missile gaps," about "second-class power," "round-the-clock air alerts."

With such a critical subject as the strength of our country in the face of the Communist threat, it is natural that the hue and cry reach a fever pitch—particularly during an election year.

But the important thing for all Americans is to acquaint themselves thoroughly with all the facts, and to reach objective judgments; it's all too easy to be misled by slogans and scare headlines. With this purpose in mind, a brief appraisal of the highlights of the defense debate seems in order.

Through my work as ranking minority member of the Senate Armed Services Committee, and as a result of weekly meetings with the President and some of his advisers, I have tried to keep as close as possible to the situation, and have naturally reached certain conclusions of my own.

One of the most recurrent charges leveled at the Pentagon is that the United States will suffer a missile gap with respect to the Soviets in the near future, specifically in long-range missiles—ICBM's. The crucial time seems to be 1962–63 and the margin most frequently referred to, 3 to 1.

Recently our new Defense Secretary Thomas Gates acknowledged that the Russians may have a moderate numerical superiority in ICBM's at times during the next 3 years.

Gates emphasized, however, that U.S. defense posture is not exclusively dependent on ICBM strength. "U.S. deterrent power is the sum total of a variety of retaliatory and defensive weapons systems," he said.

Long-range missiles are of increasing importance, but it is unwise to overlook our strategic bomber force—clearly the best in the world. The manned bomber is still the most effective means to deliver nuclear weapons in the volume and with the accuracy required. This capability is bolstered by air-to-ground missiles and advanced refueling techniques—here we are well ahead of the Russians.

We must also consider our intermediate-distance missiles now deployed abroad within easy range of the Soviet heartland and our mobile carrier striking forces. Our Polaris missile submarine program is an invaluable addition to our strategic force.

Our "mix" of weapons must be considered as a whole, therefore, in order to accurately assess our defense position. To isolate one segment is illogical and obviously distorted. The important gap in the final analysis would be the deterrent gap, which doesn't exist at present and in the President's judgment, will not exist in the future because of the research, development and operation of new systems.

Recently, the charge was made on the floor of the Senate that the administration had "juggled" intelligence estimates in order to balance the budget, and the implication was made that U.S. intelligence ignored enemy capabilities, considering only enemy intentions. The President refuted these allegations and again forcibly expressed the strong trust he places in the ability and integrity of his chief defense advisers.

I vividly recall criticism of administration policy in 1956 for not accelerating bomber production to meet Soviet capabilities. Yet the Soviets stopped production far short of their capabilities. Today, as planned, we have a clear superiority.

Much publicized was a speech last month by General Power, Chief of the Strategic Air Command, in which he claimed that a surprise attack of 300 Soviet missiles could knock out America's retaliatory power before it got off the ground.

It is important to note that the situation he described was hypothetical. Moreover, Secretary Gates and the Joint Chiefs of Staff believe his estimate unrealistic in relation to present intelligence. They rejected Power's request for an immediate continuous air alert. Ninety million dollars has been requested in the 1961 budget to prepare for a round-the-clock bomber alert if it becomes necessary.

Irresponsible, careless, or partisan criticism does not help the defense posture of the United States. On the other hand, serious examination into our position by qualified men may frequently result in worthy criticism.

I hope, in their consideration of this matter, that the people will seek out facts rather than slogans, appraise the whole rather than

the fragment, and make qualitative rather than merely quantitative examination.

In this way, we will best determine, in the words of the President, how to "provide security in a way that effectively deters aggression and does not itself weaken the values and institutions we seek to defend."

Mr. SYMINGTON. I wish to add that no one in the Senate has more respect and greater affection for the Senator from Massachusetts than I have. There is no greater patriot in this body. I have always regretted that he did not see fit to sign the airpower report, after I held it up in 1956, and did not publish it until after the election. What he signed in January 1958, from the standpoint of being critical of the present effort, namely, Senator JOHNSON's report from the Military Preparedness Subcommittee, was at least as great if not a greater indictment than the report we presented to the Senate in January, 1957. I have been distressed that the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts did not sign the 1957 Airpower Report, although I know whatever he did was and whatever he will do in the future will always be prompted by what he considers to be the highest interest of our country. I might add that it was the only report of any subcommittee of which I have been the chairman, which was not unanimous. However, I fully support any comments which my able friend from New York would like to make concerning the character or integrity of the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I thank the Senator from Missouri. We agreed to disagree on that matter.

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

Mr. SYMINGTON. I am glad to yield.

Mr. ANDERSON. I do not intend to get into figures or circumstances or facts; I simply wish to compliment the able Senator from Missouri, not only for his presentation here today, but for his study and presentation of a strong point of view.

It was my great good fortune to be associated with the able Senator when he was in the administrative part of our Government. I believe he worked as hard on this subject then as he has in succeeding years. I can testify to what I regard to be an extremely sound point of view.

In recent weeks, as I have watched his work on a special investigating committee, I have been constantly impressed with the information which he gathers and the hard work which I know must be entailed in getting it. I compliment him on the fine speech he has just made.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I am deeply grateful for the remarks of one of the ablest men it has been my privilege to know in Government or in private business. I am most grateful for what he has said.

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

Mr. SYMINGTON. I am glad to yield.

Mr. GORE. I have listened to every word of the address and the colloquy since I entered the Chamber at the very initiation of the debate. I compliment the able Senator from Missouri. I know that he has been on his feet for a long time and that he must be weary. I do not wish, therefore, to introduce a new subject into the discussion; but since the distinguished Senator from New Mexico, the able chairman of the Joint Committe on Atomic Energy, is on the floor and is well aware of the subject about which I am to speak, I wish to suggest to the able Senator from Missouri that he has not by any means covered all of the fields of rollback, slowup, and stretchout.

I have heard distinguished scientists express the view that if the United States is ever to possess space with maneuverability and the attributes necessary to produce it to our advantage it may very well come through nuclear-powered rockets.

As the able Senator knows, the committee on which I serve is entitled to the intelligence reports, the same as is the committee on which he serves. There has been a very important and, I think, a very damaging rollback and stretchout, for money reasons, on the project to develop nuclear-powered rockets. I can say the same thing about atomic airplanes, which is especially important in relation to the B-70.

I ask the distinguished Chairman of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy if this is not a correct statement of the facts.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Missouri yield, to permit me to reply?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I am very glad to yield for that purpose.

Mr. ANDERSON. What the Senator from Tennessee has said is absolutely correct. I believe the great promise we have for success in the space age lies in nuclear propulsion. The Senator from Missouri referred to the fact that the Russians have put up one item which had more weight to it and required more thrust than all the satellites we have put up. The one great field in which we can develop thrust is the field of nuclear propulsion. Yet funds for that project have been reduced—and they were released only recently—from $22,800,000 to $18 million. It seems to me that $4 million or $5 million in a project which means so much is a fantastic reduction.

What the Senator from Tennessee has said is completely correct. We are stretching out our program at a time when we ought to be pushing harder, because nuclear propulsion of space vehicles is probably one of the most important fields for space development which we have.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I am glad the Senator from Tennessee and the Senator from New Mexico have brought this question up. I was present when this testimony was presented before the Senate Committee on Appropriations on June 8, 1953.

Since there has been much implied criticism, in recent days and weeks, to the effect that some of us on this side of the aisle were not concerned about increasing our defense strength and modernizing our weapons systems, I should like to read in the RECORD the testimony given by Secretary of Defense Charles E. Wilson before the Senate Appropriations Committee on June 8, 1953:

If we want to go ahead and have pure research, let us let somebody subsidize it. Let us not put the burden of it on the Defense Department. I am not much interested, as a military project, in why potatoes turn brown when they are fried.

Senator MAYBANK. Did they have such a project as that?

Secretary WILSON. That is an apt way to describe it.

Senator MAYBANK. I have to differ with you.

Senator FERGUSON. All right, Mr. Kyes, you had something on this research and development.

Senator HILL. Mr. Wilson, why not give us a real or true illustration, not about potatoes, but something you did not approve of.

Secretary WILSON. We were pushing the atomic airplane. You could consider that was in the area of pure research. We were pushing that too fast, because if everything worked out perfectly like the scientists hoped it would, it still would have been a bum airplane.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, does the Senator have the date of that?

Mr. SYMINGTON. It was on June 8, 1953.

The remark of the Senator from Tennessee is most apt. I refer to his comments about the vital importance of our making ready and, if possible, doing something we have not done in many years—to be first—in this case, to be first in the development of a nuclear-powered airplane.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I yield.

Mr. GORE. Nothing is closer to the heart of the American people than the security of their country. The security of their country is involved. When we fall behind the Russians in rocketry, in missiles, in technological progress, in education, in the real growth of our national economy, this does not involve partisanship; it concerns a policy which affects the security of every American citizen. I congratulate the Senator for his forthrightness. I have listened to his speech with great approbation.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I thank the able Senator from Tennessee, who is one of the most thorough and industrious Members of this body. I deeply appreciate what he has said. There is no Member by whom I would rather be commended in this matter than he.

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

Mr. SYMINGTON. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CLARK. First, I compliment the Senator from Missouri on his temperate, constructive contribution to a vitally important national debate. I congratulate him on his courage for bringing this subject to the floor of the Senate. I congratulate him on refusing to be silenced. I urge him to continue to speak on this important subject in the future as he has in the past.

The Senator may recall that the President held a press conference on Wednes-

day, February 17, during the course of which he was asked a question by Mr. Charles E. Shutt, of Telenews:

Mr. President, two of the many charges that your defense critics have made against you and your administration are that the administration has been complacent in advising the people of the danger we face in world affairs.

I believe that charge to be a correct charge. I wonder if the Senator from Missouri would agree and would care to comment briefly.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, from my father-in-law, the late great Senator James Wadsworth, I tried to learn the importance of avoiding personalities.

Mr. CLARK. I agree entirely with my friend. I want to be as objective as does my friend from Missouri, and I am as interested as is he in avoiding personalities.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I realize that; and the support of the Senator from Pennsylvania on the entire matter of national defense has been one of the most pleasant aspects of my work in the Senate since we have had the good fortune to be here together.

Mr. CLARK. I thank the Senator. I shall repeat the first part of the question which Mr. Shutt asked of the President:

Mr. President, two of the many charges that your defense critics have made against you and your administration are that the administration has been complacent in advising the people of the danger we face in world affairs.

Does the Senator from Missouri not think we have not been adequately advised of the danger we face in world affairs?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I think we have been far too complacent, and that we have not been adequately advised.

Mr. CLARK. I thank the Senator.

Mr. Shutt's other question was:

The other is that economy may stand in the way of developing some weapon or a series of weapons we may need.

I believe economy has stood in the way of the adequate development of missiles and other weapons which we need. I wonder whether my friend from Missouri agrees.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Well, perhaps not so much economy itself as how our economy has been misused by this administration. Today the income of the American people is about $1,400 million a day. The question is simply one of whether we wish to devote more of the resources of the economy to what might be called luxury living; or whether we want to devote more of our resources to giving our children and their children a better chance to survive against an enemy. I hope that reply is germane to the question from the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CLARK. I thank the Senator; but I think he would agree that budgetary considerations appear at least to have had an unfortunate impact on needed development of missiles and weapons.

Mr. SYMINGTON. The able Senator is correct; and the testimony before our committee—without any reservation of any kind—confirms what the Senator has just now said.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Missouri yield further to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ENGLE in the chair). Does the Senator from Missouri yield further to the Senator from Pennsylvania?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I am glad to yield to the Senator.

Mr. CLARK. Because I, too, do not wish to indulge in personalities, I shall not cite, or even comment on, the answer the President gave to that question, other than to state my view that in his answer he set up a strawman, and then proceeded to knock it down, but did not ever reply responsively to the question Mr. Shutt asked him.

Would my friend mind referring now, briefly, to page 10 of his original very able presentation, where he made his recommendations? I should like to ask him a series of very brief questions, to which I am sure his replies can be equally brief, because I do not wish to detain him any longer than seems desirable.

His first recommendation is:

Provide for an adequate airborne alert of SAC bombers.

My question is this: Do we have such an alert now?

Mr. SYMINGTON. We do not.

Mr. CLARK. Second, will it take substantial additional appropriations to get ready for it?

Mr. SYMINGTON. That is correct.

Mr. CLARK. Is it true that no such appropriations have been requested in the pending budget?

Mr. SYMINGTON. That is correct.

Mr. CLARK. The Senator's second recommendation is:

Accelerate the Polaris and ICBM missile programs.

I point out that the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], whom I see on the floor at this time, and Adm. Arleigh Burke and I, and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT], recently had a half-hour television program in which we dealt very largely with the situation respecting the Polaris submarine. I ask the Senator whether my understanding is correct: That today we do not have in commission a single Polaris submarine equipped with Polaris missiles, although it is hoped we shall have in the reasonably near future.

Mr. SYMINGTON. That is correct, and "reasonably near future" could be defined, but we shall not go into that.

Mr. CLARK. Yes, because we do not wish to go into classified material.

Mr. SYMINGTON. That is correct.

Mr. CLARK. Is it not true that presently there are authorized, and in various stages of construction, only nine Polaris submarines?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I do not have the exact figure in mind; but if the Senator from Pennsylvania says that is the number, I am sure he is correct. Thanks to the efforts of the Congress, the figure has been increasing.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Missouri yield for a matter of clarification?

Mr. SYMINGTON. Certainly; I yield.

Mr. JACKSON. There have been authorized, and funds have been made available for, nine Polaris-type submarines, plus long lead items on three additional submarines. That makes a total of 12. Of the 12, Congress added 7 which were not in the budget. In other words, it is nine plus long-time lead items for three.

Mr. CLARK. The Senator is entirely correct. I shall make a somewhat stronger statement than the statement he made—namely, that seven of those Polaris submarines have been forced on a reluctant administration by a Congress which saw the utility of this defense system.

Does the Senator not know that Adm. Arleigh Burke has requested an eventual fleet of 45 Polaris submarines?

Mr. SYMINGTON. If the Senator from Pennsylvania gives that figure, I am sure it is correct.

Mr. CLARK. It is correct. Admiral Burke has said he needs to build six more immediately, but General Twining has indicated his unwillingness to go forward with that program. This has been in the newspapers in recent days

Mr. SYMINGTON. In that connection I should like to read into the RECORD some testimony of the able Senator from Ohio [Mr. YOUNG], who recently was in the chair:

This is from testimony of Admiral Burke on February 8, 1960, before the Preparedness Investigating Subcommittee:

Senator YOUNG of Ohio. I will go further than that. Does the President share your confidence in the Polaris?

Admiral BURKE. I do not know that at all, sir.

Senator YOUNG of Ohio. Apparently the funds provided by Congress were withheld—that is, the funds we provided in 1959 for the Polaris.

Admiral BURKE. Yes, sir.

Senator YOUNG of Ohio. And that was withheld?

Admiral BURKE. Yes, sir.

Senator YOUNG of Ohio. So it does not appear that your confidence is shared, does it? Or would you care to comment on that?

Admiral BURKE. Well, we have had a lot of tests since then.

So long as the Polaris is coming up in this field, however, I wish to point out that I have consistently voted money for the Polaris, and I will vote for more if that is considered right. But today we are presented with a most paradoxical situation. The administration has cut out any further development or any real research on new advanced planes which could very possibly fly many thousands of miles an hour, while at the same time the administration favors putting more money into something that goes considerably less than 100 miles an hour.

Mr. CLARK. The Senator is referring to the B-70 airplane program which has been canceled, is he not?

Mr. SYMINGTON. That is correct.

Mr. CLARK. I ask him to return again briefly to the conclusions set forth toward the end of his formal address. At this point I refer to his third recommendation, namely:

Speed up the ICBM hardening and dispersal programs.

I understand he has stated that at the moment we have only a handful of ICBM missiles, although the amount is secret, but that presently there is not under way any program to remedy that deficiency. Is that correct?

Mr. SYMINGTON. That is true.

Mr. CLARK. The Senator from Missouri said, on that page, that we should speed up the ICBM hardening and dispersal programs. I wonder if my friend would tell me whether there is adequate money provided in the budget to do that.

Mr. SYMINGTON. There is not.

Mr. CLARK. Does the Senator have a rough estimate as to how much should be appropriated for that purpose?

Mr. SYMINGTON. Hardening and dispersal programs call for long leadtime periods. Therefore, with about $2½ billion or $3 billion more than is in the budget, we could do much that is necessary to take care of long leadtime items on the base construction and the other programs I suggested.

Mr. CLARK. I call the Senator's attention to his recommendation that we should increase our antisubmarine warfare capability. Is an adequate amount of money provided in the budget to do a good job in that respect?

Mr. SYMINGTON. No, there is not; and it is necessary that we get an adequate antisubmarine warfare capability, because that is where, at least as much as in any other field, a great danger faces our country today. There is a very large fleet of Russian submarines that has been modernized over a period of years, and it is nearly 10 times as large as the fleet Hitler had when World War II started, and is now being seen in packs reasonably close to the United States.

Mr. CLARK. And possibly in Argentine waters?

Mr. SYMINGTON. Well, that story is one I do not know much about.

Mr. CLARK. I would like to call attention to the fact that on the television program of which I spoke a moment ago Admiral Burke testified that the Russians had over 400 first-class submarines ready and in operation. I wonder if that estimate, which was made on an open program, is in accord with my friend's understanding.

Mr. SYMINGTON. That is correct. We have publicized to the American people for many years the fact that the Russians had over 400 submarines. When some persons asked me why that number had not gone up, I got interested and took the time to find out why. The reason given is that the Russians are modernizing their submarine fleet. In other words, they are constantly adding the latest type of submarine to the fleet and letting older submarines slide out of the inventory. That means the danger is steadily growing.

So much is made about the claims that we have something better than what the Russians have. On the basis of available information we are not sure that there is any basis for such claims with respect to submarines, any more than about any other weapon. It was not so long ago that certain high officials said the matter of rocket thrust capacity was not important because our ICBM's were more accurate. That claim has been exploded by recent Soviet activities.

The Russians have been modernizing their submarine fleet steadily over a period of years; they have modern submarines. When we boast about what we have in the way of submarines, missile systems, and ICBM's the American people are getting a wrong impression about things which we have in such small numbers that they can be counted on the fingers of both hands.

Mr. CLARK. Admiral Burke told us, on that same television program, that, in his judgment, these Russian submarines were equipped with missiles, which they probably would have to surface to fire, but which could be fired for an unstated but substantial distance from the sea to cities on our Atlantic and gulf coasts, and western ports. Is the Senator in accord with that statement?

Mr. SYMINGTON. Yes; but there is more to the subject.

Mr. CLARK. Is it not true that in order to hunt and track down one submarine, a very large portion of the surface Navy must be put in motion, and a good part of the naval air arm has to be concentrated in task forces?

Mr. SYMINGTON. That is correct. I may read from the testimony given by Admiral Burke in recent days. I asked him:

Are you worried about the offensive danger from Russian submarines?

Admiral BURKE. Yes, sir; we are very much worried about it. Any form of air breather or ballistic missile can be fired from their submarines. Years ago they were interested in air breathers. We believe now they are interested in their ballistic missiles in their submarines. We are very much concerned about it.

Senator SYMINGTON. So you are concerned about both, in other words?

Admiral Burke said, "Yes."

The important point I wish to make is that we hear that Russia's submarines are probably oldfashioned and their missiles are probably air breathers, not ballistic weapons. Yet, the No. 1 military expert in the Navy tells us the Navy is very much worried about the ballistic missile capacity of their submarines. As we all know, our ballistic missile operational capability in submarines is nonexistent.

Mr. CLARK. It is zero at the moment, and hopeful for later on. Is that correct?

Mr. SYMINGTON. That is correct.

Mr. CLARK. The next recommendation of the Senator is that we should modernize the equipment and increase the mobility of our Army and Marine Corps. I call attention to the gallant fight the Senator from Missouri made to do just that, with the support of some of us on the floor of the Senate. I ask the Senator from Missouri whether he has any reason to believe that the needs necessary for us to modernize the equipment and increase the mobility of our Army and Marine Corps are being presently taken care of or are requested to be appropriated for in the pending budget?

Mr. SYMINGTON. No. There is nothing like enough money provided for our Army and Marine Corps in our present budget. As I stated earlier today, a great deal of the money appropriated to get the Army in reasonable shape has been impounded by the administration.

Mr. CLARK. Is it not true that a substantial part of the equipment which our Armed Forces overseas now have is of very ancient vintage?

Mr. SYMINGTON. Some of the equipment which our troops in Germany today have is of World War I vintage—not even of World War II vintage.

Mr. CLARK. The Senator has reference to machineguns?

Mr. SYMINGTON. Various weapons and pieces of equipment the Army has.

Mr. CLARK. Is it true, if the Senator can tell me this without violating any secrecy requirements, that in order to get an adequate airlift for our airborne forces in an emergency, it would be necessary, if we were to fly more than one division, and perhaps a few marines, into a danger spot, to mobilize our commercial air fleet, because there is not an adequate militarily controlled airlift for that purpose?

Mr. SYMINGTON. The Senator is correct as to the inadequacy of our airlift. We are lacking in capacity airlift for what has been called a possible limited war. I include as a part of the requirement the supplies essential for keeping our men alive after they have landed. It is the duty of the Government to provide the equipment necessary to keep those men alive, if at all possible. Commercial airliners are not designed for this type of lift. Because of floorloads, space requirements, the necessity for ingress and egress of small tanks and other vehicles, commercial airliners cannot do the job.

The airlift situation—a subject on which the able junior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] is the authority in this body—is very serious from the standpoint of what we should do and be ready for in the future in case we get into the type and character of hostilities that we call limited war.

May I add that there have been about 20 limited wars since World War II. General Taylor testified to 18 last year. There have been two more since that time, at Laos and Tibet. None of those wars have been nuclear wars; they have all been limited wars in which conventional equipment was used. Our capability to handle this type of problem is sadly deficient.

Mr. CLARK. With respect to airlift there is no adequate appropriation requested in the pending budget to make up for the deficiency, is there?

Mr. SYMINGTON. There is not.

Mr. CLARK. On the last page of the Senator's speech my friend made a statement with which I should like to associate myself, as follows:

> If additional taxes are necessary, and after there has been a real effort to get the maximum defense out of each defense dollar, I am certain the American people will support any sacrifice necessary to preserve our Nation and our freedom.

I am in complete accord with that statement, but I want to ask my friend if he does not agree we should promptly take serious measures to attempt to cut down the tax dodgers, to collect some of the $25 billion of unreported taxable income with respect to which the Commissioner of Internal Revenue has spoken, for the benefit of the Federal Treasury?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I do not think there is any question about that. If people are getting away with not paying their taxes, it should be stopped promptly and to the extent possible. This is a critical weakness in the administration of our Government.

Mr. CLARK. The Senator last year on several occasions supported the closing of a number of inequitable tax loopholes, which also would have raised several billion dollars in additional revenue. I am sure the Senator will agree that we should pursue that objective and deplores the fact that the administration does not seem anxious to help us.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I well remember the efforts of the Senator on that score, and I was happy to associate myself with him.

Mr. CLARK. Finally, Mr. President, I thank the Senator for his patience. I commend him for the last sentence in his speech:

> We can attain permanent world peace only if we are able to negotiate from a position of strength, supported by worldwide knowledge that we have that strength.

To paraphrase the words of Winston Churchill, "We arm to parley."

I know the Senator is as strong an advocate of meaningful disarmament and peace as any Member of the Senate. I deplore a little bit the efforts of some to make the Senator from Missouri appear as though interested only in defense and not in disarmament, because I know he shares my grave concern and perhaps my view that disarmament within our lifetimes is one of the most important issues confronting the American people today.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I am very grateful for what my able friend from Pennsylvania has said. We have been together in this fight for some time.

I have put into the RECORD a quotation of Mr. Stanley Baldwin in 1936. I was granted unanimous consent to do so.

The truth of the matter is that the British Empire was almost destroyed because its people would not face up to the importance of keeping their country strong, so that it could negotiate from a position of relative strength instead of a position of relative weakness. As a result, there was Munich. After Munich, there was a disaster.

I repeat, the analogy between the position in the early 1960's of the United States and the position in the late 1930's of the British is so comparable as to be terrifying, with one great exception. There is no one who is behind us, as we were behind the British in the late 1930's. I know the British would have been defeated and their people would have been enslaved if the United States had not come in behind them. That is no criticism of the British, who are a brave and glorious people, but they went so far along the way of the policies of Stanley Baldwin and Neville Chamberlain that when they said, "We must protect ourselves," it was too late.

If Senators will read a book entitled "Central Blue," written by Air Chief Marshal Sir John Schlesser, they will note that he remarked, as he put it, "in white-faced fury," that just a few weeks before the Battle of Britain the Chancellor of the Exchequer, Sir John Simon, was slashing squadron after squadron out of the Royal Air Force, saying to these men in the military, "You men don't realize that Britain's No. 1 line of defense is its economy."

The analogy is all too clear.

Mr. CLARK. In conclusion, I thank the Senator, and I refer with some pride to the fact that as long ago as 1955 the Senator from Missouri was one of the principal cosponsors, if not the sponsor, of a resolution advocating disarmament, which was steered through this body. Is that not correct?

Mr. SYMINGTON. The Senator is correct. That was my resolution. Over half of the Members of the Senate joined to cosponsor it. It was passed unanimously.

What we need in the world more than anything else is a just and lasting peace, and freedom under God. Based on the record—the record of Czechoslovakia, of Rumania, later of Hungary, and even later of Tibet, and other nations—I am not willing to trust my children's future to the good faith of the people who rule the Kremlin and of those who rule in Peiping. If we do not decide as a nation that we are going to summit conferences economically, psychologically, physically, technologically, and spiritually strong, I think we are almost insuring future disaster for the United States of America.

Mr. ERVIN, Mr. CHURCH, and Mr. YARBOROUGH addressed the Chair.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I am glad to yield to my friend from North Carolina, who has been waiting for some time.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I wish to make some statements and then to ask the able and distinguished Senator from Missouri some questions.

During 1956 the Senator from Missouri was the chairman of a subcommittee created by the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services [Mr. RUSSELL] to investigate the sufficiency of the Air Force to perform its mission. I think we can truthfully claim that the subcommittee summoned before it the most competent military and naval experts in America to testify. Is that not correct?

Mr. SYMINGTON. That is correct. I will say that the Senator from North Carolina and the distinguished junior Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON] were the other members of that subcommittee, who signed the final report. It was a great honor to serve with both of them on the subcommittee. The Senator knows fully about what he speaks.

Mr. ERVIN. We attempted, as members of that subcommittee, to make a fair and impartial review of the sufficiency of the Air Force to perform its mission. The Senator from Missouri and the able and distinguished Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON] and myself came to the conclusion, which we thought was absolutely inescapable, that the efforts being put forward to maintain an adequate national defense were absolutely insufficient to insure the safety of the nation; did we not?

Mr. SYMINGTON. The Senator is correct. We had, as the able Senator well knows, witness after witness come before us, each of whom was questioned at length by the members of the subcommittee and the brilliant and able counsel, Mr. Fowler Hamilton, of New York City. We talked with the witnesses before the hearing. If a matter was not clear, we talked with the witnesses after the hearing. We set a record as to what was necessary for the future security of the United States.

We had before us the foremost authority at that time on strategic airpower. The question was asked, "If the policies of this country do not change, how long will it be before our condition may be hopeless?" Gen. Curtis LeMay did not want to answer that question, but he was pressed, and he finally said, "Well, I would say in about 3 years."

That was 3½ years ago. Since then our relative strength—which is the important word vis-a-vis the Communists—has gone downward instead of upward.

Mr. ERVIN. Does the Senator from Missouri recollect, as I do, that on a number of occasions military and naval experts expressed an opinion, in substance, that unless our efforts in national defense were stepped up that by 1959 or 1960, or even earlier, we would be overtaken by the Russians in many respects and passed by them in some respects?

Mr. SYMINGTON. The Senator is entirely correct.

Mr. ERVIN. As a result of my service on that subcommittee I am familiar with the attitude of the able and distinguished Senator from Missouri in that connection, which I wish was known to all the people of America. If the people knew what I know, they would realize the great fight the Senator has been making, to try to see to it that we are given an adequate national defense, comes from his devotion to his country and not from any partisanship.

I remember that when we heard this testimony and agreed upon the report of the subcommittee, in which it was pointed out what would be the inevitable result of failure to make sufficient efforts to get an adequate national defense, the Senator from Missouri suggested, in private conversation with the able and distinguished Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON] and myself, that we wanted the work of the subcommittee to be of some value in stirring up the administration and the people of America to strive for an adequate national defense, and for that reason the report ought not to be filed until after the then pending election of 1956. The Senator from Missouri was the one who advanced that idea originally, and insisted to the Senator from Washington and myself that we should adopt that policy. As a result we postponed filing the report of the subcommittee in order that we might not be charged with attempting to obtain supposedly partisan advantage by reason of it, and in the hope that it would be received in the same manner in which it had been made, as a dispassionate and impartial appraisal of the state of our Air Force at that time and its probable future state unless efforts to strengthen it were stepped up.

As a result of that suggestion of the able and distinguished Senator from Missouri the majority of the subcommittee postponed filing the report until after the election was over. In view of that fact, it seems rather strange to me to hear charges that the Senator from Missouri is actuated by any partisan motives in seeing that we have an adequate national defense.

I wish all the people of America could have had the opportunity to learn what I knew about the Senator's attitude at that time, when he insisted that we should postpone the filing of that report until after the election, in order that it might be considered in a dispassionate manner by the administration and by the people. But unfortunately for the present state of security of the American people, when that report was filed it was dismissed as being a mere expression of opinion of a bunch of pessimistic partisans. If that report had been heeded by the administration, as it should have been heeded, we would be in a far more secure position in the world today.

I think the Senator from Missouri has rendered and is rendering a distinguished contribution to the American people in insisting that the national defense be made adequate. I am convinced, by reason of my service with him on that subcommittee and the opportunities I had to observe his attitude, that his zeal in this cause arises out of the devotion which he entertains for his Nation.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I am most grateful to my able friend the senior Senator from North Carolina. He and the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON] and I spent many days, many weeks, and many months in the effort to present this story to the American people.

I disagree with only one thing the Senator said. I am sure that all three of us together decided that we should withhold the report until after the election, so that no politics would be involved in it.

Let me add, as I mentioned on the floor earlier today, that, thanks to the work of the Senator from Washington, the Senator from North Carolina, and the great counsel of the committee, that report is a "bible" as to what was needed for our security.

Nevertheless, for reasons best known to themselves, those who are now crying politics about the defense issue refused to sign the report and dismiss it, as the able and scholarly Senator from North Carolina has said, as a political document. I can only say that if a fraction of what we had recommended had been done, as a result of the hearings, when the report came out 3 years ago, we would not need to have this discussion on the floor of the Senate today.

Mr. ERVIN. I thank the Senator for yielding. I agree with the Senator from Missouri that the Senator from Washington and I concurred in the postponement, but the suggestion for the postponement, so as to avoid any implications of bipartisanship, was made by the able and distinguished Senator from Missouri.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I am very grateful to my friend. If there was any "sale" involved, it was a very "soft sell."

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

Mr. SYMINGTON. I yield to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I wish to express my appreciation to the able and distinguished Senator from Missouri for his service to the American people in alerting them to the grave danger confronting the country.

The people of the United States are very fortunate in having in the Senate a Member who has served in the executive branch of the Government, in the Defense Department, and who is conversant with these problems from the executive standpoint as well as from the legislative point of view.

I was grateful also to note the presence in the Chamber of the distinguished Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], chairman of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, who listened and expressed his approval of the great message of the distinguished Senator from Missouri. Like the distinguished Senator from Missouri, the distinguished Senator from New Mexico has also been a Cabinet officer, and has had executive experience in matters of grave concern to the Nation.

Referring to the statement of the distinguished Senator from Missouri, I preface my question with these three sentences from his statement:

> The executive branch has the right to classify and declassify information incident to our defenses. However, it does not have the right to give information in secret to the Congress which shows the missile gap is widening in favor of the Soviets—and at the same time inform the public that the gap is narrowing.

That is what was done this year; and that is one of the primary reasons for the present confusion.

I desire to ask the distinguished Senator from Missouri whether or not, when the administration issued a public statement within the past 10 days critical of the military personnel testifying before the Senate Military Preparedness Subcommittee, such criticism implied a threat to those military officers who appeared and testified before the Senate committee investigating these matters.

Mr. SYMINGTON. It would seem so to me.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Is not such an implied threat to the military personnel who testify before the legislative branch of the Government, a coordinate branch with the executive branch of the Government, with its power of promotion, a dissservice to the country?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I would say that it certainly would be, inasmuch as these are able men under oath. If they as experts do not give us their opinion, it is a very unfortunate situation indeed.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Again I wish to thank the distinguished Senator from Missouri for the service he is rendering to the American people.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I am very grateful to my friend from Texas. It is a privilege to serve with him. He is one of the most able Members of the Senate. I thank him for what he has said.

Before yielding the floor I wish to thank my able colleague from Indiana, who planned to talk before I took the floor. I appreciate his patience and courtesy. I had no idea that there would be this interest shown in the subject I discussed. If I have in any way inconvenienced him, I hope to have the opportunity to make it up to him.

Mr. HARTKE. I wish to say to the distinguished Senator from Missouri that not alone has he been of great service to the country, but I believe what he has said has been a very enlightening discussion. He has brought facts to the American people, and I think the people are entitled to those facts, and not to the emotional appeals for complacency and sleepiness in this time, when many people are going full tilt as fast as they can go.

I congratulate the Senator on his fine statement and the excellent way in which he has answered the various questions that were put to him.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I am grateful to the Senator from Indiana. I yield the floor.

USE OF SO-CALLED HAIFA CLAUSE BY NAVY MILITARY SEA TRANSPORTATION SERVICE

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, this morning the newspapers announced "Navy Ends Clause Tied to Arab Ban."

This involves the use by the Navy's Military Sea Transportation Service of the so-called Haifa clause, which barred any vessel which had stopped at an Israeli port from being utilized in the MSTS.

Admiral Gano, who is the distinguished commander of the MSTS, was in

to see me this morning, and brought me a memorandum which I ask unanimous consent to have made a part of my remarks, and which terminated the use of this clause.

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

USE OF THE SO-CALLED HAIFA CLAUSE BY THE NAVY'S MILITARY SEA TRANSPORTATION SERVICE—MEMORANDUM FOR SENATOR JAVITS

1. Issue: Recently in newspaper editorials and news comments and in correspondence addressed to the White House, to the Secretary of Defense, to the Secretary of the Navy and to Members of Congress, there has been a condemnation of the use by the Military Sea Transportation Service (MSTS) of what is known as the Haifa clause. Bills have been introduced in Congress to prohibit its use in Government contracts. Critical comments range from the accusation that the clause constitutes a boycott by the Government of ships that have traded with Israel to the allegation that the Government, by its use of the clause, is recognizing officially the Arab boycott or is supinely accommodating itself to such a boycott.

2. The Haifa clause: The standard clause used in MSTS contracts for tankers calling at Persian Gulf ports is:

"(a) In event the vessel is prevented from loading or discharging in any port by the local authorities because of the vessel having previously traded with Israel, the charterer shall have the option:

"(1) To cancel the charter as of the date loading is refused or after discharge at another port.

"(2) To require the substitution of another vessel of similar size, class, condition of tanks or cargo holds, and in a similar position.

"(3) To nominate other loading or discharging port or ports.

"Expenses incurred by the charterer in exercising an option shall be for the account of the owner."

3. Background: This clause has been used in appropriate MSTS charters since the spring of 1958. It was adopted only after considerable discussion within MSTS and with the tanker industry and after rejection of several suggested alternatives. The immediate spur to the institution of its use was the *National Peace* incident in December 1957. The *National Peace* had been chartered by MSTS to carry Navy special fuel oil from Ras Tanura, Saudi Arabia, to Manila. Port officials at Ras Tanura discovered that the vessel had previously, under the name of SS *Memory*, traded with Israel; they refused to permit the vessel to load. After some time, when it became quite obvious that the vessel would not be able to perform her contract, MSTS was forced to cancel and charter another vessel to fulfill this operational requirement. The vessel owners claimed damages from MSTS in the amount of $160,000 and, upon disallowance of this claim, sued in the Federal courts. This suit is pending.

4. What the clause does: By law, with or without the clause, a voyage charterer may cancel the contract in a situation wherein the owner is unable to present his ship ready and able to perform the voyage for which he contracted. For that reason, inability on the part of a ship to enter the specified port and load the cargo due to a boycott (just or unjust) works great financial hardship on the shipowner. It also results in financial loss to the cargo owner, who must continue to store and care for the cargo and position another ship. Where vital military cargo such as aviation fuel is concerned, a substantial delay in delivery also presents serious problems in the maintenance of the defense posture. The clause used by MSTS is not considered by shipowners as any more severe than a charter without the clause. However, it puts shipowners on notice that ships that have traded with Israel may not be permitted by certain countries to come into their ports. It spells out the options that the Government may pursue in such a situation. It is thus of some assistance to the Government in preventing offerings of ships that would be unable to load important cargoes of petroleum products. It is of help to those shipowners who might unknowingly undertake a service they cannot perform.

5. What the clause does not do: Contrary to the various expressions of public concern, the clause does not:

(a) Preclude any vessel owner from bidding on a Government charter. Any owner of a vessel that has traded with Israel and who is prepared to take the calculated risk may offer his ship.

(b) Assist any boycott in any manner. The test of this statement is simple: Elimination of the clause would not change by one iota the posture of the boycott or the status of any vessel offered to MSTS. Its elimination would not enable any vessel to get into any port otherwise barred to it. Its elimination would not enable any vessel to perform that could not otherwise perform.

(c) Require a vessel owner to choose between serving Arab countries or Israel. (Such an allegation has been made.) The clause does not forbid trading with Israel. It cautions owners who have previously made a choice to trade with Israel of the risk of Arab boycott.

6. The clause was adopted with no intention to give support to any political boycott. It was deemed advantageous to both the Government and shipowners. However, MSTS can accomplish its mission without using the clause. Inasmuch as it has been mistakenly construed as providing some solace to the Arab boycott imposed on persons trading with Israel, the Navy will discontinue its use.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I should like to invite the attention of Senators to the concluding paragraph of the statement:

The clause was adopted with no intention to give support to any political boycott. It was deemed advantageous to both the Government and shipowners. However, MSTS can accomplish its mission without using the clause. Inasmuch as it has been mistakenly construed as providing some solace to the Arab boycott imposed on persons trading with Israel, the Navy will discontinue its use.

Mr. President, I hail the Navy for this decision. I think it is in the fine American tradition. I am delighted that this has been done. I point out again that the admiral informs me that by the mere way in which bidding is called for, the Navy can completely protect itself without the use of this clause, which does give implications with respect to the Arab boycott, to which the Navy should not be subject.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks an article on this subject from today's issue of the New York Times.

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

NAVY ENDS CLAUSE TIED TO ARAB BAN—DROPS OIL CARGO CONTRACTS PROVISO HELD TO SUPPORT THE BOYCOTT OF ISRAEL

(By Jack Raymond)

WASHINGTON, February 18.—The Navy is withdrawing from its oil-cargo shipping contracts a protested clause that seemed to support the Arab boycott of Israel.

The clause has been part of a standard contract of the Military Sea Transportation Service. It warns of certain U.S. "options" should the Arabs refuse to accommodate vessels that previously did business with Israel.

In effect, the clause—known as the Haifa clause in shipping circles—seemed to foreclose any Navy oil cargo shipping contract to U.S. shippers engaged in business with Israel.

A number of protests followed publication of a report January 21 that the Navy had been using the contract for nearly 2 years.

STATEMENT FOR CONGRESS

In a statement prepared for delivery to Congress tomorrow, the Navy takes note of the protests, explains the background of the form of contract, and stresses that it did not intend to aid the Arab boycott.

The statement concludes as follows:

"The clause was adopted with no intention to give support to any political boycott. It was deemed advantageous to both the Government and shipowners. However, Military Sea Transportation Service can accomplish its mission without using the clause.

"Inasmuch as it has been mistakenly construed as providing some solace to the Arab boycott imposed on persons trading with Israel, the Navy will discontinue its use."

Vice Adm. Roy A. Gano, commander of the Navy's Military Sea Transportation Service, is scheduled to deliver the memorandum tomorrow to several Senators and Representatives who have made inquiries regarding the use of the Haifa clause.

The standard clause to which exception has been taken, reads as follows:

"A. In event the vessel is prevented from loading or discharging in any port by the local authorities because of the vessel having previously traded with Israel, the charterer shall have the option—

"(1) To cancel the charter as of the date loading is refused or after discharge at another port.

"(2) To require the substitution of another vessel of similar size, class, condition of tanks or cargo holds, and in a similar position.

"(3) To nominate other loading or discharging port or ports.

"Expenses incurred by the charterer in exercising an option shall be for the account of the owner."

The Navy statement notes that this clause was adopted in the spring of 1958 after "considerable discussion" between Navy officials and the tanker industry and "after the rejection of several suggested alternatives."

According to the explanation, the inclusion of the clause was prompted by the refusal of port officials at Ras Tanura, Saudi Arabia, to permit the loading of a vessel, the *National Peace*, en route to Manila. The *National Peace* had previously, under the name SS *Memory*, traded with Israel.

When it appeared that the vessel would not be able to fulfill the contract, the Navy canceled it and chartered another ship. The vessel's owners claimed damages of $160,000. When the Navy refused to pay, the owners sued in the Federal courts. The suit is pending.

The Navy contends in its statement that the Haifa clause has served a useful purpose for the Government "in preventing offerings of ships that it would be unable to load important cargoes of petroleum products."

The memorandum insists that the clause does not "assist any boycott in any manner."

"The test of this statement is simple: elimination of the clause would not change by one iota the posture of the boycott or the status of any vessel offered to MSTS," it declares. "Its elimination would not enable any vessel to get into any port otherwise

barred to it. Its elimination would not enable any vessel to perform that could not otherwise perform."

Senator CLIFFORD P. CASE, Republican, of New Jersey, commented:

"As one who protested against the Navy Department's discriminatory policy in its oil shipping contracts, I warmly applaud the Navy's decision today to discontinue the use of its cancellation clause in future contracts.

"I hope the public protests which greeted revelation of this now discontinued practice will serve as notice to other Government agencies. The American public does not believe a U.S. Government agency should knuckle under to any form of international blackmail."

LEASING OF PORTION OF FORT CROWDER, MO.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 8315) to authorize the Secretary of the Army to lease a portion of Fort Crowder, Mo., to Stella Reorganized Schools R-I, Missouri.

Mr. HARTKE obtained the floor.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Indiana yield to me for a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ENGLE in the chair). Will the Senator from Indiana yield to the Senator from Massachusetts?

Mr. HARTKE. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Previously I had asked the Senator from Indiana to yield to me for a few minutes to make a statement. I understand that he has an engagement which will require him to make his remarks and then yield the floor to keep his engagement. Therefore I shall not try to make my statement at this time, but will make it just as soon as I have an opportunity to do so.

Mr. HARTKE. I thank my distinguished friend from Massachusetts for indulging me.

Mr. President, much is being said these days about "rights." We hear about civil rights, States rights, voting rights.

In the final analysis, when the oratory is finished and the votes tabulated here, the Senate will be asked to legislate human rights. The overriding issue in this entire controversy is whether or not it is an American right—a human right—for every man to have a voice in his government.

We are taught in school in "the American's Creed" that the powers of our country are justly derived from the governed. To suppose that our powers are derived from only certain classes of citizens and to suppose that all other classes of citizens have no such rights is foreign to the idea of democracy.

Our envoys to the peace tables of the world, among the various defense organizations to which we belong, at the United Nations, everywhere that we represent the prevailing view of free men in a world divided between freedom and tyranny, preach the rights of men—among them the right to vote. Our noblest documents—the Constitution, the Declaration of Independence, the U.N. Charter, among others—declare the inalienable rights of all men.

Yet we would be less than honest if we did not agree now that all Americans do not have all of the rights and privileges of citizenship which we have long ago agreed truly belong to all citizens.

I wonder what would be the position of the Members of the Senate if we proposed, for instance, that all Negroes be denied the right to vote or hold office or live in houses with decent plumbing. What would be our position if it were proposed that all Catholics be denied the right to vote or hold certain offices? What if we were faced with a bill to deny Jews certain privileges and rights? Or if we were to vote on whether to deny certain rights and privileges to persons of German ancestry? To any class or religion or color or to those of any national origin?

How, then, can we in good conscience sit idly by and allow certain classes of Americans to be denied these same rights? To ignore the state of voting rights and other rights of American citizens is almost as though this body were to pass a bill denying Negroes their rights in certain parts of the country.

In 1957 Congress passed the first civil rights bill since 1875. This bill created a Commission on Civil Rights empowered to investigate, study, appraise, and make findings and recommendations. The recommendations of this Commission are among the many suggestions we are considering. There are many sincere and dedicated men in this Senate who will take exception to these recommendations. But the clear, cold facts assembled by this Commission cannot be refuted.

Some of the findings indict localities, some indict States, some indict sections of the country. The findings are not pretty. They tell a sordid story of bigotry and personal prejudice.

They show that there is discrimination in voting, in housing, in education, in employment. They show northern discrimination, eastern discrimination, western discrimination, and southern discrimination. They show that Mexicans, Indians, orientals, Jews, Puerto Ricans, and Negroes all feel the lash of discrimination in various ways and to various degrees.

America has, indeed, a long way to go to become what it avows it is—the land of liberty, one Nation indivisible with liberty and justice for all.

But this is largely because America is populated by mortal men. We mortals have prejudices, blind prejudices. Some of us are prejudiced because of fear, some by history, some by habit.

Thus, the problems of whom we want as our neighbors, what church we attend, those with whom we associate, indeed, those with whom we would have our sons and daughters marry, all these are our personal problems and some of us will apply to them blind prejudice and some will not. This does not make it right. But it also may not mean that the solution lies in some government intervention.

On the other hand, government must take a stand for what it espouses. When Adolf Hitler came to power in Germany, he struck at political thinking first. Then he struck at Jews, and, to some extent, Catholics. Discrimination was first officially winked at, later encouraged, and finally made the law of the land.

So it is with Soviet Russia and other Communist countries. Party membership is exclusive. The right to vote is limited to these members. Civil liberties are largely unknown. Outright bans are enforced against certain churches.

These, too, began from a less annoying, less widespread condoning by government of the abridgment of liberty. Today they are government sponsored. The yoke of oppression applied by the Soviets, in particular, to residents of satellite countries is well known.

Thus the story of tyranny is written.

The difference between the Germany of the 1930's and 1940's and the West Germany of 1960 is that today the desecrations of synagogues and other acts of destruction and vandalism are not alone simply not tolerated by government, they are condemned and the perpetrators are punished.

So must we act to see that those who desecrate and plunder and bomb are punished. But this is not enough. We also must not by inaction allow discrimination to continue spreading poison among our citizens and denying to so many thousands the blessings which belong to all Americans. We must, through education and by law when necessary, insure first-class citizenship for all Americans. Nothing less will satisfy me. For, as I said at the outset, human rights which are supposedly insured for all Americans must be insured for all Americans, by law if need be. We have no more precious rights in this country.

In no area of this problem is the need more desperate and more deserving than in the field of voting. In no area of this problem is the role of the Federal Government more clear cut.

Yet, here we are in the year 1960, nearly 100 years after the Civil War, nearly a century after the Emancipation Proclamation, debating whether all Americans should be allowed to vote. It is a blot upon our entire Nation.

In one State the voting-age population is 20.5 percent nonwhite. Yet, 11.4 percent of the registered voters are nonwhite. In another State, only 9.1 percent of those registered are nonwhite, while 20.1 percent of the voting-age population is nonwhite. Figures for a third State show only 12.5 percent of the registered are nonwhite compared to 28.6 percent nonwhite among voting-age persons. A fourth State shows 13.8 percent nonwhite among registrants and 30.3 percent nonwhite persons of voting age. Other States are as bad or worse. In one State, unofficial figures show fewer than 4 percent of the nonwhite population registered while nonwhite comprise 41 percent of the voting-age population.

The Civil Rights Commission has said that apathy, lack of education, and uncoerced hesitancy do not account for all this. In the South 16 counties which, according to the last census, had a ma-

jority of nonwhites in their population, had absolutely no nonwhites eligible to vote. Forty-nine other counties with Negro population majorities had fewer than 5 percent Negro registrants.

Sworn statements of threats and coercions, even among war veterans who theoretically fought for the right to vote in this country and elsewhere, are contained in the Commission's report. We have all read also of registrars quitting rather than to allow a Negro to register.

It is clear that in the field of voting discrimination is practiced. This discrimination in the field of voting is chiefly in the South and is chiefly directed against Negroes. Denying the right to vote to anyone because of his race, for instance, violates the Federal Constitution insofar as it denies the individual the right to vote for U.S. Representatives and Senators. This fact is grounded in several decisions of the Supreme Court, dating back, I might add, for several generations.

Generations ago we were exposed to those who would deny residence, jobs, and the right to worship and vote to certain religious groups. In earlier days Catholics, Quakers, and Jews were denied the right to vote and hold office in whole States. We have eliminated the barriers to voting and the holding of office against these groups of Americans because such barriers were wrong and because democratic government could do no less. Today the theory of universal suffrage continues to be challenged. Today we can do no less for the disfranchised racial elements of America as we have previously done for the disfranchised religious elements.

The Reverend Father Theodore M. Hesburgh, president of the University of Notre Dame, in my own State of Indiana, and a distinguished and able member of the Civil Rights Commission, has written an eloquent and moving statement on human rights. I would like to quote excerpts from Father Hesburgh:

> As I read American history, the unfolding story of our Nation centers about the often agonizing attempt to achieve the fullness of human dignity through the ever-widening application of that equality of opportunity which has best characterized America in the family of nations. Deep and often dark emotions have been aroused by the discussion of integration and segregation, but anyone who really understands the majesty of the American dream cannot fail to see in our history that equality of opportunity for all men has been our most valid response to the inherent and God-given dignity of every human person.

Father Hesburgh continued to say that human dignity in America will grow and America will become richer for it when all Americans have equal opportunity to be educated to the full extent of their talents, equal opportunity to work to the fullness of their ability and wishes, equal opportunity to live in decent housing and wholesome neighborhoods, and "equal opportunity to participate in the body politic through free and universal exercise of the franchise."

He pointed out that there is no section of this land where all of these opportunities apply to all Americans. In some areas, none exists for nonwhite Americans.

Deprive any white man of these four opportunities, and he will fail. Yet, those who would deprive a nonwhite of these basic opportunities often do so under the guise that the white is basically superior to the nonwhite.

No American can escape participation in the struggle for basic human rights. We who are in Congress are in the forefront of this struggle.

Some of our colleagues will argue that we must pass a bill in order that the world will know that we are ready to implement our democracy. This is important.

But I feel that we must do it, not alone to demonstrate democracy to the world, but more important to dedicate it to ourselves. We must be honest with ourselves.

As Shakespeare wrote:

> To thine own self be true. Thou canst not then be false to any man.

If the American dream is to be a reality, we must proclaim for ourselves as well as the rest of the world that we believe in democracy. This faith must be nailed down by law which insures that no chicanery, subterfuge, threats, coercion, or intimidation will keep us from practicing the principle of universal sufferage.

From this cornerstone we will build an even greater America. From this cornerstone we will go on, and eventually solve the problems of the other three basic equalities.

Federal law and policy must lead the way so that States, cities, counties, towns, and individual Americans will be guided by the basic principles of freedom and equality which we here propound and insure for all Americans.

Laws and policies, indeed, do not solve all problems. We surely cannot legislate tolerance, intelligence, compassion, and understanding. But, by so defining in clear terms the goals and standards of the greatest democracy in the world, Federal law and policies will show the way to all Americans, and thereby to the entire world.

I hope that when the debate has subsided and the votes taken, we will have pointed the way to equality of opportunity, to fulfillment of the American dream and to first-class citizenship for all Americans. I hope we will have upheld human rights and human dignity, for ourselves as well as those among us who still feel this lash of discrimination.

THE STATUS OF OUR NATIONAL DEFENSE

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. 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. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I wish to make a brief statement on the subject of the discussion led earlier by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON].

Mr. President, I would not want the discussion this morning to be concluded without my making a very brief statement. This is not the occasion to make a long statement of our Nation's overall defensive strength today.

What all of us want is to have sufficient defensive strength so that no nation will dare to attack us.

All the witnesses who appeared before our committee, both those in uniform and the civilian leaders of the various services, including the Secretary of Defense and the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, said the United States is stronger today than any other nation, so that no other nation would dare to attack us. What we want to do is to maintain that strength now and in the years to come.

Certainly there is no intention on the part of the President of the United States or any of the officials in the Pentagon to mislead the citizens or Members of Congress as to the military strength we have or as to the military strength we should have in the future. Certainly, there is no intent, as the President of the United States has said with great emphasis, to put budget balancing above the national security.

Most of the debate today related to the number of missiles we have and the development of missiles.

Today our strength is based on a mix of weapons—using that term in its broad sense. We have a very strong superiority of B–52 long-range bombers. As was brought out in the debate today, one B–52 can carry greater destructive power than that of all the bombs the allies dropped during the Second World War. Today the B–52 can carry several times the destructive power than an ICBM can carry. Today we are receiving our first operational Hound Dog air-to-ground missiles, which, attached to the B–52, can be launched many miles away from the target.

Then we have our various missiles that are building up. Today, we have a few Atlas ICBM's in operation at Vandenberg Air Force Base, Calif. We are building other Atlas ICBM bases.

We have the Titan ICBM coming along; and we hope within 2 or 3 years to have the Minuteman ICBM, which uses a solid fuel, which makes it a much more advanced missile, designed for launching from mobile bases.

So today we have that superiority of B–52's; we have both IRBM and ICBM missiles operational; and we have further advanced missiles developing.

But we have something else; we have the aircraft carriers—a number of them. We are told that there are some 275 planes that can be based on aircraft carriers. These attack aircraft are capable of delivering a strategic load over a distance of over 1,000 miles. So that

is an additional part of our "mix" of weapons systems—the aircraft carriers, which move around the seas as mobile bases.

In addition, we have the Polaris submarine—one of our latest and most formidable weapons. We shall have at least one, and possibly two, in inventory with missiles in 1960. Last year and the year before we authorized the building of nine Polaris submarines and long leadtime items for three more. In the 1961 budget there are requested funds to build Polaris submarines Nos. 10, 11, and 12, and funds for long leadtime items for three more.

These Polaris submarines have nuclear power and great mobility and the ability to let go an IRBM from under water. So that is another part of our "mix" of our weapons systems—the Navy and the Air Force.

Today an argument was made about the power of thrust. If I correctly understand the situation, the Russians undoubtedly have more thrust than we have; in other words, they can put a bigger payload up into space. But what we want to do is put into the end of a missile a payload with sufficient destructive power, so that if it were used, it would cause so much damage that any persons who might wish to start anything against us will be deterred. The important thing is a sufficient playload to do the job, so that no country will want to attack us.

There have been references to an airborne alert. Today we have a ground alert, as was brought out in the debate. Moreover, today we have in the budget appropriations for an on-the-shelf or standby airborne alert. Are they enough? If they are not, the President, under the present defense appropriations law for 1960 and under the 1961 budget, if we adopt similar provisions, has the authority, under section 612 (a) and (b), to establish an airborne alert and to spend whatever money is necessary to develop and maintain it, even though it has not been appropriated for in advance. This is similar to provisions of the general statutes that permit the Army, the Air Force, and the Navy to purchase food and other items for subsistence—whatever they need—even though the money is not in the budget, and have the President later request the money from Congress.

So the President can establish an airborne alert, according to his discretion. Congress can require an airborne alert in the budget, but Congress cannot require the President or the Department of Defense to spend that money unless he so desires. Today he does have that power, discretionary authority, under the law anyway.

General Power—whom I respect, and who quite rightly, as the head of the Strategic Air Command of the Air Force, must look at the situation from the viewpoint of his own responsibility—says we need a continuous airborne alert, and that, without such an alert, with 300 missiles the Russians or any other nation could theoretically destroy our SAC bases within a very few minutes.

Let me put the matter in the form of a question: Is it theoretically possible or is it practically realistic for us to believe that today any nation has sufficient missile bases so it can throw 300 ballistic missiles on the United States in less than 30 minutes, without our getting some warning?

What General Power says may be theoretically possible in the future. What General Power says is not, in my opinion, practically a problem which we have to face at the moment.

Congress has the budget before it. We had a long and interesting debate today. I did not agree with a great deal that was said in the course of that debate. But Congress still has the budget before it; and the budget is being considered by the House committee and by the Senate committee, which are holding hearings on the amounts of the budget which shall be made available to the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force.

We certainly should go into these questions with the greatest care.

I should like to leave this thought with the Senate: Today everyone—either in uniform or out of it—says we are the strongest nation in the world. Today we have this mix of weapons that gives us such great strength. We want to build on that strength in the next 3 years, so we shall continue our superiority the next year and the year after.

There may be some differences of opinion; but certainly the President of the United States, the Secretary of Defense, and all the officials in the Pentagon will do their utmost to see that we have that strength and that we are developing it for the years to come; and certainly there is no intention on the part of anyone to mislead any Member of Congress or to mislead the people, our constituents.

I hope that, in thinking over the long debate which took place earlier today and in thinking of the problem of missiles, which we debated at length then, we will remember our tremendous strength through the mix of weapons and the conscientious effort of those in responsible positions today who see to it that we maintain that strength and that effort in the days to come.

I wish to leave that thought with the Senate as my contribution to the debate on our defense.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I wish to express my commendation to the Senator from Massachusetts for the attitude and the fairness he has shown today, and which he has consistently shown.

I also wish to commend the distinguished junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] for the fairness and frankness with which he discussed his position on the question of our defenses at the present time.

I noticed that on at least three occasions the Senator from Massachusetts said there is no dispute as to our strength at the moment or for this year. I would point out that the Senator from Missouri agrees with the Senator from Massachusetts; and I express the hope that following the debate had today in the Senate—which I think has been quite comprehensive, and has been carried on on a very high plane, and with mutual respect to both sides—on the coming Sunday the President will make a contribution to this subject, so that the confusion and the fog which have shrouded this question in this body, in the administration, in the Defense Establishment, and among the people of the country, will to the greatest possible extent be cleared away—because, as I said last Monday, if anything happens to us, we shall not be asked whether we are Democrats or Republicans; all of us will be in that situation together.

So I thank the Senator from Massachusetts, as well as the Senator from Missouri, for making this fine contribution to the subject.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I thank the Senator. Like him, I will listen to the speech of the President at 6 o'clock Sunday evening.

ORDER FOR RECESS UNTIL 12 O'CLOCK NOON ON MONDAY, NOTICE OF POSSIBLE EVENING SESSIONS NEXT WEEK, AND NOTICE OF SATURDAY SESSION NEXT WEEK

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I announce for the information of the Senate that we do not plan to hold a session of the Senate tomorrow, Saturday. No notice has been given that there would be a session, and many Senators have made other plans. Those who do not expect to be out of town have had a rather long week, and expect to be occupied in their offices tomorrow. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its deliberations today, it stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon on Monday.

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, it is customary that Washington's Farewell Address be read on his birthday, and I announce that the distinguished Senator from Utah [Mr. MOSS] will read the address on Monday, February 22.

Following the reading of the Farewell Address, we will return to the discussion of the pending business.

I should like all Senators to be on notice that we may have evening sessions next week, including rollcalls, and that we expect to have a Saturday session next week.

LEASING OF PORTION OF FORT CROWDER, MO.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 8315) to authorize the Secretary of the Army to lease a portion of Fort Crowder, Mo., to Stella Reorganized Schools R-I, Missouri.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. I have been in Congress 27 years. The Senate now is proceeding in irresponsible disorder such as I have never seen before.

The objective of this disorderly procedure is to enact a so-called civil rights

law vitally affecting the lives of millions of people by legislative rider.

This would bypass all committee deliberation in the Senate, and probably limit House of Representatives consideration to a conference report.

As a Senate committee chairman, I know such procedure produces bad legislation. The Senate leadership, on both sides, has taken this position repeatedly in the past, except for civil rights.

As usual with so-called civil rights legislation, deliberate effort again has been made to avoid longstanding rules of the Senate for orderly consideration of legislation.

Scores of bills and amendments are being hurled from all directions. Two Senators from a single State have introduced nearly 50 proposals.

No so-called civil rights bill has been reported by any Senate committee. We do not have the benefit of committee explanation, section-by-section analysis, or minority views.

Parliamentary chaos is to be expected. If it is not designed by proponents of so-called civil rights legislation, it reflects on the character of the Senate just the same.

There is no reason to wonder why this procedure has been adopted. Its purpose is, in confusion, to enact punitive, vindictive, and unconstitutional legislation.

I shall confine this discussion to one batch of these bills which have now been pulled together under one cover and called the program sponsored by the administration.

It is formally referred to as amendment 2-15-60—B to H.R. 8315. And H.R. 8315 is an innocent little bill, allowing the Army to lease a building to be used as a schoolhouse.

This proposed amendment would call upon Congress to—

First. Recognize Supreme Court decisions as amendments to the Constitution.

Second. Amend the Constitution by statute.

Third. Make resistance by State and local officials, and the public generally, to Federal court school orders a felony punishable by both imprisonment and fine.

Fourth. Appropriate funds for use in attempts to bribe State and local officials to accept the Warren Court school decision.

Fifth. Open records of State and local election officials to "representatives" of a politically appointed Federal attorney general. These so-called representatives need not be employees of the Justice Department, nor, for that matter, of the Federal Government. They may be also representatives of the NAACP.

Sixth. Authorize Federal agents to determine who is qualified to vote in any local, State, or Federal election, and police the polling places and the counting of the votes. And,

Seventh. Push further toward general enforcement of the old FEPC proposals that a Federal agency should control hiring and firing employees in private business.

There is reason to suspect that the provisions of this amendment were drafted in the Department of Justice, by direction of the Attorney General.

I appeal to Members of the Senate to read carefully section 201 of the amendment. It begins on line 5 of the first page and runs through line 24 on page 2.

It would add a new section to the United States Criminal Code. It would create a new Federal crime to fit those who oppose Federal court orders in local school cases.

Now those who resist Federal court school orders may be found in contempt of the court, but, convicted in Federal court under this amendment, they would be felons.

Legalistic quibbling over such words as "corruptly," "willfully," "endeavors," and so forth, appearing in the section is useless. This is a political amendment.

For this reason my discussion goes to practical application and effect. The practical application and effect of this section 201 is to prohibit any opposition to Federal court orders in local school cases.

It would make no difference whether the court order says who will or who will not be admitted to any school. Neither could court-approved desegregation plans be opposed.

To oppose any of these things would be punishable by 2 years' imprisonment and $10,000 fine. But it would be all right for NAACP to oppose an order disapproving a local plan.

The Senate may wish to note the language in this section 201 is "any" school. This could include private and church schools, colleges, universities, and so forth.

It is notable also that "no injunctive or other civil relief against the conduct made criminal by this section shall be denied on the ground that such conduct is a crime."

Discussing this section on Tuesday of this week, the very able Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN], said:

> For the first time in American history, so far as I am able to determine, this section makes resistance to a Federal court desegregation decree a crime.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. I yield to the Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. ERVIN. Does the Senator from Virginia feel, as I do, that it is absolutely unnecessary to make offenses of this character Federal crimes, because they are already punishable by contempt of court proceedings?

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. I certainly agree with the Senator.

Mr. ERVIN. Does the Senator not also agree that if acts of violence are resorted to, such acts constitute assault and battery under State law and are punished as State crimes, and that if this bill were enacted into law, insofar as use of violence or threatened use of violence was concerned, it would mean a person could be punishable three times, namely, as a criminal for a State offense, as a person guilty of contempt of a Federal court, and as a criminal for a Federal offense for what essentially would be the same act?

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. I believe the Senator from North Carolina is correct. Let me say I think the Senator from North Carolina made one of the most masterly and able addresses I have ever heard in my long experience in the U.S. Senate on this subject.

To continue to quote the Senator from North Carolina:

> It is not necessary to make the impeding of a Federal court decree a crime. An act of that character is already punishable as a contempt of court.
>
> But if it were wise to make resistance to a decree of a Federal court a crime—for the first time in history—the law to that effect should be directed at resistance to all decrees of Federal courts.
>
> If it is iniquitous to resist one type of decree of Federal courts, it is iniquitous to resist all types of decree of Federal courts.

I shall now move on to the next section of this administration amendment, but I expect to have more to say about section 201 at a later date.

Section 202 of the administration amendment would amend the code to punish flight to avoid prosecution for unlawful destruction of educational or religious structures.

I know of no one who condones criminal destruction by fire or explosion of religious or educational structures, or, for that matter, any other kind of structures.

Attention of the Senate is invited to the provisions of this section 202, lines 1 through 24 on page 3 of the amendment. Two innovations should be noted.

Venue, for cases covered by the section, could be in one of three places—where the act was committed, where the offender is in custody, or where he might be caught.

The section creates another new Federal crime, and makes the penalties for fleeing greater than the penalties for the actual destruction of the property.

This amendment carries two separated sections for Federal interference with education. I have treated one. The other will come later. Likewise, it has two separated sections on Federal interference with elections.

The first of these sections on elections is section 203. It begins with line 1 on page 4 and runs through line 8 on page 6. It is contended that this section is limited to elections for Federal officers.

It is frequently difficult, however, to separate records and papers relating to elections for Federal officers and those for State and local officers.

This section 203 would require the preservation of and the opening of local and State Federal election papers for the inspection, copying, and the use of the Federal Attorney General and his "representatives."

Preservation of these records and papers is required in the language of line 2 on page 4, and opening them to the Federal Attorney General and his agents is provided between line 24, page 4, and line 23, page 5.

Lines 24 on page 4 through line 4, page 5, say the Federal Attorney General or his "representative" may have access to these papers and records upon demand in writing.

Lines 13 and 14 on page 5 indicate the Attorney General's "representatives" would not have to be employees of the Department of Justice. And there is nothing to prevent them from representing NAACP, also.

There would be no requirement for identification, or proof of need. The Attorney General or his representative would simply write his demand for the records and papers, and give it to the local or State official and he must comply.

Section 203 would require all State and local election papers and records to be preserved for 3 years for use by these people. If this were not done, election officials would be subject to punishment under Federal law.

If anyone—local or State election official, or anyone else—destroys, mutilates, or alters any of these local and State records and papers he, too, is guilty of a Federal offense.

On demand, the Attorney General or his representative could require local and State election officials to bring their records and papers to the office of the U.S. district attorney for Federal use.

The Federal district court could compel compliance with these demands by a politically appointed Attorney General or his political representatives simply by the issuance of a court order.

Once the Attorney General or his representatives gets these papers and records, section 203, lines 11 through 18 on page 5, says they may use them in performance of official duties.

But the section does not say what official duties are, except to include use of them in any case or proceeding before any court or grand jury. It does not even say the official duties of a representative must be Federal in nature.

An NAACP representative of the Attorney General might find numerous official duties where such records and papers could be for remarkable purposes. The Attorney General might disclose the entire contents in his annual report.

Let me remind the Senate that section 201, which I have already discussed briefly, would make it a Federal crime and a felony for local and State officials in the public generally to resist Federal court school orders.

Section 204, beginning on line 9, page 6, and running through line 18, page 13, would require Congress to recognize Supreme Court decisions as amendments to the Constitution and amend the Constitution by statute.

And in addition it would authorize appropriation of funds for use in attempts to bribe State and local officials to accept the Warren Court decision with payments to school districts where schools are segregated.

The section is opened on line 9, page 6, with the words "The Congress recognizes that," and this is followed on lines 16, 17, and 18 of the same page with the language "the Constitution as interpreted by the Supreme Court of the United States is the supreme law of the land."

Compare this statement with the language of article VI of the Constitution itself which says:

> This Constitution, and the laws of the United States which shall be made in pursuance thereof; and all treaties made, or which shall be made, under the authority of the United States, shall be the supreme law of the land.

There is not a word in the Constitution that can be interpreted to say that a decision by the Warren Court in one case should be a part of the supreme law of the land.

Therefore, any effort to say that such a decision should be recognized as such would in itself be in violation of explicit language written by the Founding Fathers into our fundamental doctrine.

But section 204 goes still further. In lines 18–21, page 6, it says State and local governments which relied on previous Supreme Court decisions are now obligated to conform with a different decision.

There is not a word in the Constitution on the subject of education, but section 204, line 25 on page 6 through line 2 on page 7, would amend the Constitution to say States and localities have "constitutional obligations" with respect to education.

Webster defines the word "bribe" as "a price, reward, gift, or favor bestowed or promised with a view to pervert the judgment or corrupt the conduct of a person in a position of trust."

Section 204 of the amendment, beginning on line 6, page 7 and running to the end of the page would authorize Federal payments to local and State agencies which seek to conform with the Warren decision, local ordinances and customs, and State laws and constitutions to the contrary.

None of the money to be paid to States and localities under this section could be used for school construction or directly for purposes of instruction. It would be used primarily to defray technical and social work costs incident to desegregation of schools.

It could be used for supervisory or administrative services, pupil placement, social workers, visiting teacher services, and special nonteaching professional services.

These Federal payments would be made to school districts, localities, and States who were not conforming with the Warren Court school decision in 1953–54.

School districts, localities, and States conforming to the Warren Court idea of how local public schools should be run at that time would be unable to qualify for Federal payments under this section.

Lines 1 through 15 on page 8 of the amendment would establish the basis for these Federal allotments of funds to be paid to State and local agencies, and local school boards, qualifying under the section to accept the Federal bribes for desegregation.

The allotment would be determined on the basis of the number of students attending segregated schools in 1953–54 as compared to those attending such schools throughout the Nation.

These numbers would be determined by the Federal Commissioner of Education on the basis of the best average daily attendance data available to him.

This allotment plan, as Senators may see, is burdened with highly complex and confusing provisions. But with a Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare such as Arthur Flemming, and a Federal Commissioner of Education who would be subordinate to him, the manner in which the allotments would be administered is not difficult to foresee.

Section 204 on page 8, lines 16 through 25 and page 9, lines 1 through 7, provides that if a State has a desegregation plan which meets the approval of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare and his Education Commissioner, payments may be made to it.

But if a State does not have a desegregation plan which meets the approval of Federal officials, but local agencies, including the school board do have a plan that Federal officials will approve, the State may be bypassed, and the money given to local agencies under provisions in lines 1 through 19 on page 11 of the amendment.

In either case if the HEW Secretary and the Education Commissioner decide they do not like the way the plans are being administered the allotment payments may be withdrawn.

This withdrawal authority is set forth in lines 6 through 25, page 10 of the amendment, and lines 16 through 19 on page 11.

The Health, Education, and Welfare Secretary, through his Commissioner, would prescribe the criteria and procedures for making approval and withdrawal in a manner which he thinks is best calculated to bring about desegregation by regulation.

The proponents of this amendment obviously think local and State school officials can be "bought" over to desegregation with a quick flash of the dollar sign. Lines 9 and 10 on page 13 read:

> No appropriation may be made pursuant to subsection (b) for any fiscal year ending after June 30, 1961.

Section 205, line 19, page 13, through line 15, page 17, amends existing law with respect to public education for children residing on Federal property, and children of members of the armed services and other Federal employees attending public schools in impacted areas where Federal funds have been made available for construction of school facilities.

This section provides that when schools serving these areas are closed for any purpose by State or local government, the Commissioner may take over public school facilities on which Federal expenditures have been made, taking into account such equity as the State or locality may have in such facilities.

Section 206 of the amendment, running from line 16 on page 17 through line 22 on page 19 creates another Federal commission to push further toward general enforcement of the old FEPC proposals for Federal control over hiring and firing of employees in private business.

This new Commission will be called the Commission on Equal Job Opportunity Under Government Contracts. But the Senate should not be misled by this title.

The Commission's activities actually would not be limited to Federal contract provisions controlling employment practice of contractors doing business with the Federal Government.

I quote lines 5 through 14 on page 19 of the amendment:

> The Commission shall also encourage, by the development and distribution of pertinent information and by other appropriate means, the furtherance of educational programs by employer, labor, civic, educational, religious, and other nongovernmental groups in order to eliminate discrimination in employment.
>
> The Commission is authorized to establish and maintain cooperative relationships with agencies of State and local governments, as well as with nongovernmental bodies, to assist in achieving the purposes of this section.

In general, the bill would further Federal control of employment practices of Government contractors, and promote extension of FEPC activities by providing for continuing pressure in this field.

The amendment proposes that the policy of the United States shall be to eliminate "discrimination" because of race, creed, color, or national origin in the employment of persons by Government contractors and establishes a commission of 15 members for this purpose.

Lines 1 through 3 on page 18 contemplates that at least some members of the Commission may be employees of the Federal Government. These may include the Attorney General, the Assistant Attorney General in charge of the Civil Rights Division, Department of Justice, and so forth.

There is no prohibition against chairmen and other officers of national political parties serving on the Commission. In all probability a representative of the NAACP would be included.

Members of the Commission are to be appointed by the President, and according to the language in lines 20 through 23 on page 17 of the amendment advice and consent of the Senate would not be required.

Such a Commission, dealing directly, in the interest of FEPC, with Federal contractors, and empowered to go abroad into State and local governments in private organizations, would make annual reports to the President.

On the basis of experience with at least two previous Commissions on Civil Rights, and with the additional White House Committee on the same subject, there is reason to believe the primary purpose of the Commission is to keep the pressure on for FEPC and provide material for campaign issues in elections of the future.

This new Commission would be authorized throughout its life to make such investigations, studies, and surveys, and hold such hearings, as it may deem necessary to accomplish the purpose of the amendment. There would be no limit as to time or place with respect to such hearings.

And the President may, in his discretion, require all Government agencies contracting for goods and services to cooperate with the Commission in the accomplishment of its purposes.

The Commission would be empowered, in its discretion, to employ whomever it desired in the performance of its duties and the exercise of its broad powers.

The amendment fixes no limit on the amount of money to be appropriated for the staff or the operation of the Commission.

Now we come to section 207 of the administration's amendment. This section starts with line 23, page 19, and runs to the end of amendment "2-15-60—B," proposed in connection with H.R. 8315.

This amendment deals with voting in any and all elections—local, State, and Federal—and the qualifications of suffrage. Nothing could be more clear than the Constitution on this subject. Article I, section 2, at the very beginning of the basic law of this Nation, provides:

> The House of Representatives (and the Senate under the 17th amendment) shall be composed of Members chosen every second year by the people of the several States (every sixth year for Senators), and the electors in each State shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislature.

This amendment would authorize Federal agents to determine whether citizens of the States are qualified to vote for State and local officers as well as for Federal positions.

I submit that when Federal agents determine the qualifications of voters in State and local elections as well as Federal elections, police the polling places, and the counting of the votes, we have Khrushchev-type "free elections."

A vindictive Federal Government tried to police congressional elections in the Reconstruction era under the "force bills." The result was political scandal of the lowest order in the North and the Ku Klux Klan in the South.

The so-called Civil Rights Act of 1957 established a so-called Civil Rights Commission, and it recently recommended that the Federal Government should again interfere with conditions for suffrage, limited to elections for Federal office.

There is no doubt about the source of the proposal embodied in section 207. It came directly from the politically appointed Attorney General, who was well trained in the Herbert Brownell school.

The President was asked his views on this proposal. He replied that the Attorney General thought he had an alternative to improve procedures within the framework of existing law, but it was "somewhat technical"—a "legalistic amendment" difficult for him to describe in detail.

And what would the Attorney General's "technical," "legalistic amendment" do? He told the Senate Rules Committee what it would do when he testified recently.

In violation of the first fundamental in the Constitution, it would authorize federally appointed agents who might be goons, to act as czars, at least under certain conditions, over both Federal and State elections.

Analyze the proposal, as the Attorney General outlined it. Read lines 5 through 21 on page 20 of the amendment, and what you find may surprise even the proponents of this provision.

The Attorney General himself could institute so-called voting rights cases whenever, and wherever he may choose to go find someone to enter into the arrangements with him.

Federal district courts would appoint voting referees, and the proposal would fix no standards or qualifications to be met by these so-called referees. But they would determine the qualifications of others to vote in any election.

And when these so-called referees say a person is qualified to vote in any election, the law notwithstanding, their word is final, even binding on the court which, on their say-so, would be required to enter the decree.

But this is not all. Read lines 21 through 25 on page 21 and lines 1 through 7 on page 22.

The same Federal district court would be authorized to appoint these same so-called referees, or others, to be at the polling place in any election to police the voting and the counting of the votes.

Now read the sentence beginning on line 25, page 20, and on through line 13 on page 21. In effect it says the Attorney General would proceed in the name of the Federal Government against any election official who does not cooperate with this apparatus even in violation of State election laws.

The proposal not only avoids qualifying standards to be met by these henchmen; it prescribes no standards for their decisions. They may be hoodlums, and their decisions may be unreasonable and illegal, if they are not clearly erroneous.

Please keep in mind I am speaking about practical application and effects of this political amendment. I ask Senators to read again lines 12 through 21 on page 20 of the amendment.

Mark well this fact: The Attorney General would not limit the authority of these so-called referees to prevention of racial discrimination. Under his proposal they could determine who, in any or all respects, are qualified to vote.

It should be understood that the Attorney General would have all of this done in the name of the Federal judiciary. Federal district judges would be forced to set up the situations, condone referee actions, and enforce them.

Look at what will face Federal district judges under the proposal by the Attorney General, as he has personally outlined it to a committee of the Senate. It is too much to expect the Federal judiciary will protect us from the political intent of this bill.

I quote directly from the Honorable A. S. Harrison, attorney general of Virginia. After examining the Federal Attorney General's proposal, Mr. Harrison says:

> The legislation proposed by the Attorney General of the United States is subject to constitutional objection on two readily apparent grounds.

Initially * * * the proposal authorizes the voting referees to ascertain whether or not certain persons are qualified to vote in any election without prescribing any standards by which this decision is to be made.

Determination of qualified electors is thus left to the unfettered discretion of voting referees.

It should require no particularized citation of judicial authority to demonstrate that the exercise of legal rights may not be exposed, by so vague and indefinite legislation as this, to curtailment or denial at the whim or caprice of individual public officers.

Secondly, and far more fundamentally, the proposed amendment—to the extent that it authorizes voting referees to determine who are qualified to vote in both State and Federal elections—clearly exceeds the powers vested in Congress by the Constitution of the United States and infringes the rights simultaneously secured to the States by that instrument.

I emphasize the Virginia attorney general's interpretation of authority Mr. Rogers would give the so-called referees over all aspects of voting qualifications. Mr. Harrison says further:

It is apparent at a glance that the present bill is not limited to the prevention of racial discrimination in the enjoyment of the elective franchise condemned by the 15th amendment.

The authority of the voting referees envisioned by this legislation is not circumscribed to determining the narrow question of whether or not a citizen's right to vote has been denied or abridged by a State on account of race, color, or previous condition of servitude.

On the contrary, the bill in question authorizes voting referees to investigate the qualifications of electors, to determine—by some unknown standard—which citizens are qualified to vote and to certify to the court the names of all persons deemed by the referee to be so qualified.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the statement of the attorney general be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

STATEMENT BY ATTORNEY GENERAL A. S. HARRISON, JR., OF VIRGINIA, TO THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON RULES AND ADMINISTRATION, FEBRUARY 5, 1960

On January 26, 1960, the Attorney General of the United States made public the text of a bill prepared by the Department of Justice to deal with alleged racial discrimination in both Federal and State elections. Technically, the bill in question would amend the Civil Rights Act of 1957 by adding a new subsection to 42 U.S.C.A. 1971, as amended. Essentially, the proposed amendment would authorize Federal district courts, acting in voting rights cases instituted by the Attorney General under the provisions of 42 U.S.C.A. 1971(c), to appoint voting referees to determine whether or not certain persons making application to them are qualified to vote in any election and to certify as such all persons found by the referees to be so qualified.

The report of a voting referee, unless clearly erroneous, would be binding upon the court, which would then be required to issue a supplementary decree specifying that the persons named therein are entitled to vote. In addition, the court is empowered to direct the voting referees, or such other person or persons as it may appoint, to attend any election at which a person named in the court's decree is entitled to vote, and report to the court whether any such person has been denied the right to vote or to have his vote properly counted. Certified copies of the court's original decree and any supplementary decrees would be transmitted by the Attorney General to the appropriate election officials of the State; and any officer who, with notice of such decree, refuses to permit any person named therein to vote at any election covered thereby, or to have the vote of any such person properly counted, may be proceeded against for contempt.

The legislation proposed by the Attorney General is subject to constitutional objection on two readily apparent grounds. Initially, it should be noted that the bill in question authorizes the voting referees to ascertain whether or not certain persons are qualified to vote at any election, without prescribing any standards by which this decision is to be made. Determination of qualified electors is thus left to the unfettered discretion of the voting referees. It should require no particularized citation of judicial authority to demonstrate that the exercise of legal rights may not be exposed, by so vague and indefinite legislation as this, to curtailment or denial at the whim or caprice of individual public officers.

Secondly, and far more fundamentally, the proposed amendment—to the extent that it authorizes voting referees to determine who are qualified to vote in both State and Federal elections—clearly exceeds the powers vested in Congress by the Constitution of the United States and infringes the rights simultaneously secured to the States by that instrument. The right to prescribe the qualifications of electors and to determine, in light of such qualifications, which of its citizens is entitled to vote in State elections, is one resting exclusively within the province of the individual States. In this connection, the Supreme Court of the United States has declared that a State is free to conduct its elections and limit its electorate as it may deem wise, except as its action may be affected by the prohibitions of the Federal Constitution or in conflict with powers delegated to and exercised by the National Government, and that the power of Congress to legislate at all upon the subject of voting in State elections rests upon the 15th amendment and extends only to the prevention by appropriate legislation of the discrimination forbidden by that amendment (*Smith* v. *Allwright*, 321 U.S. 649; *United States* v. *Reese*, 92 U.S. 214).

It is apparent at a glance that the present bill is not limited to the prevention of racial discrimination in the enjoyment of the elective franchise condemned by the 15th amendment. The authority of the voting referees envisioned by the instant legislation is not circumscribed to determining the narrow question of whether or not a citizen's right to vote has been denied or abridged by a State on account of race, color, or previous condition of servitude. On the contrary, the bill in question authorizes voting referees to investigate the qualifications of electors, to determine—by some unknown standard—which citizens are qualified to vote and to certify to the court the names of all persons deemed by the referee to be so qualified. Manifestly, the proposed amendment infringes the right of the individual States to determine who may vote in State elections and exceeds the power vested in Congress to enforce the prohibition of the 15th amendment by appropriate legislation. Indeed, eminent judicial authority may be marshaled to support the views that an attempt to vest in Congress such broad power over the conduct of State elections, even by means of an amendment to the U.S. Constitution, would merit instant condemnation. On this precise point, no less a constitutional authority than Judge Robert G. Story has observed:

"If a clause were introduced in the national Constitution to regulate the State election of members of the State legislature it would be deemed a most unwarrantable transfer of power, indicating a premeditated design to destroy the State government. It would be so flagrant a violation of principle as to require no comment. It would be said, and justly, that the State governments ought to possess the power of self-existence and self-organization, independent of the pleasure of the National Government."

Contemporaneously with his release of the proposed bill, the Attorney General of the United States issued a statement in which he declared:

"Our bill would not fragmentize the election process. It would leave the election procedures in the States where they have always been. At the same time, it would operate within established judicial procedures to prevent discrimination in all elections, as the Constitution of the United States intends."

A mere reading of its provisions discloses beyond cavil that the proposed bill would have an effect diametrically opposite to that claimed for it by the Attorney General. If enacted and made operative, this bill would "fragmentize the election process" by establishing separate agencies to pass upon the qualification of electors and fractionate the electorate into two distinct classes; one class embracing those found qualified to vote by State officials applying State-established criteria governing qualifications for voting, and the other class comprising those found qualified to vote by court-appointed voting referees administering criteria—established by no one—and known only to the voting referee, if known at all. The invidious result of a scheme which establishes such a dichotomy in the electorate is not difficult to imagine. In his speech in the House of Representatives on January 26, 1890, the Honorable Henry St. George Tucker, Representative from Virginia, commenting upon the then pending bill to amend and supplement the election laws of the United States, denounced its divisive effects in the following language:

"I object to another provision of the bill, Mr. Speaker. I do not believe in the supervision feature, as a matter of expediency, looking to the true interests of our State and Federal systems. I think the only logical position for Congress to take in regard to the elections of Representatives, if the time ever comes when under the Constitution it can take charge of the elections, is this: Either to give it absolutely into the hands of the States or absolutely into the hands of the Federal Government. Do not have any mixture of the two. It is, and will be, a source of serious trouble, dispute, and clashing of interests, as well as clashing of authority, if Congress assumes control of a part of the machinery and the States take charge of another portion of it."

Aside from its illegality and its necessarily divisive consequences, the historically demonstrable inutility of the present bill is alone sufficient to deprive it of any fundamental merit. A canvass of the legislative history upon the subject of congressional elections discloses that, with the exception of some 24 of the 171 years since the National Government was founded, the policy has been to leave the regulation of such elections almost entirely to the States, whose representatives Congressmen are. For more than 50 years after the National Government was organized, no congressional action whatever was taken until, in 1842, a law was enacted requiring representatives to be elected by districts, thus attempting to eliminate the practice which then prevailed in some States of electing on a single ticket all of the Members of Congress to which the State was entitled. Twenty-four years more elapsed before further action upon this subject was taken, when Congress provided for the time and method

of electing U.S. Senators. In 1870, for the first time, a comprehensive system for dealing with congressional elections was enacted by laws which remained in force until their repeal in 1894.

These laws provided extensive regulations for the conduct of congressional elections. They made unlawful false registration, bribery, voting without legal right, making false returns of votes cast, interfering in any manner with officers of election, and the neglect by any such officer of any duty required of him by State or Federal law; they provided for appointment by circuit judges of the United States of persons to attend at places of registration and at elections, with authority to challenge any person proposing to register or vote unlawfully, to witness the counting of votes, and to identify by their signatures the registration of voters and election tally sheets; and they made it lawful for the marshals of the United States to appoint special deputies to preserve order at such elections, with authority to arrest for any breach of the peace committed in their view.

In *United States* v. *Gradwell* (243 U.S. 476), the Supreme Court of the United States, commenting upon the history of the regulation of congressional elections and the experience gained thereby, pointed out:

"It will be seen from * * * these enactments that Congress by them committed to Federal officers a very full participation in the process of the election of Congressmen, from the registration of voters to the final certifying of the results, and that the control thus established over such elections was comprehensive and complete. It is a matter of general as of legal history that Congress, after 24 years of experience, returned to its former attitude toward such elections, and repealed all of these laws with the exception of a few sections not relevant here.

"The policy of thus intrusting the conduct of elections to State laws, administered by State officers, which has prevailed from the foundation of the Government to our day, with the exception, as we have seen, of 24 years, was proposed by the makers of the Constitution, and was entered upon advisedly by the people who adopted it, as clearly appears from the reply of Madison to Monroe, in the debates in the Virginia convention, saying that:

"It was found impossible to fix the time, place, and manner of election of Representatives in the Constitution. It was found necessary to leave the regulation of these, in the first place, to the State governments as being best acquainted with the situation of the people, subject to the control of the General Government, in order to enable it to produce uniformity and prevent its own dissolution. * * * Were they exclusively under the control of the State governments, the General Government might easily be dissolved. But if they be regulated properly by the State legislatures the congressional control will probably never be exercised. The power appears to me satisfactory, and as unlikely to be abused as any part of the Constitution."

The striking similarity between the principal features of the pending bill and those of the election laws of the United States in force between the years 1870 and 1894 indisputably stamp the proposed legislation as the modern day progeny of the same thinking which fostered the ill-advised attempt on the part of Congress to purify congressional elections by entrusting their regulation to officials appointed by Federal courts. In light of the deplorable results engendered by former congressional legislation in this field, it is unimaginable that any present day legislative proposal could possibly trace its lineage to a more inauspicious origin. In 1893, reporting on the reprehensible conditions prevailing under the Federal election laws which had then been in force for almost a quarter of a century, the Select Committee of the House of Representatives To Inquire Into the Supervision and Administration of Election Laws by Officers of the United States in the City, County, and State of New York advised the House of Representatives (H. Rept. No. 2365, 52d Cong., 2d sess.):

"It is assumed by the committee that the administration and results of such laws would nowhere appear more clearly or in a better light than in the city of New York.

"It is believed that in the largest city in the country, where every class of our voting population is fully represented and where the respective parties have for years made their principal headquarters at important elections, and under the constant publicity given by the best organized and most effective newspaper press of the world, the actual workings of these laws and their good or evil results can be more clearly seen and appreciated and more intelligently judged than is possible anywhere else.

"Your committee, after a very careful study of the operations of the Federal election laws before election and on election day in the city of New York, are of the opinion that all of these laws have entirely failed to produce any good results in the direction of the purity of elections or the protection of the ballot box, and have been productive of such serious and dangerous results that they ought at once to be repealed.

"The reasons for our recommendation for the repeal of these laws, based on our study of their operation and results in New York, may be classed under four heads. They ought to be repealed—

"First. Because they result in no conviction of offenders, and are therefore useless to prevent or punish crime.

"Second. Because they cause great expense and are fruitful of constant and continuing frauds upon the Treasury.

"Third. Because they are designed to be used and are used only as part of the machinery of a party to compensate voters who are friendly to it, and to frighten from the polls the voters of the opposing party.

"Fourth. Because under and by virtue of these laws the gravest interference with the personal rights and liberty of citizens occur, and voters are punished by arrest and imprisonment for their political opinions.

This report of the select committee served to bear out with a vengeance the unequivocal prediction made on June 26, 1890, by the Honorable Henry St. George Tucker in his speech in opposition to the then pending bill to amend the Federal election laws:

"In conclusion, let me say, gentlemen, that while this bill in my opinion is unconstitutional, and Congress has no power to pass it, that the provisions of it are hideous, and that they ought not to be entertained by this House or this Congress; that even if it passes it will never accomplish the purpose 'whereunto it is sent.' You may rely upon that. As was said in the discussion here today, if there be fraud and corruption in the country the only way to correct them is by an enlightened public sentiment which will frown them down, so that a man who deals in fraud, bribery, or corruption will not be countenanced in the community."

This forceful statement by the Representative from Virginia upon the proper as well as the improper method of controlling abuses in the conduct of elections was echoed by President Coolidge in language which reflects a philosophy of government fundamentally at variance with that of the sponsor of the pending bill:

"It is too much to assume that because an abuse exists it is the business of the National Government to provide a remedy. The presumption should be that it is the business of local and State governments. Such national action results in encroaching upon the salutary independence of the States and by undertaking to supersede their natural authority fills the land with bureaus and departments which are undertaking to do what it is impossible for them to accomplish, and bring our whole system of government into disrespect and disfavor.

"The Nation is inclined to disregard altogether too much both the functions and the duties of the State. They are much more than subdivisions of the Federal Government. They are also endowed with sovereignty in their own right."

In addition to the objections which may be lodged against the bill in question upon the grounds of illegality and inutility, a canvass of existing law clearly reveals that the proposed amendment is altogether unnecessary. Title 42 U.S.C.A., 1971(a) derived from the Civil Rights Act of 1870, declares that all citizens otherwise qualified to vote in any election shall be allowed to vote in such elections without regard to race, color, or previous condition of servitude. The Civil Rights Act of 1957 amended this section of the United States Code by adding provisions which declare that no person shall intimidate, threaten, or coerce another for the purpose of interfering with his right to vote in any election in which a Federal officer is to be selected; authorizes the Attorney General of the United States to institute proper proceedings for preventive relief whenever any person has deprived or is about to deprive another of rights secured by section 1971; vests jurisdiction of such proceedings in Federal district courts without requiring an aggrieved party to exhaust State administrative or judicial remedies, and establishes contempt proceedings which provide for the rights of individuals cited for contempt of an order issued in an action instituted under the statute in question.

The existence of these laws lends abundant support to the dissent registered by the Honorable John S. Battle, a former Governor of Virginia, and a former member of the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, to the Commission's proposal for the Presidential appointment of temporary registrars. This dissent is couched in language which is equally applicable to the pending proposal of the attorney general:

"I concur in the proposition that all properly qualified American citizens should have the right to vote but I believe the present laws are sufficient to protect that right and I disagree with the proposal for the appointment of a Federal registrar which would place in the hands of the Federal Government a vital part of the election process so jealously guarded and carefully reserved to the States by the Founding Fathers."

Illegal, useless and unnecessary the pending proposal, if enacted cannot but be productive of incalculable mischief. History has demonstrated in conclusive fashion the detrimental effects upon Federal-State relationships which legislation of this character must produce, without any countervailing benefits to the electoral process. Fewer public interests have a higher claim upon the informed discretion of Congress than the avoidance of needless friction between the Federal and State governments, and a scrupulous regard for the rightful independence of State governments and the smooth working of our federated system should at all times actuate the National Legislature.

An obvious characteristic of the bill in question is its palpable direction at the Southern States, and an even more insidious, but no less inevitable, consequence of its passage will be its reprehensible appeal to long dormant regional animosities. Enactment of the bill proposed by the attorney general will herald the return of those flagrant abuses of the electoral process which obtained during the period in which congressional elections were conducted under Federal supervision, extend the reach of such abuses to State elections, subvert the independence of State governments by encroaching upon rights reserved to them by

the Constitution, disrupt harmonious relationships between the Federal and State governments, resurrect the spectre of sectional hatred, and impede rather than facilitate a constructive solution to the problem sought to be redressed.

I know of no statement more suited to the pending proposal than that uttered by Senator William E. Borah, of Idaho, speaking in the Senate on January 7, 1938, in opposition to a measure similar in nature. With reference to the Southern States, the Senator from Idaho declared:

"These States are not to be pilloried and condemned without a full presentation of the nature of the task which fate and circumstances imposed upon them, and not without a complete record as to the weight and difficulty of the task, what has been done, and with what good faith it has been met. I shall contend that the Southern people have met the race problem and dealt with it with greater patience, greater tolerance, greater intelligence, and greater success than any people in recorded history, dealing with a problem of similar nature."

The situation which the proposed amendment seeks to remedy was in the process of progressive and constructive solution in a spirit of mutual goodwill and in promotion of amity and concord between the two races. The course which this legislation will shape and direct will destroy much of the salutary gain already made and accentuate and stimulate the gravity and difficulty of a solution in the days ahead.

For the reasons stated, I oppose passage of the legislation recommended by the attorney general and renew the eloquent appeal made under similar circumstances by the Honorable Henry St. George Tucker to the House of Representatives in 1890:

"I only ask that this House will do no act that will disturb the harmony * * * of the State and the Federal governments, that beautiful system which, when kept in its perfect symmetry, is the admiration of the world, but when jostled or gotten out of gear will work destruction to the people for whose welfare it was intended."

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, it must be obvious to all, but those motivated by extreme bias, that the Attorney General's proposal infringes the right of States to determine who may vote in State elections and exceeds any constitutional power given the Federal Government.

The so-called referees provisions in this amendment are only one set of proposals which have been made in the name of the administration.

Another set was recommended by the Commission on Civil Rights established in the 1957 act. Former Governor Battle of Virginia was a member of that Commission until he could no longer take its attitudes and recommendations.

The Commission proposed a Federal registrar type of control over Federal elections as they are conducted in States and localities. Governor Battle appeared before the Senate Rules Committee in opposition to the Commission's proposals.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD the statement of the Honorable John S. Battle and the colloquy before the Committee on Rules and Administration.

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

Mr. BATTLE. To also express to Senator BYRD and Senator ROBERTSON, if I may, my appreciation of their overly kindly remarks.

Now, Mr. Chairman, and gentlemen of the committee, I had the privilege of serving as a member of the Commission on Civil Rights established by act of the Congress of September 9, 1957.

The Commission, in its report to the President and the Congress, recommended, among other things, that the President be authorized to appoint Federal registrars of elections under the conditions and with the powers therein outlined, and I understand that bills have been introduced and are now before this committee designed to carry out this recommendation of the Commission on Civil Rights.

I disagreed with my colleagues in this recommendation and your chairman has graciously invited me to appear and give you my reasons for my disagreement.

I am not a constitutional lawyer and do not have any peculiar knowledge of this subject but do have very deep convictions relative to it.

The recommendations of the Commission and the bills which are before the committee designed to carry out those recommendations may be summarized as follows:

When a citizen of the United States believes he has been deprived of the right to register and vote because of his race, religion, color, or national origin, he may file with the President a petition setting out those facts and request the appointment of a Federal registrar for his registration district. When, within the time specified in the bills, the President receives nine or more petitions from individuals who reside in the same registration district, he shall refer the petitions to the Commission on Civil Rights. The Commission shall investigate matters set forth in such petition "and if the Commission determines that any individual who files such petition is, solely because of his race, religion, color, or national origin, being deprived the right to register as a voter under the laws of the State in which he resides, the Commission shall certify such determination to the President."

Upon the receipt of such certification, the President "shall establish an office of Federal registrar for the registration district in which the individual who filed such petition resides and appoint a Federal registrar for such registration district from among officers or employees of the United States who reside within the State and within or near such registration district."

The Federal registrar shall accept registration applications and all applicants whom the registrar finds to be properly qualified, under the laws of the State, shall be registered to vote for all candidates for Federal elective office in Federal elections held in such district. Each individual so registered shall have the right to vote and have his vote counted for all candidates for Federal elective office in any Federal election held in his registration district.

My objections to the recommendations of the Commission on Civil Rights and to the bills now before this committee are as follows:

First. The preservation of our Federal system is of supreme importance. Rights, privileges, and obligation of the States and of the Central Government as delineated in the Constitution of the United States must be preserved. The Constitution clearly reserves to the States the conduct of elections and the qualification of voters in such elections. Under the bills before this committee, a vital part of the election machinery will be taken away from the States and turned over to the Federal Government.

Second. The Federal registrar voter plan would be cumbersome and difficult of administration. It would set up two sets of voters: the one group permitted to vote in all elections and the other group permitted to vote only in Federal elections. When a name is placed on the Federal list, there appears to be no way of correcting that list, even though the voter may subsequently become disqualified under the provisions of State law, that is, by being convicted of a felony, and so forth. No method of transfer of voters from one voting precinct to another is prescribed, and I emphasize this, if the chairman please, no right of appeal is provided on behalf of a State official or of the applicant to register.

These bills would place in the hands of a Federal official or employee who would, in rural sections, of necessity, be a second- or third-class postmaster or post office employee, deputy marshal, and the like, as the only Federal official or employee available, the duty and authority to interpret and give effect to State laws relative to qualification of voters and determine whether the applicant to vote be properly qualified under the laws of his State.

He must further determine whether the applicant has been denied the right to register on account of his race, religion, color, or national origin, and having made all of these decisions, he may register the applicant to vote in an election for Federal officials or decline such registration.

Let me repeat and emphasize as strongly as I can that the determination by this Federal employee as to the propriety of the registration of an applicant would be final and conclusive. It could not be questioned in any proceeding except possibly upon the ground of fraud or gross dereliction of duty on the part of the registrar. I know of no such finality of authority being given any official of the Federal Government short of the Supreme Court of the United States.

The Attorney General of the United States in his statement of January 27, in referring to a bill presented by him, said:

"I believe this bill would be more effective than the Federal registrar proposals and would avoid many of the serious and practical problems connected with Federal registrars."

Third. The recommendations of the Commission on Civil Rights and the bills before the committee are, in my judgment, clearly unconstitutional for they charge the Commission with the duty of investigating and determining whether or not the allegations contained in the petitions filed with the President are true. If the Commission should find that the petitioners are being deprived of the right to vote in Federal elections solely because of race, religion, color, or national origin, the Commission shall so certify to the President. The act under which the Commission on Civil Rights was created provides that it is "in the executive branch of the Government" and yet under these bills, this arm of the executive branch of the Government is called upon to perform a judicial function and this without notice to the interested parties or appeal from its decision.

The requirement of the performance of this judicial function by an agency in the executive branch of the Government clearly violates the fundamental requirement of the Constitution of separate and distinct functions in the executive, legislative, and judicial branches of Government.

The Attorney General clearly was conscious of this fundamental objection when in his statement of January 27 he said: "This would avoid"—referring to his own bill—"the constitutional and legal questions which would arise under plans based upon a determination by a nonjudicial body that State officials have discriminated against citizens in violation of the Federal Constitution."

And referring to the proposals in the bills before the committee, he continued:

"Since these other proposals are not within the established judicial framework, they would, I believe, be subject to a more extended and severe legal challenge."

It would appear unnecessary to say more on this phase of the matter except we might comment that in the event these bills are enacted into law it will be the duty of the Attorney General to defend them, and, in view of his public statements to which I have referred, he would certainly be in an embarrassing, if not impossible, position before the Court.

Fourth. Although the Commission on Civil Rights is in the executive branch of the Government, it does not appear to be amenable to the President, but, rather, the contrary, for, upon the certification by the Commission on the petitions to which I have referred, the President "shall appoint" a Federal registrar. Here, the Commission appears to be superior to the President, for upon its finding, whether such finding is justified or not, the President "shall appoint." He has no discretion in the matter, for the language of the bills is definite and explicit.

Now, with reference, Mr. Chairman, if you please, to the Attorney General's bill, in an effort to present to the Congress a plan which he could defend, the Attorney General has prepared and submitted a bill which I believe is now before the committee.

This bill is nothing more or less——

The CHAIRMAN. My delay this morning, Governor Battle, I might say, was because of a call from the Attorney General relating to his testimony on Friday—that he would be here tomorrow. He told me that he did not propose to have a bill or ask that a bill be offered embodying the plan that he wanted to testify about tomorrow. So there is no bill presently pending.

Mr. BATTLE. Well, I take it, my comments then on that would be out of order, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. It is really technical because the Attorney General has submitted a memorandum and a proposal. But there is no bill before us as yet.

Mr. BATTLE. I had about completed my statement, sir, and I just had one page on that subject.

The CHAIRMAN. I did not want to interrupt you except to indicate to you that nothing as yet has been introduced as a bill which embodies the Attorney General's plan. However, it is perfectly proper and indeed desirable for you to discuss it.

Mr. BATTLE. Sir?

The CHAIRMAN. I say it is perfectly proper and indeed desirable for you to discuss it, if you care to do so.

Mr. BATTLE. I thank the chairman very much for his consideration. Technically, I presume I am out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. I did not mean to raise the technical point, Governor. I just wanted to advise you that there is presently no bill.

Mr. BATTLE. Yes. Well, I hope there will not be a bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Before us.

Thank you, sir.

Mr. BATTLE. Well, the bill, if the chairman please, which was carried verbatim in the New York Times, in the issue of January 27, at which time the Attorney General's statement was carried verbatim, is the statement to which I have made reference, and that bill is nothing more nor less than a refinement of the old act of 1870, as amended, described as the Enforcement Act and generally known as the force bill of Reconstruction days.

In resurrects the specter of reconstruction which those of us who live in the southern portion of our reunited country had hoped and believed had been forever buried. The force bill, which was so obnoxious, was, in 1894, repealed by the Congress by an act which sets out the various code citations of the Enforcement Act, and not being satisfied with that, concludes—the author of this act seems to have been very anxious that he wipe out the whole works, for he concludes:

"All statutes and parts of statutes relating in any manner to supervisors of election and special deputy marshals be and the same are hereby repealed."

The bill of 1870 provides for supervisors of election. The Attorney General's bill, in an effort apparently to make it more palatable, provides for "voting referees," but their powers and duties are substantially the same.

The bill of 1870, when attacked on constitutional grounds, was sustained by a divided Supreme Court as being authorized under article I, section 4, of the Constitution, which, it will be recalled, provides—

"The times, places, and manner of holding elections for Senators and Representatives shall be prescribed in each State by the legislature thereof; but the Congress may at any time by law make or alter such regulations, except as to the places of choosing Senators."

Although the 14th and 15th amendments had been adopted prior to the passage of the bill of 1870, no reference to those amendments was made in the Court's decision. The Enforcement Act, by its terms, operated only in elections for Members of the House of Representatives, and the Court in its decision in *Ex parte Siebold* (100 S. Ct. Repts., p. 393), used this language:

"We do not mean to say, however, that for any acts of the officers of election having exclusive reference to the election of State or county officers they will be amenable to Federal jurisdiction."

It is further interesting to note, Mr. Chairman, that one of the cases sustaining the Enforcement Act arose from Maryland and the other case came up from Ohio.

The Attorney General's bill further provides, when authorized by the Federal district court, the so-called referees shall attend at any time and place for holding any election in which any person authorized by the court shall vote or is entitled to vote and report to the court whether any such person has been denied the right to vote. He shall also attend at any time and place for counting the votes cast in the election at which any such person would vote and report to the court if any vote cast by such person has not been properly counted. So that under this bill, this Federal referee would be present when the election officials counted the ballots and this even in a State, county, or municipal election.

It is difficult to see how this Federal referee could ascertain that the vote cast by the voter he had registered was properly counted, unless he examined every ballot and even then he could not be certain for it is common knowledge that some ballots are thrown out because of improper marking or mutilation.

If I might interpose there, Mr. Chairman, that in the hearings conducted by the Commission on Civil Rights and in its report, there is not a scintilla of a suggestion that any vote had not been counted as properly as it was cast.

The Attorney General's bill would, therefore, appear to be objectionable because it would set up two lists of qualified voters. It would deprive the States of their time-honored rights to administer the voting processes. It would authorize the appointment of Federal officials with the right of general supervision over the voting of electors and be at least of highly doubtful constitutional validity in that it embraces within its terms the election of every State and local official.

In my judgment, Mr. Chairman, the present laws are ample to take care of the situation as revealed in the report of the Civil Rights Commission.

I do not for one moment condone conditions such as were recited in the report of the Commission on Civil Rights, but I believe the remedies proposed are worse than the malady, and I am further of the opinion that there is ample legislation already enacted which, if properly invoked, would correct the conditions complained of. I would refer in this connection to, first, 18 U.S.C.A. 242, which makes it a crime for State election officials willfully to deprive any qualified person of the right to register, vote, or have his vote counted as cast.

Second, to 42 U.S.C.A. 1983, 1985, and 1988, which vests in each citizen the right to sue State election officials for damages or for preventive relief if he is actually denied or threatened with denial of his right to register, to vote, or to have his vote counted as cast.

Third, under the Civil Rights Act of 1957, now 42 U.S.C.A. 1971, the Attorney General may sue State election officials to prevent any qualified citizen from being denied his right to register or vote.

I conclude, therefore, with the statement I filed with the report of the Commission on Civil Rights:

"I concur in the proposition that all properly qualified American citizens should have the right to vote, but I believe the present laws are sufficient to protect that right and I disagree with the proposal for the appointment of a Federal registrar which would place in the hands of the Federal Government a vital part of the election process so jealously guarded and carefully reserved to the States by the Founding Fathers."

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you, Governor Battle.

Have you any questions, Senator?

Senator JORDAN. I have not.

The CHAIRMAN. Senator Jordan has no questions.

Governor Battle, there are a good many things I would like to discuss with you with profit to myself.

Mr. BATTLE. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. However, we are working under certain handicaps today as to time. I want you to know that as a distinguished American and former Governor of a great State and former member of the President's Commission on Civil Rights, we appreciate very much your having taken the time and trouble to prepare your statement and to come here and present it to us, which is of benefit on this question of greatest importance.

Mr. BATTLE. Thank you, Senator.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you, Governor.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, we are still waiting for the Senate Rules Committee to report its bill on Federal supervision of elections in States and localities.

The House Rules Committee yesterday reported still another Federal elections bill. And almost simultaneously the Attorney General of the United States produced still another administration bill.

Representative WILLIAM M. MCCULLOCH, of Ohio, is quoted in today's New York Times as saying he would introduce the Attorney General's new bill in the House of Representatives.

In the existing chaos surrounding this so-called civil rights legislation of 1960 we learn what is being proposed only by reading the latest edition of the newspapers. This morning's edition of the New York Times may be behind the times by now, but I quote it as follows:

The revised (Attorney General's) bill includes a number of substantial changes designed to assure the effectiveness of the referee proposal to advance Negro voting. The changes go a long way toward the position of some civil rights advocates who feared they had seen loopholes in the original draft.

On the basis of bills drawn in the past by the Department of Justice at the direction of the Attorney General we have reason to expect he will develop more loopholes in the process of plugging up his previous loopholes. We shall see.

Mr. President, I have before me a draft of what purports to be the text of the new referee proposal of the Attorney General, as it appeared on page 10 of the New York Times of today. I ask unanimous consent that it may be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

TEXT OF NEW DRAFT ON VOTING REFEREES—A BILL TO AMEND THE CIVIL RIGHTS ACT OF 1957 BY PROVIDING FOR COURT APPOINTMENT OF UNITED STATES VOTING REFEREES, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America assembled, That section 2004 of the revised statutes (42 U.S.C. 1971), as amended by section 131 of the Civil Rights Act of 1957 (71 Stat. 637), is amended as follows:

"(A) Add the following as subsection (E) and designate the present subsection (E) subsection '(F)':

"'In any proceeding instituted pursuant to subsection (E) in the event the court finds that any person has been deprived on account of race or color or any right or privilege secured by subsection (A), the court shall upon request of the Attorney General make a finding whether such deprivation was or is pursuant to a pattern or practice. If the court finds such pattern or practice, any person of such race or color resident within the affected area shall, for one year and thereafter until the court subsequently finds that such a pattern or practice has ceased, be entitled, upon his application therefor, to an order declaring him qualified to vote, upon proof that at any election or elections (1) he is qualified under State law to vote, and (2) he has been (A) deprived of or denied under color of law the opportunity to register to vote or otherwise to qualify to vote, or (B) found not qualified to vote by any person acting under color of law. Such order shall be effective as to any election held within the longest period for which such applicant could have been registered or otherwise qualified under State law at which the applicant's qualifications would under State law entitle him to vote.'"

MAY APPOINT REFEREES

"'Notwithstanding any inconsistent provision of State law or the action of any State officer or court, an applicant so declared qualified to vote shall be permitted to vote in any such election. The Attorney General shall cause to be transmitted certified copies of such order to the appropriate election officers. The refusal by any such officer with notice of such order to permit any person so declared qualified to vote, to vote at an appropriate election shall constitute contempt of court.

"'An application for an order pursuant to this subsection shall be heard within ten days, and the execution of any order disposing of such application shall not be stayed if the effect of such stay would be to delay the effectiveness of the order beyond the date of any election at which the applicant would otherwise be enabled to vote.

"'The court may appoint one or more persons, to be known as voting referees, to serve for such period as the courts shall determine, to receive such applications and to take evidence and report to the court findings as to whether or not at any election or elections (1) any such applicant is qualified under State law to vote, and (2) he has been (A) deprived of or denied under color of law the opportunity to register to vote or otherwise to qualify to vote, or (B) found not qualified to vote by any person acting under color of law. In a proceeding before a voting referee, the applicant shall be heard ex parte. His statement under oath shall be prima facie evidence as to his age, residence, and his prior efforts to register or otherwise qualify to vote. Where proof of literacy or an understanding of other subjects is required by valid provisions of State law, the answer of the applicant, if written, shall be included in such report to the court; if oral, it shall be taken down stenographically and a transcription included in such report to the court.

"'Upon receipt of such report, the court shall cause the Attorney General to transmit a copy thereof to the State Attorney General and to each party to such proceeding together with an order to show cause within 10 days, or such shorter time as the court may fix, why an order of the court should not be entered in accordance with such report. Upon the expiration of such period, such order shall be entered unless prior to that time there has been filed with the court and served upon all parties a statement of exceptions to such report. Exceptions as to matters of fact shall be considered only if supported by duly verified copy of a public record or by affidavit of persons having personal knowledge of such facts; those relating to matters of law shall be supported by an appropriate memorandum of law. The issues of fact and law raised by such exceptions shall be determined by the court, or, if the due and speedy administration of justice requires, they may be referred to the voting referee to determine in accordance with procedures prescribed by the court. A hearing as to an issue of fact shall be held only in the event that the affidavits in support of the exception disclose the existence of a genuine issue of material fact. The applicant's literacy and understanding of other subjects shall be determined solely on the basis of answers included in the report of the voting referee.'"

UNITED STATES TO PAY REFEREES

"'The court, or at its direction the voting referee, shall issue to each applicant so declared qualified a certificate identifying the holder thereof as a person so qualified.

"'The court may authorize such referee or such other person or persons as it may designate (1) to attend at any time and place for holding any election and to report whether any such person declared qualified to vote has been denied the right to vote, and (2) to attend at any time and place for other action relating to such election necessary to make effective the vote of such a person and to report to the court any action or failure to act which would make such vote ineffective.

"'Any voting referee appointed by the court pursuant to this subsection shall to the extent not inconsistent herewith have all the powers conferred upon a master by rule 53(C) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. The compensation to be allowed to any persons appointed by the court pursuant to this subsection shall be fixed by the court and shall be payable by the United States.

"'The court shall have authority to make an order entitling an applicant to vote provisionally pending final determination of any exception and to take any other action appropriate or necessary to carry out the provisions of this subsection and to enforce its decrees, and this subsection shall in no way be construed as a limitation upon the existing powers of the court.

"'When used in the subsection, the word "vote" includes all action necessary to make a vote effective including, but not limited to, registration or other action required by State law prerequisite to voting, casting a ballot, and having such ballot counted and included in the appropriate totals of votes cast with respect to candidates for public office and propositions for which votes are received in an election; the words "affected area" shall mean any subdivision of the State in which the laws of the State relating to voting are or have been to any extent administered by a person found in the proceeding to have violated subsection (A); and the words "qualified under State law" shall mean qualified according to the laws, customs, or usages of the State, and shall not in any event, imply qualifications more stringent than those used by the persons found in the proceeding to have violated subsection (A) in qualifying persons other than those of the race or color against which the pattern or practice of discrimination was found to exist.'

"(B) Add the following sentence at the end of subsection (C):

"'Whenever, in a proceeding instituted under this subsection, any official of a State or subdivision thereof is alleged to have committed any act or practice constituting a deprivation of any right or privilege secured by subsection (A), the act or practice shall also be deemed that of the State and the State may be joined as a party defendant and, if prior to the institution of such proceeding, such official has resigned or has been relieved of his office and no successor has assumed such office, the proceeding may be instituted against the State.'"

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, in the confusion of broken Senate rules we are asked to consider scores of bills, many of which we learn about in advance only from the newspapers. But in general they would—

First. Write new meaning into the Constitution of the United States.

Second. Accept the Warren Court's interpretation of the Constitution as the supreme law of the land with respect to public education.

Third. Make it a felony to resist Warren Court decrees.

Fourth. Bribe State and local officials to conform with Warren Court orders.

Fifth. Open local and State election records to a politically appointed Federal Attorney General and his representative.

Sixth. Authorize Federal agents to decide the qualification of voters in local and State elections as well as Federal and police the voting and the counting of the votes.

Seventh. Set up the machinery for making another try at FEPC Federal control over hiring and firing of employees in private business.

CRITICISM OF PRESIDENT'S POSTAL RATE INCREASE

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I wish to comment on the President's proposal for a postal rate increase on the basis of information supplied to me by the Post Office Department, the latest available figures show that the rates for first class mail and airmail show an annual surplus of $156 million for the fiscal year 1959. Yet, these are the rates which primarily are to be raised. Second, third, and other classes of mail, which are primarily for newspapers, magazines,

bulk advertising, and business firms, show a deficit of $726 million for that fiscal year. The latest information therefore shows a deficit of $569 million which is entirely in the second, third, fourth, and other classes of mail, but not in first class or airmail.

Yet the President is proposing that the first class rates be raised from 4 cents to 5 cents for letters and from 3 cents to 4 cents for postcards, and that the airmail rates be raised from 7 cents to 8 cents for letters and from 5 cents to 6 cents for postcards. This would produce an additional $427 million a year in revenues in the classes which already more than pay their way. The other classes, where the big deficits exist, would be raised by only $127 million.

There was a deficit of $303 million in the second class rates, which are those for newspapers and magazines, yet the President's proposals would produce only an additional $46 million in revenues from this class of mail.

It is amazing to me that newspapers, magazines, and business groups whose editorial policies and trade organizations are most critical of Government subsidies and excessive expenditures should themselves be receiving almost three-quarters of a billion dollars a year in postal subsidies. The President is now asking that this deficit be paid for in the main by increasing the rates on ordinary letters, airmail, and postcards, which as I have said, now more than pay their own way.

I want also to criticize the figures listed in the fiscal year 1961 budget for business subsidies. The amount in the list of expenditures which primarily benefit private business groups was estimated at $864 million in the fiscal year 1961 budget compared with $1.4 billion in fiscal year 1960, or an apparent reduction of about $550 million. The budget on page 917 states:

> This decrease reflects mainly the proposed increase in postal rates designed to eliminate the postal service deficit now covered by budgetary expenditures.

While the President's proposal for postal increases fall in the main on nonbusiness groups and the general public, the President's budget deducts these amounts from business subsidies. In other words, business groups keep the subsidy while the budget states that it is to be reduced.

Mr. President, the data provided by the Post Office Department on the surplus or deficit by class of mail and the President's proposed increases are shown in a table which I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in my remarks.

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

Fiscal year 1959 actual postal surplus or deficit by class of mail compared with the administration's proposals for a postal rate increase

Class of mail	Fiscal year 1959 surplus or deficit	President's proposals	
		Proposal	Revenue increase
			Millions
1st class	+$135, 350, 391	Increase from 4 to 5 cents on letters and 3 to 4 cents on postcards.	+$409
Domestic airmail	+21, 455, 337	Increase from 7 to 8 cents on letters and 5 to 6 cents on postcards.	+18
2d class	−303, 455, 640	Increase by ½ cent per piece	+46
3d class [1]	−287, 080, 814	Bulk rate increase of average of 24 percent	+85
4th class and other rates	−136, 086, 012	Increases, all other rates	+25
Deficit on 2d, 3d, 4th, and other classes	−726, 622, 466	Total increase	583
		Offset for reduced yields due to composition of mail.	29
Surplus on 1st class and airmail	156, 805, 728	Net increase for fiscal year 1961	554
Net deficit, fiscal year 1959	−569, 816, 738		

[1] Increases in rates primarily for 3d class during fiscal year 1959 would have raised revenues on a full year basis. But the predicted deficit for fiscal year 1961 nevertheless is $554,000,000 for all classes of mail.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent that a letter which I addressed to the Postmaster General under date of February 3, 1960, asking for information on revenues and expenses, together with the reply from the Post Office Department and a table supplied by them, may be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

U.S. SENATE,
Washington, D.C., February 3, 1960.

Hon. ARTHUR E. SUMMERFIELD,
Postmaster General,
Post Office Department,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR POSTMASTER GENERAL: In his budget proposals for fiscal 1961, the President has requested a further increase in first-class postage rates and in other postage fees in order to eliminate the prospective deficit for the Post Office Department.

The Joint Economic Committee has the responsibility to report to the Congress its evaluation of the President's budget and Economic Report. Before it is possible for us to appraise the proposal for an increase in postal rates, we need to have information concerning the source of the deficit of the Department's operations.

Would you, therefore, please provide us promptly with a breakdown of revenues and expenses by class of mail for the fiscal years 1959 and 1960, and the estimated revenues and expenses by class of mail for fiscal 1961?

This information is essential to us before we can properly recommend what action should be taken and it is needed very quickly.

With best wishes.

Sincerely yours,

PAUL H. DOUGLAS,
Chairman.

FEBRUARY 11, 1960.

Hon. PAUL H. DOUGLAS,
Chairman, Joint Economic Committee,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The Postmaster General has asked me to reply to your letter of February 3 and I am enclosing an advance copy of exhibit I from our cost ascertainment report for fiscal 1959 which is now being printed. This exhibit shows the postal revenues and obligations by classes of mail and service for fiscal 1959. In addition, the exhibit carries hypothetical amounts showing the estimated effect on the revenue/cost relationships for the individual classes of mail of currently authorized maximum rate increases and certain authorized operating cost increases at the 1959 level of operations. The percentage coverages of adjusted obligations by adjusted revenues shown on the exhibit for the individual classes of mail represent the latest data that we have on this subject.

The Post Office Department does not ordinarily attempt to break out its budget estimates by classes of mail except as to revenue. For fiscal 1961, these appear on page 766 of the President's budget. The allocation of costs by classes of mail is a tremendous undertaking involving a great host of quantitative tests, analyses, and allocations which literally take months to complete after the close of the fiscal year. To attempt to make such analyses of budget estimates would require not only a great deal of work but the use of many assumptions which would have to be so tenuous as to render the results of little practical value.

The Postal Policy Act of 1958, Public Law 85-426, approved May 27, 1958, while providing that the postal service as a whole should be self-supporting, except with respect to public service losses for which specific appropriations would be made, recognized the principle of differential pricing for certain classes of mail. Specifically the act provided that postage for first-class mail should be sufficient to cover the entire amount of the expense allocated to it, plus an additional amount representing the fair value of all extraordinary and preferential service, facilities, and factors relating thereto. Cost, therefore, is only one of the factors to be considered by the Congress in fixing postal rates and the extent of the loss on individual classes of mail is not necessarily a guide as to the rate adjustments that should be made except in the case of zone rate fourth-class mail, the revenue from which is required to be within 4 percent of the cost.

The overall postal deficit of $554 million shown in the President's budget for 1961 after allowing for reimbursements for public service losses, is the target toward which our rate proposals now in process of submission to the Congress are directed. The proposals will include increases in all major classes of mail, the rates for which are fixed by law. When introduced, the bills of course will be referred to the appropriate legislative committees and it is our hope that hearings thereon will shortly thereafter be held. We will be happy to provide your committee with any material that we submit to the legislative committees at the time of these hearings if you would be interested in receiving it.

I am sorry that I am not able to provide you with any projections on cost coverage for the various classes of mail other than those shown on the enclosed exhibit. In its presentation on rates before the Congress, the Department has consistently used data based on current and historical experience.

With kindest regards.

Sincerely yours,

HYDE GILLETTE,
Assistant Postmaster General.

EXHIBIT I.—*Comparison of revenue and obligations by classes of mail and services, fiscal year 1959*

[NOTE.—The difference between revenue and obligations is not necessarily the only measure of the adequacy of postal rates. For example, see the Postal Policy Act of 1958 (72 Stat. 134 et seq. title of Public Law 85-426) for other factors that in some cases are to be considered for this purpose which are outside of the scope of the annual cost ascertainment report]

Class of mail or service	Actual revenues [1]	Actual obligations [2]	Actual revenues under (−) or over (+) actual obligations	Adjustments to show assumed effect of currently authorized changes if they had been in effect for the entire fiscal year 1959 [3]		Adjusted revenues under (−) or over (+) adjusted obligations	Percent coverage of adjusted obligations by adjusted revenues
				Additional revenues [4]	Additional obligations [5]		
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
1st class mail	$1,438,732,956	$1,303,382,563	+$135,350,391	$23,930,000	$16,275,000	+$143,005,000	111
Domestic airmail	173,978,995	152,523,658	+21,455,337	957,000	1,214,000	+21,198,000	114
2d class mail	69,080,977	372,536,617	−303,455,640	28,369,000	4,704,000	−279,791,000	26
Controlled circulation publications	6,826,090	9,848,983	−3,022,893	20,000	124,000	−3,127,000	69
3d class mail	390,644,760	677,725,574	−287,080,814	109,767,000	[6] 11,937,000	−189,250,000	73
4th class mail:							
Zone rate parcels	531,365,761	638,539,976	− 107,174,215	88,855,000	[6] 6,459,000	−24,778,000	
Catalogs	15,257,328	21,049,636	−5,792,308	2,005,000	[6] −504,000	−3,283,000	
Fees	1,142,403		+1,142,403			+1,142,000	
Total, zone rate 4th class	547,765,492	659,589,612	−111,824,120	90,860,000	5,955,000	−26,919,000	96
Other 4th class mail	27,852,307	49,091,306	−21,238,999	21,972,000	693,000	+40,000	100
Total, 4th class mail	575,617,799	708,680,918	−133,063,119	112,832,000	6,648,000	−26,879,000	96
Total, prepaid domestic mail	2,654,881,575	3,224,698,313	−569,816,738				
Government mail (paid for under reimbursement procedures):							
Penalty, including registry, other departments [7]	66,150,000	57,073,023	+9,076,977	1,076,000	682,000	+9,471,000	116
Franked mail:							
Members of Congress [7]	2,301,000	3,009,110	−708,110		37,000	−745,000	76
Others		23,631	−23,631	204,000		+180,000	
Total Government mail	68,451,000	60,105,764	+8,345,236	1,280,000	719,000	+8,906,000	115
Free for the blind		1,276,263	−1,276,263	1,293,000	17,000		
Total, domestic mail	2,723,332,575	3,286,080,340	−562,747,765				
International mail	97,940,396	105,829,777	−7,889,381	1,939,000	2,617,000	−8,575,000	92
Total, all mails	2,821,272,971	3,391,910,117	−570,637,146				
Special services	242,124,937	257,947,106	−15,822,169				
Unassignable revenues and obligations	11,890,701	12,313,433	−422,732				
Total mails and special services	3,075,288,609	3,662,170,656	−586,882,047				
Nonpostal services for other agencies	1,742,470	19,977,668	−18,235,198				
Grand total, all operations	3,077,031,079	3,682,148,324	−605,117,245				
Deductions:							
Indemnity claims	5,994,370	5,994,370					
Embossed envelopes purchased	8,638,910	8,638,910					
Losses and chargeoffs	270,487	270,487					
International money order expenses	104,760	104,760					
Airmail transportation reimbursements	21,114,030	21,114,030					
Nonpostal reimbursements	1,742,470	1,742,470					
Miscellaneous revenues and obligations offsets	3,915,244	3,915,244					
Net postal operations as stated in Postmaster General's annual report	3,035,250,808	3,640,368,053	−605,117,245				

[1] See exhibit 10 for details of revenue concessions at postage rates in effect for 1959 totaling $39,347,000 made to certain users of the mail as required by law.

[2] Includes building improvements and rehabilitation, equipment and research recorded on an obligations-incurred basis, but does not include any provision for accrued depreciation, or costs incurred by other Government agencies as follows:

	Millions
Workmen's compensation costs	$4.5
Custodial costs and alterations, and repairs to post office buildings	21.7
Unemployment compensation costs	11.0
Miscellaneous costs, other agencies	2.2
Total	39.4

[3] Hypothetical amounts showing estimated effect, based on 1959 level of activity on the revenue/cost relationship by individual classes of mail of currently authorized maximum rate increases and certain authorized operating cost increases. The aggregate of the results shown in col. (6) is not indicative of overall future fund deficiencies since no effect has been given to other future factors such as changes in mail volume, shifts to lower priced classes or subclasses of mail, and the funds required for the postal modernization program instituted in fiscal year 1960 with an initial appropriation of $80,000,000.

[4] Additional revenues calculated on the basis of 1959 level of activity include the following:

		Millions
Ultimate effect of all rate increases authorized by law or approved by the Interstate Commerce Commission through November 1959		$229.0
Reclassification from 4th to 3d class of revenue from parcels and catalogs under 1 pound for July 1958 (Public Law 85-426):		
Deducted from 4th class	−$2.4	
Added to 3d class	+1.7	
		−.7
Reimbursements for public services that would have been received for 1959 transactions at the ultimate rates using the concepts and procedures adopted by the Congress in the 1960 Post Office Department Appropriation (Public Law 86-39)		$52.0
Total		280.3

[5] The additional obligations shown give cost increases authorized through November 1959 applied to fiscal year 1959 level of activity for—

	Millions
Health insurance program (effective July 9, 1960)	$37.2
Extension of life insurance coverage for employees over age 65 (effective Oct. 3, 1959)	.4
Increase gasoline tax at 1 cent per gallon (effective Oct. 1, 1959)	.5
Transportation of military mails to Alaska and Hawaii without reimbursement (effective Nov. 16, 1959)	.7
Increased rates, foreign mail transportation and foreign terminal charges (effective fiscal year 1960)	1.7
Western railroad rate increase effective July 1959	7.0
Total	47.5

[6] Additional obligations include adjustments for reclassification from 4th class to 3d class of costs of parcels and catalogs under 1 pound amounting to $3,400,000 for July 1958 (Public Law 85-426).

[7] Penalty mail includes Government Printing Office mailings of CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and other documents sent at congressional request, at a cost of $385,000.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, an article published in the Wall Street Journal of Wednesday, February 17, 1960, gave some figures slightly different from those I have used for the proposed postal increase. However, I have today checked those figures with the Bureau of the Budget and have been informed that the figures I have given with respect to the estimated revenues from the new proposals are correct.

SENATE INCONSISTENCY

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, during our consideration of the so-called civil rights bills I think it is our duty, and that it will be necessary from time to time, to point out glaring inconsistencies in the legislative action taken by the Senate. When the Federal aid to school construction bill—S. 8—was brought up, repeated assurances were given that it was an aid bill, a Federal program to help the States, not a device to interfere with State educational laws, institutions, or administration. This assurance was specifically spelled out in section 3 of that bill, which provided as follows:

In the administration of this Act, no department, agency, officer, or employee of the United States shall exercise any direction, supervision, or control over the policy determination, personnel, curriculum, program

of instruction, or the administration or operation of any school or school system.

This bill passed the Senate on February 4, 1960.

Yet now we have before us a proposal, introduced in all seriousness, to provide for a temporary Federal confiscation of school buildings constructed with Federal-aid funds. It requires affirmative State action to get the building back from Federal control. I opposed S. 8 because of this very fear. My fear was well grounded.

These provisions are found in the amendments to H.R. 8315 proposed by the minority leader to section 205.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD an excerpt from this proposal.

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

(3) Section 10 of such Act is further amended by inserting "(a)" after "SEC. 10." and by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(b) Whenever the Commissioner determines that—

"(1) any school facilities with respect to which payments were made under section 7 of this Act, pursuant to an application approved under section 6 after the enactment of this subsection, are not being used by a local educational agency for the provision of free public education, and

"(2) such facilities are needed in the provision of minimum facilities under subsection (a).

he shall notify such agency of such determination and shall thereupon be entitled to possession of such facilities for purposes of subsection (a), on such terms and conditions as may be prescribed in regulations of the Commissioner. Such regulations shall include provision for payment of rental in an amount which bears the same relationship to what, in the judgment of the Commissioner, is a reasonable rental for such facilities as the non-Federal share of the cost of construction of such facilities bore to the total cost of constuction thereof (including the cost of land and off-site improvements), adjusted to take into consideration the depreciation in the value of the facilities and such other factors as the Commissioner deems relevant. Upon application by the local educational agency for the school district in which such facilities are situated and determination by the Commissioner that such agency is able and willing to provide suitable free public education for the children in the school district of such agency to whom section 10 is applicable, or upon determination by the Commissioner that such facilities are no longer needed for purposes of subsection (a), possession of the facilities shall be returned to such agency. Such return shall be effected at such time as, in the judgment of the Commissioner, will be in the best interest of the children who are receiving free public education in such facilities, and in the light of the objectives of this Act and the commitments made to personnel employed in connection with operation of such facilities pursuant to arrangements made by the Commissioner."

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, this proposed section does not refer to the bill passed by the Senate on February 4, but it makes reference to another provision of law whereby there is a Federal program for contributions to school buildings. The procedures are the same. Such provisions speak for themselves. After clearly announcing a specific and firm policy of no Federal control of schools, even though the Federal Government contributed to the cost of the buildings, a few days later it is proposed to reverse that policy, take over the buildings, and put the burden of proof on the States to regain possession of the buildings, if possible.

NAVY DROPS HAIFA CLAUSE

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, yesterday the Department of the Navy informed me that they intend to drop the so-called Haifa clause in their contracts with American shippers.

This clause has in recent weeks been the subject of considerable controversy. In effect, it states that a shipper who has traded with Israel and who contracts with the Navy bears the full responsibility if he cannot fulfill his Navy contract because his cargo is boycotted by the Arab nations.

Many Americans protested this clause because to them it seemed to put the Navy in the embarrassing position of tacitly endorsing and enforcing the Arab boycott of shippers who trade with Israel.

A number of Members of Congress, including myself, protested to the Secretary of the Navy and urged that the Haifa clause be eliminated. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my letter on this subject of January 29, 1960, to Secretary of the Navy William B. Franke, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

JANUARY 29, 1960.

Hon. WILLIAM B. FRANKE,
Secretary of the Navy, Department of the Navy, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: In a recent news story it was reported that the Navy includes cancellation clauses in its contracts with U.S. flag ships to take into account the Arab boycott of Israel. As I understand it, what this means is that if an American shipper has traded with Israel, and if as a result Arab nations boycott his vessels, he is obligated by a special clause in doing business with the Navy to cancel his contract and in some instances also to substitute another and exactly similar ship to the Navy.

In recent weeks, many people have commented to the effect that this policy puts the Navy in the position of enforcing and indirectly supporting the Arab boycott of ships that trade with Israel. The New York Times in an editorial on this subject recorded, "shock to learn that the U.S. Navy is supinely accommodating itself to the Arab boycott of ships trading with Israel."

Reports and comments on the Navy's policy in this matter are quite disturbing to me. I would appreciate it if you would spell out more clearly and clarify the position of the Navy on this matter. I have three questions in mind which I should very much like to have answered. They are:

1. What are the reasons behind this official pronouncement of Navy policy which to many people seems to have the effect of backhandedly and subtly endorsing the Arab boycott of American ships trading with Israel?

2. Does the Navy intend in this way to indicate official or tacit approval of this boycott?

3. What, if any, steps have been taken by the Navy to protect the Arab boycott in general and to deal with the specific ramifications of the Navy's shipping policy toward American shippers who do business with Israel?

I appreciate your attention to this matter and will look forward to hearing from you.

Very sincerely yours,

KENNETH B. KEATING.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Secretary's reply to this letter, in which he notes that the Navy intends to drop the Haifa clause, together with a memorandum sent by him, be printed at this point in my remarks.

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

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY,
MILITARY SEA TRANSPORTATION SERVICE,
Washington, D.C.

Hon. KENNETH B. KEATING,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR SENATOR KEATING: The Secretary of the Navy has forwarded to me for direct reply your letter of January 29, 1960, concerning the New York Times article of January 20, "U.S. Contract Aids Boycott of Israel."

I believe the newspaper article reflects a misunderstanding of the purpose and effect of the Navy contract clause discussed. To avoid any further misunderstanding, the Navy is discontinuing the use of the clause.

For your information, I have prepared the attached memorandum which I trust will give you a more complete picture.

If I may be of further service to you, please do not hesitate to call upon me.

Sincerely yours,

ROY A. GANO,
Vice Admiral, U.S. Navy; Commander, Military Sea Transportation Service.

USE OF THE SO-CALLED HAIFA CLAUSE BY THE NAVY'S MILITARY SEA TRANSPORTATION SERVICE—MEMORANDUM FOR SENATOR KEATING

1. Issue: Recently in newspaper editorials and news comments and in correspondence addressed to the White House, to the Secretary of Defense, to the Secretary of the Navy and to Members of Congress, there has been a condemnation of the use by the Military Sea Transportation Service (MSTS) of what is known as the Haifa clause. Bills have been introduced in Congress to prohibit its use in Government contracts. Critical comments range from the accusation that the clause constitutes a boycott by the Government of ships that have traded with Israel to the allegation that the Government, by its use of the clause, is recognizing officially the Arab boycott or is supinely accommodating itself to such a boycott.

2. The Haifa clause: The standard clause used in MSTS contracts for tankers calling at Persian Gulf ports is:

"(a) In event the vessel is prevented from loading or discharging in any port by the local authorities because of the vessel having previously traded with Israel, the charterer shall have the option:

"(1) To cancel the charter as of the date loading is refused or after discharge at another port,

"(2) To require the substitution of another vessel of similar size, class, condition of tanks or cargo holds, and in a similar position,

"(3) To nominate other loading or discharging port or ports.

"Expenses incurred by the charterer in exercising an option shall be for the account of the owner."

3. Background: This clause has been used in appropriate MSTS charters since the

spring of 1958. It was adopted only after considerable discussion within MSTS and with the tanker industry and after rejection of several suggested alternatives. The immediate spur to the institution of its use was the *National Peace* incident in December 1957. The *National Peace* had been chartered by MSTS to carry Navy special fuel oil from Ras Tanura, Saudi Arabia, to Manila. Port officials at Ras Tanura discovered that the vessel had previously, under the name of S.S. *Memory*, traded with Israel; they refused to permit the vessel to load. After some time, when it became quite obvious that the vessel would not be able to perform her contract, MSTS was forced to cancel and charter another vessel to fulfill this operational requirement. The vessel owners claimed damages from MSTS in the amount of $160,000 and upon disallowance of this claim, sued in the Federal courts. This suit is pending.

4. What the clause does: By law, with or without the clause, a voyage charterer may cancel the contract in a situation wherein the owner is unable to present his ship ready and able to perform the voyage for which he contracted. For that reason, inability on the part of a ship to enter the specified port and load the cargo due to a boycott (just or unjust) works great financial hardship on the shipowner. It also results in financial loss to the cargo owner, who must continue to store and care for the cargo and position another ship. Where vital military cargo such as aviation fuel is concerned, a substantial delay in delivery also presents serious problems in the maintenance of the defense posture. The clause used by MSTS is not considered by shipowners as any more severe than a charter without the clause. However, it puts shipowners on notice that ships that have traded with Israel may not be permitted by certain countries to come into their ports. It spells out the options that the Government may pursue in such a situation. It is thus of some assistance to the Government in preventing offerings of ships that would be unable to load important cargoes of petroleum products. It is of help to those shipowners who might unknowingly undertake a service they cannot perform.

5. What the clause does not do: Contrary to the various expressions of public concern, the clause does not:

(a) Preclude any vessel owner from bidding on a Government charter. Any owner of a vessel that has traded with Israel and who is prepared to take the calculated risk may offer his ship.

(b) Assist any boycott in any manner. The test of this statement is simple: Elimination of the clause would not change by one iota the posture of the boycott or the status of any vessel offered to MSTS. Its elimination would not enable any vessel to get into any port otherwise barred to it. Its elimination would not enable any vessel to perform that could not otherwise perform.

(c) Require a vessel owner to choose between serving Arab countries or Israel. (Such an allegation has been made.) The clause does not forbid trading with Israel. It cautions owners who have previously made a choice to trade with Israel of the risk of Arab boycott.

6. The clause was adopted with no intention to give support to any political boycott. It was deemed advantageous to both the Government and shipowners. However, MSTS can accomplish its mission without using the clause. Inasmuch as it has been mistakenly construed as providing some solace to the Arab boycott imposed on persons trading with Israel, the Navy will discontinue its use.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I am delighted that the Navy has decided to clarify its position on this highly complex and controversial issue. I congratulate the Secretary and all others responsible for this decision. The Department has indicated that it does not feel that the policy in this regard actually constituted an endorsement of the Arab boycott. This is fully discussed in the Secretary's letter which I have just inserted in the RECORD. I am glad that the Navy took this opportunity to explain their reasons for this policy. However, I feel strongly that the situation has changed significantly since this policy was established.

Concern over the Arab boycott of Israel shipping, particularly with regard to the ban on Israeli ships and Israeli cargoes using the Suez Canal, has mounted. The Secretary General of the United Nations, Mr. Dag Hammarskjöld, in a statement made yesterday, was pessimistic in commenting on the "deteriorating" situation in the Mideast, especially as to relations between Israel and Egypt with regard to the Suez. Mr. Hammarskjöld's comments followed upon a strong and abusive statement by General Nasser to the effect that the Arab Republic would never allow Israeli ships to use the Suez Canal.

Mr. President, in this context of tension and bitterness, there is no question that a U.S. Navy policy which appeared to imply support of the Arab boycott was bound to cause great confusion. Whether or not the Navy's policy actually supported the Arab boycott is not so important as is the fact that a great many informed Americans, including leading newspapers, interpreted the Navy's policy in this way. In light of this widespread interpretation, namely that the Haifa clause implied support of the Arab boycott, the Navy was certainly wise in discontinuing its use. I commend the Secretary for his willingness to discard this clause, not because he felt it to be wrong, but because he recognized that such a policy could not help but confuse and undermine American relations with Israel and with every nation in the world which is concerned about General Nasser's bitter and totally inexcusable boycott of Israeli shipping.

Mr. President, Secretary Franke has put to rest the fears of many Americans. The Arab Republic's boycott interference with the free flow of trade through one of the world's most important and critical waterways cannot be tolerated. This boycott has contributed greatly to the tension and unrest in the Middle East. It has burdened the commerce of our friend and ally, the great nation of Israel and has hampered this nation's vigorous drive to build a sound economy and to provide for the welfare of its citizens.

Mr. President, I conclude by repeating that I was greatly pleased yesterday to learn that the Navy has dropped its Haifa clause. In doing so, the Navy has clearly and forthrightly acted to eliminate confusion as to America's attitude toward the United Arab Republic's unreasonable and inexcusable obstruction of the commerce of the world.

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

Mr. KEATING. I yield with the understanding that I do not lose my right to the floor.

Mr. HUMPHREY. First, I commend the distinguished Senator from New York for his remarks relating to the action of the Department of the Navy in removing what is commonly called the Haifa clause from contracts for oil tankers calling at Persian Gulf ports. I have received a similar notice, as the Senator knows, from the Department of the Navy, relating to its removal of this objectionable clause. I was greatly concerned upon learning last month of the inclusion of such a clause in MSTS contracts, and I immediately inquired of the Navy on this matter.

On February 4 I received in reply a letter dated February 3 from Vice Adm. Roy A. Gano, commander of the Military Sea Transportation Service, together with a memorandum on the subject "Use of the Haifa Clause by the MSTS."

This afternoon I received a hand-delivered letter and memorandum from Vice Admiral Gano informing me that the clause has been discontinued.

I ask unanimous consent that the Navy Department's replies of February 3 and February 19 and the attached memorandums relating to the use of the Haifa clause be printed at this point in the RECORD, in connection with my remarks.

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

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY,
MILITARY SEA TRANSPORT SERVICE,
Washington, D.C., February 3, 1960.

Hon. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
U. S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR SENATOR HUMPHREY: Your inquiry to the Office of Legislative Liaison of the Navy concerning the New York Times news item of January 21, 1960, entitled "U.S. Contract Aids Boycott of Israel," has been forwarded to me for comment.

In my opinion, the New York Times news reflects a considerable misunderstanding of the contract provision in question and of the Military Sea Transportation Service's attitude. It has resulted in other news reports of a somewhat similar nature and in a great many inquiries addressed to the Navy.

For your information, I have prepared the attached memorandum which I think gives a more accurate picture. I hope that you will find it sufficient for your purpose. Please call on me for any additional information you may desire.

Sincerely yours,

ROY A. GANO,
Vice Admiral, U.S. Navy; Commander,
Military Sea Transportation Service.

USE OF HAIFA CLAUSE BY MSTS—MEMORANDUM FOR SENATOR HUMPHREY

1. Issue: During the past week in newspaper editorials and news comments and in correspondence addressed to the White House, to the Secretary of Defense, to the Secretary of the Navy and to Members of Congress, there has been a condemnation of the use by MSTS of what is known as the Haifa clause. Mr. CELLER introduced a bill (H.R. 9808) to prohibit its use in Government contracts. These critical comments range from the accusation that the clause constitutes a boycott by the Government of ships that have traded with Israel to the allegation that the Government, by its use of the clause, is recognizing officially the Arab boycott or is supinely accommodating itself to such a boycott.

2. The Haifa clause: The standard clause used in MSTS contracts for tankers calling at Persian Gulf ports is:

"(a) In event the vessel is prevented from loading or discharging in any port by the local authorities because of the vessel having previously traded with Israel, the charterer shall have the option:

"(1) To cancel the charter as of the date loading is refused or after discharge at another port,

"(2) To require the substitution of another vessel of similar size, class, condition of tanks or cargo holds, and in a similar position,

"(3) To nominate other loading or discharging port or ports.

"Expenses incurred by the charterer in exercising an option shall be for the account of the owner."

3. Background. This clause has been used in appropriate MSTS charters since the spring of 1958. It was adopted only after considerable discussion within MSTS and with the tanker industry and after rejection of several suggested alternatives. The immediate spur to the institution of its use was the *National Peace* incident in December 1957. The *National Peace* had been chartered by MSTS to carry Navy special fuel oil from Ras Tanura, Saudi Arabia to Manila. Port officials at Ras Tanura discovered that the vessel had previously, under the name of SS *Memory*, traded with Israel; they refused to permit the vessel to load. After some time, when it became quite obvious that the vessel would not be able to perform her contract, MSTS was forced to cancel and charter another vessel to fulfill this operational requirement. The vessel owners claimed damages from MSTS in the amount of $160,000 and upon disallowance of this claim, sued in the Federal courts. This suit is pending.

4. What the clause does: The *National Peace* incident stressed the advisability of adopting a provision in MSTS invitation for vessel offerings and in the ensuing charters that would tend to protect MSTS from a vessel's inability to accomplish an operational requirement as well as against the possibility of money loss. The provision itself is not any more severe in law upon the shipowner than the contract would be without such a provision. It puts shipowners on notice that ships that have traded with Israel may not be permitted by certain countries to come into their ports; it spells out the options that the Government may pursue in such a situation. It is thus of some assistance to the Government in preventing offerings of ships that would be unable to load important cargoes of petroleum products. It is of help to those shipowners who might unknowingly undertake a service they cannot perform.

5. What the clause does not do: Contrary to the various expressions of public concern, the clause does not:

(a) Preclude any vessel owner from bidding on a Government charter. Any owner of a vessel that has traded with Israel and who is prepared to take the calculated risk may offer his ship.

(b) Assist any boycott in any manner. The test of this statement is simple: Elimination of the clause would not change by one iota the posture of the boycott or the status of any vessel offered to MSTS. Its elimination would not enable any vessel to get into any port otherwise barred to it. Its elimination would not enable any vessel to perform that could not otherwise perform.

(c) Require a vessel owner to choose between serving Arab countries or Israel. (Such an allegation has been made.) The clause does not forbid trading with Israel. It cautions owners who have previously made a choice to trade with Israel of the risk of Arab boycott.

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY,
MILITARY SEA TRANSPORTATION SERVICE,
Washington, D.C., February 19, 1960.

Hon. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR SENATOR HUMPHREY: Since my last letter to you of February 3, 1960, there have been further developments concerning the so-called Haifa clause, in which I believe you would be interested. Correspondence has indicated some misunderstanding of the clause by the public. To avoid any further misunderstanding, the Navy is discontinuing the use of the clause.

For your information, I have prepared the enclosed memorandum which I trust will give you a more correct picture.

If I may be of further service to you, please do not hesitate to call upon me.

Sincerely yours,

ROY A. GANO,
Vice Admiral, U.S. Navy; Commander, Military Sea Transportation Service.

USE OF THE SO-CALLED HAIFA CLAUSE BY THE NAVY'S MILITARY SEA TRANSPORTATION SERVICE—MEMORANDUM FOR SENATOR HUMPHREY

1. Issue: Recently in newspaper editorials and news comments and in correspondence addressed to the White House, to the Secretary of Defense, to the Secretary of the Navy and to Members of Congress, there has been a condemnation of the use by the Military Sea Transportation Service (MSTS) of what is known as the Haifa clause. Bills have been introduced in Congress to prohibit its use in Government contracts. Critical comments range from the accusation that the clause constitutes a boycott by the Government of ships that have traded with Israel to the allegation that the Government, by its use of the clause, is recognizing officially the Arab boycott or is supinely accommodating itself to such a boycott.

2. The Haifa clause: The standard clause used in MSTS contracts for tankers calling at Persian Gulf ports is:

"(a) In event the vessel is prevented from loading or discharging in any port by the local authorities because of the vessel having previously traded with Israel, the charterer shall have the option:

"(1) To cancel the charter as of the date loading is refused or after discharge at another port.

"(2) To require the substitution of another vessel of similar size, class, condition of tanks or cargo holds, and in a similar position.

"(3) To nominate other loading or discharging port or ports.

"Expenses incurred by the charterer in exercising an option shall be for the account of the owner."

3. Background: This clause has been used in appropriate MSTS charters since the spring of 1958. It was adopted only after considerable discussion within MSTS and with the tanker industry and after rejection of several suggested alternatives. The immediate spur to the institution of its use was the *National Peace* incident in December 1957. The *National Peace* had been chartered by MSTS to carry Navy special fuel oil from Ras Tanura, Saudi Arabia, to Manila. Port officials at Ras Tanura discovered that the vessel had previously, under the name of SS. *Memory*, traded with Israel; they refused to permit the vessel to load. After some time, when it became quite obvious that the vessel would not be able to perform her contract, MSTS was forced to cancel and charter another vessel to fulfill this operational requirement. The vessel owners claimed damages from MSTS in the amount of $160,000 and upon disallowance of this claim, sued in the Federal courts. This suit is pending.

4. What the clause does: By law, with or without the clause, a voyage charterer may cancel the contract in a situation wherein the owner is unable to present his ship ready and able to perform the voyage for which he contracted. For that reason, inability on the part of a ship to enter the specified port and load the cargo due to a boycott (just or unjust) works great financial hardship on the shipowner. It also results in financial loss to the cargo owner, who must continue to store and care for the cargo and position another ship. Where vital military cargo such as aviation fuel is concerned, a substantial delay in delivery also presents serious problems in the maintenance of the defense posture. The clause used by MSTS is not considered by shipowners as any more severe than a charter without the clause. However, it puts shipowners on notice that ships that have traded with Israel may not be permitted by certain countries to come into their ports. It spells out the options that the Government may pursue in such a situation. It is thus of some assistance to the Government in preventing offerings of ships that would be unable to load important cargoes of petroleum products. It is of help to those shipowners who might unknowingly undertake a service they cannot perform.

5. What the clause does not do: Contrary to the various expressions of public concern, the clause does not:

(a) Preclude any vessel owner from bidding on a Government charter. Any owner of a vessel that has traded with Israel and who is prepared to take the calculated risk may offer his ship.

(b) Assist any boycott in any manner. The test of this statement is simple: Elimination of the clause would not change by one iota the posture of the boycott or the status of any vessel offered to MSTS. Its elimination would not enable any vessel to get into any port otherwise barred to it. Its elimination would not enable any vessel to perform that could not otherwise perform.

(c) Require a vessel owner to choose between serving Arab countries or Israel. (Such an allegation has been made.) The clause does not forbid trading with Israel. It cautions owners who have previously made a choice to trade with Israel of the risk of Arab boycott.

6. The clause was adopted with no intention to give support to any political boycott. It was deemed advantageous to both the Government and shipowners. However, MSTS can accomplish its mission without using the clause. Inasmuch as it has been mistakenly construed as providing some solace to the Arab boycott imposed on persons trading with Israel, the Navy will discontinue its use.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I hope the U.S. Government will never again permit itself to become in any way, either directly or indirectly, associated with what is obviously an attempt to coerce owners of American ships into not engaging in business with a friendly nation such as Israel.

The understandings relating to the Suez Canal arrived at in 1956 at the United Nations, following the British-French-Israeli action toward Egypt, finally boiled down to recognition that the Suez Canal would be an open waterway, and would not in any way be used to discriminate against legitimate shipping.

Regrettably, that has not been followed. What is more, the Arabs have maintained a boycott, not only against Israeli shipping, but also against cargoes intended for any Israeli port. And they have also maintained a boycott even against American personnel of

Jewish faith from being admitted to Arab land. They have gone so far as to pressure American-owned firms with which they deal from even employing Jews for work right here in the United States of America.

These actions by the Arab countries cannot be condoned by our Government. I call to the attention of our responsible Government officials the fact that the Mutual Security Act of last year, with the Morse amendment, made quite clear that in the administration of the mutual security program there was to be a determined effort by our Government to prevent such discrimination against American nationals of Jewish faith.

I hope the incident which has been commented upon here today by the Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING] and myself will serve to remind our officials that despite the inconveniences which may result to our Government, we should not in any way tolerate such action by the Arabs against the United States or the boycotts or embargoes in which the Arabs have indulged.

I thank the Senator from New York for yielding to me. Will he permit me to make a further statement at this time?

Mr. KEATING. Certainly.

U.S. PARTICIPATION IN THE WORLD COURT

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, pending before the Foreign Relations Committee is my resolution, Senate Resolution 94, to repeal the self-judging clause contained in our declaration of acceptance of the jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice.

A splendid article by Walter Lippmann on this resolution was published in the Minneapolis Morning Tribune of February 15. The article is entitled "United States Has Obligation Before World Court." I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

UNITED STATES HAS OBLIGATION BEFORE WORLD COURT

(By Walter Lippmann)

The Senate Foreign Relations Committee has been holding hearings on a resolution which, curiously and remarkably, was introduced by Senator HUMPHREY and has the ardent support of Vice President NIXON. This, as Mr. K. might say, is an instance where a shrimp has whistled.

The Humphrey resolution has the full backing of the administration and it is likely to command the support of the Democratic leadership. There are, to be sure, dissenters who are seriously worried that the acceptance of the resolution will be an abdication of American sovereignty.

But they are a small minority compared with the huge nonpartisan majority which includes so many of the leading lawyers of the country.

The Humphrey resolution would repeal what is known as the Connally amendment to the original Senate Resolution No. 196. This resolution, adopted in 1946, called for the deposit of a declaration accepting the compulsory jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice. This is the Court set up under the charter of the United Nations. The United States was perhaps its leading advocate.

Before the Connally amendment was adopted, the 1946 resolution said that "in relation to any other state accepting the same obligation" the United States accepts the compulsory jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice "in all legal disputes" which come under four classes of cases.

The International Court is to have compulsory jurisdiction in a dispute about (1) the interpretation of a treaty, (2) any question of international law, (3) the existence of any fact which, if established, would constitute a breach of an international obligation, and (4) the nature or extent of the reparation to be made for the breach of an international obligation.

The 1946 Senate resolution says expressly where the compulsory jurisdiction of the Court shall not apply. Of these reservations, the important one is that the Court shall not have jurisdiction in a "dispute with regard to matters which are essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of the United States."

The question was then raised in the Senate as to how it was to be decided whether a matter is or is not essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of the United States.

The Senate answered this question by accepting the Connally amendment, which added six words to the original text. Because of this amendment the question of whether a matter is essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of the United States is to be "determined by the United States." This is the amendment that both HUMPHREY and NIXON want to repeal.

As the law stands today, the U.S. Government has the right to exclude the Court whenever it desires to do so, without having to prove or to argue its position when it declares that the case is "domestic."

This means that while we have agreed to compulsory jurisdiction in legal disputes, we have in fact reserved the right to stop the Court's proceedings. As a result, no other nation with which we have a dispute can be compelled to come before the Court.

What is sauce for the goose is also sauce for the gander. Under the Connally amendment we cannot be sued without our consent. But equally we cannot sue anyone else without his consent.

This reduces the International Court of Justice to a kind of small sideshow. It is no doubt the reason why, despite all the international disputes with which the world is beset, the International Court has so few cases before it.

The question raised in Congress now is whether our Government or the International Court itself shall decide whether a matter is domestic. The dissenters, who believe that the amendment must be retained, argue that the Court might take jurisdiction in a dispute which challenged our tariff laws, our immigration laws, our currency laws, our administration of the Panama Canal.

These fears, though understandable, are groundless. If the Court took jurisdiction in domestic matters, it would be violating its own statute which expressly limits its jurisdiction to international legal disputes.

It is conceivable, although unlikely, that the Court might violate the law which created it. But if it did that, there would be a remedy. We would have an indubitable grievance and we would be entitled, legally and morally, to challenge the Court by political action in the United Nations.

There is, therefore, no risk which would leave us helpless. On the other hand, the advantages of building up the jurisdiction of the Court are very great. Perhaps the most important is one the Vice President pointed out in an address last April.

If the richer nations, like the United States, are to export capital to assist the underdeveloped countries, there must be legal security for the investments they make. To create that security the International Court can have a big part to play.

Indeed, in view of what is happening in this hemisphere to affect American property abroad, we have an interest that every property dispute, as with Castro today, should be decided by a court and not be left to propaganda, agitation, coercion and force.

But if we want to be able to go to court to protect our rights, we must be willing to go to court when someone else has a grievance against us.

THE DISARMAMENT MESS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, if the Senator from New York will yield further, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "The Disarmament Mess," written by Joseph Alsop, and published today in the Washington Post. In the article Mr. Alsop discusses a tragic situation which I, myself, have been speaking about, both in the Senate, in recent weeks, and in various parts of the country. This national tragedy is the fact that the United States has been unable to formulate any kind of either long-range or short-range disarmament policy. We invited the representatives of four Western nations to come to Washington to work out a joint Western disarmament policy; but these representatives have had to mark time while our State Department, Defense Department, and the Atomic Energy Commission argued and fought among themselves about what kind of a disarmament policy the United States ought to have.

As I have stated many times in the past, it is understandable that the various departments of government should have varying viewpoints about such crucial matters as defense and disarmament policies. But our Government and this administration have failed to exercise the necessary leadership to see that these viewpoints were reconciled rapidly into a definite policy. This state of affairs in disarmament matters has been going on for the past 5 years.

Unfortunately the situation seems to get worse, instead of better. We can be thankful for our allies, I believe, because without their prompting the situation might even be worse, if such can be imagined. I may say that there is a ray of hope that by the time the meetings are held in Washington with representatives of the four allied nations, some tentative or interim understanding will have been reached. However, there has not yet been a firm agreement between our Government and our allies. A meeting for a definite agreement will be held in March in Paris.

Mr. Alsop has rendered a real service by writing the article. Perhaps more people will now realize the serious situation that confronts us only 1 month prior to the opening of disarmament negotiations. No doubt we shall have some policy by the time the negotiations open. I have talked to Mr. Frederick Eaton, the chief of our delegation of the disarmament matter, about this problem; and he has assured me that some progress has been made, and that more will be made. Mr. Eaton, I feel sure, will be a competent negotiator. But one has to have a policy to negotiate about.

I am sure that my Republican colleagues on the other side of the aisle, in the interest of their party, as well as the interest of their country, will begin raising questions with the White House. On occasion they may have thought I was trying to be partisan when I have tried to bring these matters to light. This is not a partisan matter, and we cannot hide these facts from the American people. We must speak out, because that may be the only way in which our President and our Vice President will learn of the unfortunate "disarmament mess," as Mr. Alsop calls it, facing the country.

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

THE DISARMAMENT MESS

(By Joseph Alsop)

During the past fortnight, this city has offered a spectacle that has been richly comic, not a little humiliating, and almost incredible, all at once.

Ministerial representatives of Britain, France, Italy, and Canada came here close to 2 weeks ago, in order to discuss with the American Government the Western position on disarmament. East-West disarmament talks are due to be reopened on March 15. After that date looms the summit meeting, in May, with top level disarmament talks conspicuous on the agenda. The need for an agreed Western position is therefore urgent, to put it mildly.

Yet for 10 days the American policymakers had to avoid substantive discussions with British, French, Italian, and Canadian guests, for the beautifully simple, frankly confessed reason that the American Government had not yet decided what its own position on disarmament ought to be.

Last Tuesday, a lame, empty American position paper was offered to the allied conferees, but this not only failed to satisfy the British, French, and other Allied representatives. It also by no means represented the views of the State Department. And as these words are written, the final, intra-administration debate about the American disarmament position is at least underway.

These extraordinary facts are far from exhausting this episode's sheer fantasy. American and Soviet negotiators had been talking about disarmament, almost nonstop, from 1955 onward until a year or so ago. But last summer, a new committee headed by the Boston lawyer, Charles Coolidge, was suddenly named for the avowed purpose of making up the American Government's mind about disarmament.

While the Coolidge Committee labored, our diplomats freely told our allies that they could not tackle the disarmament problem until the Coolidge Committee had made up the administration's mind about it. At length, a report emerged from the Committee's labors. It was promptly christened the mouse in the inner circle, since it included virtually no disarmament proposals at all. And for this reason, the report was promptly interred as altogether too fruitless.

By this time, another lawyer, the able New Yorker, Frederick Eaton, had been named to present the U.S. brief on disarmament. But Eaton had no brief to present after the internment of the Coolidge report. So the struggle began all over again. And it went on long enough to leave this country's representatives at first irresolutely mute and then dimly mumbling, at a conference with Western allied representatives planned many weeks earlier.

The reason for all this is a deep division in the Government. The State Department, and especially Secretary of State Christian A. Herter, thinks that we must certainly talk about nuclear disarmament, if we talk about disarmament at all. The Atomic Energy Commission and particularly the Commission chairman, John R. McCone, favors discussion of nuclear disarmament with extra emphasis on the need for a broad framework of general disarmament. But the Defense Department policymakers, and above all the Joint Chiefs of Staff, have taken the position that any discussion of nuclear disarmament is unthinkable.

On the one hand, the old psychology of nuclear monopoly obstinately survives in the Pentagon, in flat defiance of the grim facts of recent history. On the other hand, it is thought to be too expensive and too painful, nowadays, for Western nations to put ground armies in the field, as they once used to do. Hence the Pentagon argues that the West dare not lay down its nuclear weapons while confronted with the populous hordes of Russians and Chinese.

It was this psychology that made the Coolidge report so mouselike. It was this psychology that caused the American position paper of last Tuesday to be such an impoverished thing, including no really major proposals, and with no commitment in all its six pages to discuss nuclear disarmament at any time, even in the distant future after proved success in the so-called first stages.

After the British, French, and the rest protested this position paper's emptiness, Secretary Herter was at length enabled to appeal the great issue to President Eisenhower. Essentially, the question Herter has had to ask the President is whether or not we really want disarmament, after having given vent to so much moral blather on the subject. All the trouble arose, of course, from the President's failure to decide this absolutely basic question at the very outset.

This is dangerous trouble, too. There are clear signs of the same kind of split in the Soviet Government that exists in the American Government, with the majority, headed by Nikita S. Khrushchev, really wanting to see whether serious disarmament is not possible. There is one chance in three, or four, or five of really accomplishing something. But the chance will surely pass if the American Government merely continues to flounder in its self-made bog of interdepartmental committees.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that excerpts from two speeches on the subject of disarmament, which I recently delivered before the Commonwealth Club, in San Francisco, on February 12, and at the National Roosevelt Day Dinner, in New York City, on January 28, be printed in the RECORD. In those addresses I discussed many facets of disarmament, including one which was the topic of Mr. Joseph Alsop's excellent article, published today, which I have inserted in the RECORD.

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

DISARMAMENT

(Excerpts from the address by Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY to the National Roosevelt Day dinner, New York City, January 28, 1960)

"To some generations," President Roosevelt once said, "much is given. Of other generations, much is expected."

To our generation, more has been given than to any in history. And of us even more is expected.

For to us falls the supreme task of finding peace in a most unpeaceful world—a world divided by antagonisms and boiling with revolutions, armed as the world was never armed before, with the capability of total destruction.

Tonight, by striving with our minds and our hearts towards the goal of a just and enduring peace, we best honor Franklin D. Roosevelt.

I am not one who believes that peace can be assured simply by reminding ourselves and our adversaries of the unspeakable horrors of war.

Neither do I believe that peace can be secured by one-sided disarmament—whether based on principle or parsimony.

Co-existence is not peace. It is two garrisoned states walled in by mutual fear and distrust. A policy with no goal beyond co-existence does not lead to peace.

Let me say wherein I see the hope for peace.

I believe we must first have a vision of the kind of world where peace can dwell.

In my vision I look toward a world in which power will no longer be polarized between two giant forces, but balanced among many. In which Europe, revived and united, will be a powerful middle force. In which a democratic and prosperous India will speak with the full authority of her land and her people. In which the states of Africa will join in taming their rich continent. In which the new technology will spread its blessings to the ends of the earth and unto all the inhabitants thereof.

I look toward a time when the chinks in the Iron Curtain will become windows and doors through which ideas and people can pass freely, eastward and westward; when the maturing of the Soviet economy will bring in its train the liberalizing influence of a higher standard of living; when thought will break the bonds of dogma and politics.

I look toward a world in which differences among nations will be eroded by time and understanding; where common interests will overshadow mutual antagonisms; where, perhaps, a new world civilization will be in the making, building on the best the old world has to offer.

The 21st century could be the century of the United Nations. In such a world there could be peace, under law.

I believe we have it in our power to bring that kind of world into being. But we will have to be idealistic enough to seek it, and realistic enough to recognize what we must do to achieve it. And we will have to do better than we have been doing—far better.

Three great tests challenge us:

For the first time in history men everywhere have seen the vision of banishing want from their daily lives. They see the means at hand, and they demand the opportunity.

Are we appointed to tell them it is not yet time, that they should be patient with poverty?

Shall we expect them to understand about balanced budgets and balance of payments, until we can shake loose what we can spare of our affluence?

I say it is given to us to use our affluence and our inexhaustible technology to help men make a reality of rising expectations. Not grudgingly and in driblets, but to the limit of our capacity.

Can we do this? Yes, we can.

Will we? That is the test. It is not alone the Soviet challenge that demands it, but the challenge of a world in which peace is possible.

A second test lies closer at home: the test of our ability to declare our purposes, to muster our resources, to plan our future.

We do well to recall these words of Demosthenes to the Athenians:

"The worst feature of the past is our best hope for the future. What, then, is that feature? It is that your affairs go wrong because you neglect every duty, great or small; since surely, if they were in this plight in spite of your doing all that was required, there would not be even hope of improvement. But in fact it is your indifference and carelessness that Philip has conquered.

Your city he has not conquered. Nor have you been—no; you have not even made a move."

We, too, have not even made a move. We are lost in our indifference and carelessness. We are indifferent to the persistence of poverty in our own country. Indifferent to the neglect of our public investments and public services. Careless of the rights and liberties of millions of American citizens. Heedless of the needs of our growing population.

I say it is time to stop this. Let us stop gloating over the size of our national product and ask ourselves what we are doing with it. Let us stop congratulating ourselves on the miraculous rise of productivity in industry and agriculture and ask ourselves how to harness it to our most important needs. Let us have a litle less preaching of freedom and a little more practice of civil rights.

The test is whether a democratic country can plan its future and manage its affairs to good purpose and to good effect. That is a test we took in our stride during two World Wars. We can do it again for peace.

The third test is to lift the shadow of nuclear war, to gain the time in which peace can be secured. This can be done only by agreement between the United States and the Soviet Union.

Such an agreement cannot wait on the settlement of all the complex political and territorial questions that divide West and East. We must be prepared to negotiate, and we must negotiate, on any aspect of the control of armaments where there is the least hope for a workable agreement. But we must know what we want.

Not once in all the long series of conferences has the United States entered the negotiations adequately prepared. Not once has our Government known what it wanted to achieve. We have a mere handful of people working on this vast and technical subject on which the future of civilization itself depends. We have never allocated enough from the budget's billions for studies needed to translate the ideal of disarmament into a series of practicable steps toward that ideal.

In 6 weeks we will be entering disarmament negotiations with nine countries. We still have no policy. We still do not know what we want to propose there. Again we will be forced to negotiate within the Soviet frame of reference. Again the Soviet Union will have the initiative and will reap the reward in world opinion.

But there is too much at stake for partisanship. I remain convinced that the indispensable first step toward disarmament is an agreement for the cessation of nuclear testing under effective inspection and control. The United States must not start testing again as long as negotiations show that there is no real hope for such an agreement. And we must put all the skill and determination of both of our political parties behind achieving that agreement.

Even as we explore every possibility of agreement we must use the time to build our own strength. If there is one thing more than any other that will encourage the Soviets to drag their feet in negotiations for arms control it is the hope that an American Government will do for them what they could not do for themselves: reduce the United States to a second-class power.

The Russians know as well as you and I the effects of 7 long years of Republican rule on the strength of the United States.

In 7 years we have lost that preeminence in science and technology, which was our first and firmest line of defense.

Our schools and colleges labor under an accumulating deficit of neglect.

Our housing and our cities deteriorate faster than we can renew them.

Everywhere are unmet needs, neglected opportunities. These—not the $15 billion added to the national debt—are the measures of the failures of these last 7 years.

The Russians know this, without spying. The American people know. The whole world knows.

Only the President and the Treasury are unmoved.

No more frightening or shocking statement has come out of Washington than that the President made in a revealing moment of pique when he was asked about the Soviet claim to be able to hit any place in the world with a nuclear-armed missile. He replied:

"They (the Russians) also said 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?"

Does this reasoning make our defenses adequate?

The same answer might have been given on oversea investment, or education, or hydroelectric development. The Russians didn't invent them, but they know how to turn them to their purposes.

The Russians didn't invent the automobile and the flying machine, but they did invent sputnik and they planted a rocket on the moon.

They didn't invent the Marshall plan, but they see the strategic importance of investment in developing countries.

They didn't invent TVA, but they understand its economic and political significance.

And they can read the President's budget. They can learn how little our Government has learned.

They can see that the prospect of paring the national debt is more important to our Government than an adequate long-range program of investment in the countries where the future of peace and democracy will be decided. Some call this investment foreign aid; I call it self-preservation.

The Russians can see in the budget that we are stubbornly determined to neglect our own national needs: our education system, our metropolitan cities, our farms, our forests, our resources of flowing and falling waters.

We can see it, too. If, as the new doctrine has it, intentions rather than capabilities are the determinants of power, we must appear weak indeed.

Oh, for a government of courage and vision and action, with the firm intent to use our great capabilities for power and strength.

The greatest danger is not that we cannot reach our destiny, but that we will neglect to grasp for it. Complacency and flaccid ease can defeat us, where nothing else could. It is our supreme business—yours and mine—to see that they do not.

My friends, I have great hopes and great confidence in this country and its people. I think, if they have not answered the summons, it is because they have not heard it. They have not heard it because it has been muffled and uncertain. I know that when it is loud and clear and unmistakable they will rise to the tasks that history has laid upon this generation.

Disarmament: A Central Aim of Foreign Policy

(Excerpts from remarks by Senator Hubert H. Humphrey before the Commonwealth Club, San Francisco, Calif., February 12, 1960)

I want to talk to you today about the problem which concerns us more profoundly, I think, than any other problem on our overcrowded national agenda.

We are all worried about many things—about the slowdown in the pace of our economic growth; about the continued denial of equal rights and opportunities to American citizens on the grounds of race, color, or religion; about the disgraceful inadequacy of our educational system to our expanding population and our national needs; about the allocation of an insufficient amount of our national abundance to public purposes; about the materialism and cynicism in our national moral life.

All these things, and many others, cause us deep concern. But the thing which haunts us most of all, I believe, is the question of war and peace.

The supreme task of our time is to find peace in this most unpeaceful world—a world torn by antagonisms, divided by ideologies, on fire with revolution—a world armed, for the first time in history, with the ultimate power, the power of self-obliteration.

There is no royal road to peace in such a world. Yet to renounce the search for peace is to commit us indefinitely to the theory that war can only be abolished by the permanent threat of war—that terror can only be eliminated by having a precarious and unstable balance of terror. It commits us to an everlasting arms race. It commits an ever-increasing amount of our resources to the making of guns and bombs and missiles. It commits us to deep and eternal tensions. It establishes the world forever as a collection of besieged states, each one bristling with armed power and suspicion and hate.

What a repellent destiny for mankind. Yet the fact that it is repellent does not mean that it cannot happen.

Serious issues divide the Communist states from the free states. We cannot pretend that these issues do not exist. We cannot pretend that communism does not offer the gravest possible threat to freedom. We cannot for one moment relax our guard or our vigilance. Given the Communist purpose and the Communist power, we have no alternative, in the present situation, but to build our own armed strength in order to prevent the balance of terror from turning against us.

Let me make this absolutely clear: No one hates the arms race more than I do; but, if I am sure of anything, it is that unilateral disarmament is no way out. We must redouble our efforts in the missile program and in the contest for space. We must show that we can stay in the race as long as our opponents. I say this because I know that this is the only way to convince them that they have no alternative except to join with us in bringing the race to an end.

Some proponents of unilateral disarmament have a considered belief that the Communist world means us no harm. Others have a considered belief that the capitalist world cannot afford to do what is necessary for its own defense. Unilateral disarmament is bad whether proceeding from principal or parsimony. We can never achieve peace by a policy of cutting down our own strength in advance of a general disarmament agreement.

The arms race is the center of the threat to humanity. For this reason, dealing with the arms race should be, in my judgment, the center of American foreign policy. As peace is our object, so controlled world disarmament is the key to peace. Once we can achieve this, then the political and territorial problems which tear the world apart will become relatively manageable. Until we achieve this, political and territorial settlements will be vain and illusory.

Nothing seems to me more self-evident than the understanding that disarmament, based on reliable inspection and control, affords the only chance of delivering the world from this terrifying and disastrous arms race.

Nothing depresses me more about recent American foreign policy than the low priority which disarmament has enjoyed in our dealings with the outside world.

Instead of being the center of our policy, disarmament has been on the periphery.

Instead of being a matter for top policymakers, it has been a matter for underlings.

Instead of our leaders taking every occasion and seizing every opportunity to identify the United States with the cause of disarmament, we have let the Communists reap most of the propaganda benefit from disarmament talk and have systematically presented ourselves to the world as the Nation throwing constant obstacles in the way of what the people of the world most desperately want.

Not once in all the long series of conferences has the United States entered negotiations properly prepared. Not once has our Government known what it wanted to achieve. We have a mere handful of people working on this vast and technical subject on which the future of civilization depends. We spend billions—and rightly so—to build new weapons; but we recoil at spending millions to learn how to control them.

I say that the time has come to stop treating the disarmament effort as a poor relation, to be kept in an unheated garret and fed scraps left over from the Pentagon table.

I say that the time has come to make disarmament a top priority in our foreign policy.

I say that the time has come for a President of the United States to make controlled world disarmament his personal cause and his personal crusade so that the people of the world will understand that the American Government is exploring every possibility in its fight to lift from the world the black shadow of nuclear war.

I say the time has come for a President to take the disarmament offensive against Khrushchev.

If disarmament is the key to peace, detection and inspection provide the key to disarmament. The technical problems in this field are very great; many critical problems remain to be solved. We must make the progress toward their solution a major national effort.

We had a crash program to build the bomb. Now we need a crash program to control it. We need a Manhattan project for peace. And we need a National Peace Agency to run the crash peace program.

This is not a problem for Republicans or Democrats. It is a problem for all Americans. It is time for us all to unite in the determination to make disarmament the central American issue. It is time for us so to bombard the Communists with schemes for inspection and control of all weapons that either they will accept a workable disarmament plan or else they will be exposed before the world as the real enemies of peace.

Why aren't we doing this already?

Well, one reason, I think, is that such a policy will require a great deal of administrative vigor and executive energy—vigor and energy to unite all branches of the Government behind such a policy.

Another reason is the obsession with balancing the budget. This obsession has led the Government to deny the Nation adequate funds for our national defense—which means that the Russians, convinced that we are probably going to let our defensive position deteriorate anyway, have no real incentive to submit to a scheme for arms control. It is the Communist hope that an American Government will do for them what they could not do for themselves: reduce the United States to a second-class power.

And this same obsession with budget-balancing denies our scientists and engineers the funds necessary for research on disarmament—research necessary to achieve the technical breakthroughs which will improve our systems of detection and inspection and make international arms control a practical reality.

If we accept the policy of controlled world disarmament, we must accept the implications of this policy.

One basic implication has to do with the nations to be inspected. Obviously any substantial arms control plan which leaves out Communist China would be meaningless. Without China in an arms control agreement, the entire power balance in the world would be dangerously upset. National security and world security alike demand the inclusion of Communist China in major arms control agreements.

Unfortunately Communist China is still highly irresponsible and aggressive. It may take the combined persuasiveness of the Soviet Union, the United States and all the countries of Asia to impress on Peiping the need to forego plans of aggression and to cease its defiance of the international community. Strange as it may seem to think of Soviet-American cooperation to persuade China to participate in a disarmament agreement, the world situation may yet produce such a result.

No problem in the world is more urgent than disarmament. No peace will be reliable until we have solved it. No responsibility will rest more fatefully on the next administration than the responsibility of restoring American leadership in the cause of disarmament.

As we solve this problem, then we can press forward on the other fronts necessary to bring about genuine peace.

Peace has to be something more than the absence of war. Peace must mean justice, freedom and opportunity for all the people of the world.

To achieve all the dimensions of peace will take generations, perhaps centuries. But, unless we embark on this effort soon, we may lose forever the chance to preserve the kind of world to which we, as Americans, have always been dedicated.

Why should we surrender our dream of freedom to the world of tyranny?

In my vision I look toward a world in which power will no longer be polarized between two giant forces, but balanced among many. In which Europe, revived and united, will be a powerful middle force. In which a democratic and prosperous India will speak with the full authority of her land and her people. In which the states of Africa will join in taming their rich continent. In which the new technology will spread its blessings to the ends of the earth and unto all the inhabitants thereof.

I look toward a time when the chinks in the Iron Curtain will become windows and doors through which ideas and people can pass freely, eastward and westward; when the maturing of the Soviet economy will bring in its train the liberalizing influence of a higher standard of living; when thought will break the bonds of dogma and politics.

I look toward a world in which differences among nations will be eroded by time and understanding; where common interests will overshadow mutual antagonisms; where, perhaps, a new world civilization will be in the making, building on the best the old world has to offer.

The 21st century could be the century of the United Nations. In such a world there could be peace, under law.

I say to you, with all the soberness at my command, that the fight for peace is the supreme issue of our lifetime.

I say to you that, unless the American Government dedicates its energy and resources to the achievement of workable world disarmament, we will have forfeited our claim to the leadership of free peoples.

And I say to you that, whatever the politicians and the makers of high policy think, this is what the American people want and demand. Neither the people of our own land nor the people of the world will be satisfied until the leaders of every great nation prove by words and deeds their absolute commitment to the search for peace.

OPPOSITION TO EXTENSION OF KLM AIRLINE ROUTES IN THE UNITED STATES

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield to me?

Mr. KEATING. I yield, provided it is understood that in yielding to the Senator from New Hampshire, I shall not lose the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, in 1957, when a delegation from the Netherlands was in this country, to negotiate a bilateral air transport agreement with the United States, in a speech on the floor of the Senate, I deplored the action of the Department of State in making grants to the Netherlands far beyond what was deserved. The views which I expressed at that time were also expressed by the Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, the Chamber of Commerce of the United States, the Civil Aeronautics Board, and every U.S. airline who was interested and knowledgeable in the international field.

Despite my protests and those of many of my distinguished colleagues, the Department of State nevertheless made what I considered to be an excessive grant of air transport rights to the Government of the Netherlands.

One thing which the Government of the Netherlands sought at that time, but which the Department of State did not grant, was a route to the west coast. The Government of the Netherlands has continued to press, however, for rights to operate this route. Recently, a Netherlands delegation came to the United States, for the purpose of securing such rights. It is my information that the Department of State, with the recommendation and full concurrence of the Civil Aeronautics Board, has refused to make the grant. I should like to congratulate the Department of State for the soundness and firmness of this decision.

It should be emphasized that those who oppose the grant to the Netherlands of a route from the west coast are not taking a position which imposes a burden upon our friends on the west coast. My opposition, at least, is based upon the necessity for this Government to begin now to recognize the need to support its own U.S. airlines, and not to continue in a program of giving to other countries vital and lucrative route grants that are not warranted.

I should also like to say that I do not approve of the tremendous pressure which has been built up to procure air routes for KLM. In this connection, let me make it very clear that I hold the Government and the people of the Netherlands in the highest regard. Our two countries enjoy, and, I trust, will continue to enjoy, the friendliest of relations. However, this controversy is not

to be decided on emotional grounds. Instead, it should be decided on its merits. As I have stated, my compelling interest is in seeing that adequate protection and support are afforded U.S. air carriers.

I commend the Department of State for its position it has taken; and I express the hope that in the future it will continue to guard as carefully as it has here the interests of our own air-transport system.

NEGOTIATED COST-PLUS CONTRACTS

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield briefly to me?

Mr. KEATING. Yes, if it is understood that in yielding to the Senator from Delaware, I shall not lose the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I thank the Senator from New York.

Mr. President, within the past 2 years the Comptroller General has submitted to the Congress numerous reports calling our attention to the indefensible manner in which the Defense Department is wasting millions of dollars through the procedure of using negotiated or cost-plus contracts when competitive bidding would have been practical.

Under date of February 15, 1960, the Comptroller General submitted another report in which he called our attention to an unnecessary expenditure of $1,300,000 in the Department of the Air Force under circumstances which, to say the least, represent carelessness, if not deliberate waste.

This report of the Comptroller General's shows that the Government has borne increased costs because prices proposed by Fairchild and accepted by the prime contractor, Boeing Airplane Co., Seattle, Wash., in subcontract price-redetermination negotiations for B-52 wing and fin assemblies were excessive. Fairchild's proposed prices included estimated prices for component parts which Fairchild either knew or, based on past experience, should have expected would be reduced by voluntary price reductions by the supplier. Fairchild received and did not pass on to the Government reductions of about $1,300,000 in the estimated prices for these parts included in proposals for redetermination of subcontract prices.

Under these prime contracts, Boeing awarded subcontracts to Fairchild for outboard wing assemblies and vertical fin assemblies. These subcontracts were subject to subsequent price redetermination. For example, Boeing's purchase orders 739301 and 739303, issued under contract 28223, were subject to the terms of master purchase order 739305-8219 dated December 20, 1954, which provided for 10 percent upward or unlimited downward revision of the purchase order prices based on cost data to be furnished by Fairchild by May 28, 1956. Firm fixed prices were to be established on the basis of this cost data furnished by Fairchild.

Fairchild used the prices which it had established for parts furnished by a certain supplier, Research Designing Service, Inc., Centerline, Mich., in its proposals submitted to Boeing for redetermination of subcontract prices under the B-52 program. Research, however, had made frequent price reductions and, based on this experience, it should have been recognized that the prices proposed to Boeing were considerably higher than the costs which actually would be incurred. During the period March 25, 1955, to December 20, 1957, the supplier made voluntary price reductions, totaling $2,339,302, pertaining to Fairchild's subcontracts under the B-52 program, consisting of cash refunds of $1,276,304 and purchase order price reductions of $1,062,998. A substantial portion of the price reductions was received by Fairchild prior to price negotiations with Boeing for the subcontracts to which the reductions pertained. Therefore, it was unreasonable for Fairchild to base its price proposals to Boeing on the supplier's purchase order prices without giving appropriate consideration to reductions already received and to the probable further price reductions.

Voluntary cash refunds, totaling $1,276,304, directly applicable to subcontracts under four B-52 prime contracts were received from Research by Fairchild during calendar years 1956 and 1957. Only $253,158 of this amount had actually been passed on to the Government as of June 1959.

The remaining $1,023,146 had been retained by Fairchild or credited to commercial business. No evidence was found to indicate that the Government would receive any further benefit from this amount.

To make this situation even worse, the Government also incurred additional costs of $50,100 because certain of the cash refunds were applied as a reduction of Fairchild's cost of performing an incentive-type prime contract. This portion of the refunds was inappropriately retained by Fairchild as incentive profit.

Under the circumstances, the Government, rather than Fairchild, should have received the benefit of all these cash refunds and purchase order price reductions which were made by the supplier. Accordingly, the Comptroller General is recommending to the Secretary of the Air Force that action be taken to recover for the Government the full amount of the cash refunds and price reductions received by Fairchild under the B-52 program, but not passed on to the Government, including the portion retained by Fairchild as incentive profit. He is also recommending to the Secretary of the Air Force that contracting personnel be required to assure themselves, to the extent practicable through examination of contractors' records and procedures, that prime contractors and subcontractors pass on to the Government appropriate credit for significant price reductions made by suppliers.

There can be no defense for these many examples of inexcusable waste in the Defense Department's procurement of military supplies as are being periodically called to our attention by the Comptroller General.

In recent weeks there has been a regular parade of admirals and generals before the Congress, each urging an increase in the appropriations of his particular department over the amount recommended by the budget.

I most respectfully suggest to each of these military authorities that if they will direct a little more of their attention toward eliminating these many examples of unnecessary extravagance as are being systematically reported by the Comptroller General, they may find they already have enough money to provide for our defense needs.

It has been conservatively estimated that if Congress would pass a law demanding that these agencies award contracts on a competitive bid basis in all instances except when such procedure would not be feasible from a security standpoint, our defense costs would be reduced by hundreds of millions of dollars.

At a later date, I shall resubmit, as an amendment to the military construction bill, the so-called competitive bid amendment, and ask that the Armed Services Committee approve that amendment as a part of the bill it will report.

INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION ADMINISTRATION

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield to me?

Mr. KEATING. I yield to the Senator from Arkansas under the same unanimous-consent request I made with repect to yielding to the Senator from Delaware.

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

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, every time the International Cooperation Administration makes a mistake in administering economic aid overseas, someone is sure to place the matter in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. It is regrettable that when the ICA does something right, publicity rarely results.

In order to put charges of mismanagement in the administration of foreign aid in perspective, I therefore ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD at this point a letter which I received last November, making charges about irregularities in ICA procurement, together with the letter which I have just received from ICA, explaining what was done about the irregularities.

The interesting thing about this exchange is that on the day after the letter making the charge of irregularities was written, a Federal judge imposed a criminal penalty against the man charged with irregularities.

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

G. ROSEKILLY MACHINERY,
San Mateo, Calif., November 23, 1959.

Hon. Senator FULBRIGHT,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Thank you for sending me the "hearings" regarding the situation in Vietnam, together with a copy of the develop-

ment loan law, and other interesting information, which I have now finished reading.

You may not know that we supplied some generator sets to an importer here, delivering them f.o.b. Los Angeles docks for $23,500, he, collecting from ICA, we understand, $165,000 without as much as laying a hand on one box. These went to Saigon.

We do not believe this man—Frank Y. Lee—should keep out of jail.

We do not know the end result of your committee hearings but would expect a "whitewash" in view of the way the questions were asked, and the answers that were accepted. If you have any further hearings, I have quite a file that the ICA boys will have trouble talking away.

Would you like another current gem? ICA put out by airmail a request for bids on a great quantity of aluminum power cable for Thailand. We airmailed the advance word to our correspondent in Japan, who immediately went to work on it. On receiving the full information and bid forms from ICA, also by airmail from us and to us, we have a cable from Japan, that they already have had the matter for 3 weeks and are working on it direct.

How does Japan get the information nearly 3 weeks before we do?

May we wish you and yours a very happy Thanksgiving, probably away down in Arkansas—good food down there.

Thanking you,

Respectfully yours,

G. ROSEKILLY.

INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION ADMINISTRATION,
OFFICE OF THE DIRECTOR,
Washington, D.C., February 3, 1960.

The Honorable J. W. FULBRIGHT,
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Relations, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This is in further reference to your letter of December 22, 1959, and our interim reply of December 31, 1959, concerning the procurement of generator sets financed by the International Cooperation Administration. I am pleased to inform you of the action that ICA has taken with respect to irregularities in this procurement.

The shipment of generator sets referred to in Mr. Rosekilly's letter was made by Timothy Chew & Co., 1122 Powell Street, San Francisco, to Thao Poum, Vientiane, Laos, on September 28, 1956. The contract amount for this equipment, $116,430, was financed against ICA Procurement Authorization No. 39-710-99-A6-6202. Payment was made in accordance with usual ICA procedures, payment to the supplier being under a commercial letter of credit on presentation of the supplier's invoice and shipping documents.

In the course of a routine price analysis by ICA it was determined that Timothy Chew & Co., as supplier, invoiced equipment at prices which grossly exceeded the price limitations as set forth by section 201.21 of ICA Regulation 1, as amended. This agency computed the overpricing to be approximately $90,000 on this transaction.

The ICA Inspection Division, Office of Personnel, Security, and Integrity, then conducted an investigation of all phases of this generator procurement. The investigation was carried on in the United States as well as in Laos and Thailand. Upon establishment of the existence of facts of an incriminating nature, the case was turned over to the Federal Bureau of Investigation for domestic investigation, inasmuch as that Bureau has primary jurisdiction in cases of fraud against the U.S. Government.

On February 25, 1959, the Federal grand jury, San Francisco, returned an indictment charging Timothy Chung Chew and Frank Y. O. Lee on one count with having falsified statements in documents (ICA Form 280) submitted to the U.S. Government in conjunction with the sale of the five ICA-financed generator sets to Thao Poum, Laos.

Mr. Frank Y. O. Lee entered a plea of guilty, and, on November 24, 1959, U.S. District Judge George B. Harris imposed a 2-year suspended prison sentence. Mr. Lee was placed on probation for 5 years and fined $10,000. The charges against Timothy Chung Chew were dismissed.

The assistant U.S. attorney, San Francisco, does not contemplate any further criminal action in this case. The case is now pending with the Civil Division, Department of Justice, Washington, D.C., for civil action.

We have appreciated the opportunity to explain the outcome of ICA review of this procurement. With respect to the question raised about power cable in the latter portion of Mr. Rosekilly's letter, our mission in Thailand has been requested to provide full clarification as to the mode and method of advertisement of the requirement. You will be informed of the facts as soon as the awaited reply is received.

With every good wish,

Sincerely yours,

JAMES W. RIDDLEBERGER.

INTERNATIONAL BANK FOR RECONSTRUCTION AND DEVELOPMENT

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, on several occasions in recent weeks it has been suggested by Members of this body that the people of the United States are carrying too much more than our fair share of the free world's burdens. On this general proposition, there are, I am sure, differences of opinion.

There is one international financial institution which has had a remarkably fine record, and which has received excellent support from other peoples in Europe and Asia.

The International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, as a result of excellent management and sound administration, has inspired such confidence that today it is able to sell its obligations not just in the United States, but in practically all of the developed nations of the free world.

In the New York Times of Sunday last, February 14, there was an excellent article describing the experience of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development. I shall ask that it be inserted in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

It will be noted that more of the loan money raised from subscribed capital has come from outside the United States. Also, more of the Bank's bonds are owned by investors outside the United States than by investors in the United States.

I ask unanimous consent that the article from the New York Times be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

WORLD BANK GETS ITS FUNDS ABROAD—BULK OF LOAN MONEY FLOWING FROM OVERSEAS—BIGGEST CREDITOR IS GERMANY—U.S. ROLE STILL MAJOR, BUT MUCH OF THIS NATION'S CAPITAL SUBSCRIPTION SERVES AS GUARANTEE

(By Paul Heffernan)

Few people would be surprised to know that of the $4,900 million of loans approved by the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development (World Bank), none has been extended in the United States. Wasn't the Bank's chief purpose to make loans abroad?

Most people would find it hard to believe, however, that the main source of the World Bank's loan money today is not the United States, but foreign nations.

The international lending institution is now a fully developed two-way money mechanism, one that is sucking in capital from all over the world in one breath and diffusing capital all over the world in the next. Oddly enough, the Bank's biggest single creditor is the postwar central bank of the West German Republic—the Deutsche Bundesbank.

Foreign capital is now putting up the lion's share of the World Bank's lending money—from subscribed capital and from loans to the World Bank in the form of public bond issues and otherwise. This has been true of subscribed capital since 1957. Last year, with investors abroad owning most of the Bank's own obligations, it became true of the debt capital, too.

CAPITAL FOUNDATION

It is, of course, a fact that the U.S. capital subscription of $6,350 million (the original 1945 subscription of $3,175 million was doubled last year) is the major financial underpinning of the international lending institution. It is also true that the Bank, as a market borrower, has raised more money through the sale of bonds payable in U.S. dollars than through loans denominated in other currencies.

But it must likewise be kept in mind that the major part of the U.S. capital subscription—$5,080 million of the total—cannot be used for lending purposes, but only as a guarantee fund subject to call to pay off the Bank's own obligations if borrowers from the Bank should default on their loans.

And it is a further fact that while most of the Bank's $1,900 million of debt is payable in U.S. dollars, about $1 billion of the total is owed to investors abroad.

In 1945 it was expected that the United States would be the Bank's chief source of funds for some time to come, even though the Bank was set up so that other nations would share in putting up the money as well as taking it out.

SMALL PART AVAILABLE

In mid-1947 the Bank had $8 billion of capital subscribed by 44 nations, but only $819 million was available for lending—$727 million of paid-in capital from the United States and $92 million from the rest of the world. The financial rigors of the immediate postwar years made it impossible for most subscribing nations to authorize release of the paid-in part of subscribed capital for lending purposes.

Canada was the first nation to respond to the Bank's urging for the release of the paid-in capital for loans. This was in 1952. Thereafter more and more subscription money became available for lending, first from industrialized Europe. It was not until 1956 that substantial releases came from Asia and Latin America.

The following table summarizes the availability of loan money today from the Bank's subscribed capital:

[In terms of millions of U.S. dollars]

Source area	U.S. dollars	Other than U.S. dollars	Total
United States	635.0		635.0
Europe	72.4	608.5	680.9
Canada	6.5	53.4	59.9
Australia	4.0	36.0	40.0
Africa	3.2	20.7	23.9
Asia and Mideast	34.4	104.6	139.0
Latin America	11.5	21.3	32.8
Total	767.0	844.5	1,611.5

There still remains an equivalent of about $366 million in nondollar currencies not yet released for lending purposes, from the original paid-in capital. The Bank is continuing to press for permission to put such money out at loan.

The $125 million bond issue sold by the World Bank in the United States market last week was an opportune exploitation by the Bank of the late January shift here from a buyers' market in bonds to a sellers' market. There had been no active plans for a borrowing in this market this winter because the Bank in the last 6 weeks had raised the equivalent of about $90 million abroad through borrowings in British sterling, Swiss francs, and West German deutsche marks.

GERMANY'S ROLE CITED

The German credit, to take the form of 3-year notes, is the second borrowing of this kind the World Bank has arranged with the Bundesbank. Since 1957, the German institution has repeatedly purchased the World Bank's short-term notes payable in U.S. dollars. By the end of 1959, the Bundesbank had bought $403 million of such dollar obligations, of which $120 million were paid off at maturity. A further sizable block of World Bank short-term bonds payable in dollars was also placed with the Bundesbank.

On December 31, 1959, the World Bank had $1,990 million of bonds and notes outstanding, of which $1,642 million were payable in U.S. dollars and the $348 million balance in Canadian dollars. Belgian francs, West German deutsche marks, Netherland guilders, British sterling, and Swiss francs. About $960 million of the total was held by institutional investors in the United States and about $1 billion in more than 40 countries abroad.

The holdings abroad consisted of about $680 million of the outstanding bonds payable in U.S. dollars—or 41.6 percent—as well as about $348 million of securities payable in nondollar currencies. There were outstanding at the end of last year 19 issues of World Bank obligations payable in currencies other than dollars.

In the course of its operations, the Bank has sold to other investors $651 million of obligations issued by borrowers from the World Bank. Of this total, $413 million was bought by investors outside the United States and $238 million by investors in this country. Commercial banks and insurance companies in Canada, Belgium, France, Switzerland, Germany, the Netherlands, and Britain have become regular purchasers of loans negotiated by the World Bank yet not bearing the Bank's guarantee.

LEASING OF PORTION OF FORT CROWDER, MO.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 8315) to authorize the Secretary of the Army to lease a portion of Fort Crowder, Mo., to Stella Reorganized Schools R-I, Missouri.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, this is a historic period in the chronology of the 86th Congress. After much delay, we have finally come face to face with the civil rights challenge of 1960. The next few weeks will tell whether the Senate has met its obligation or whether it has rejected this challenge and compromised its duty.

What should be the goals of this debate? In simple terms—to protect the right of every qualified American to vote without discrimination; to protect the right of every American child to attend the public schools in his community without molestation; to protect the right of every citizen to equal protection of the law.

It is more than 170 years since the adoption of our Constitution, to preserve the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity. It is almost 100 years since Abraham Lincoln began his service as our President and gave a new birth of freedom to America. It is 90 years since final ratification of the 15th amendment, declaring that neither the United States nor any State shall deny or abridge the right of citizens to vote on account of race, color, or previous condition of servitude. These great events mark the steady progress of liberty in our Nation which has made us the greatest democracy in the world. But we cannot rest on our laurels. We must not slacken our efforts as long as some of our fellow Americans are denied the benefits of our common heritage.

Our goals are righteous ones. Are new laws needed for their achievement? Let us look at the record. Our source book must be the report of the Commission on Civil Rights. No one can reasonably challenge the objectivity and fairness of the men who comprise this Commission. They are outstanding men from every section of our Nation and both political parties. Their report reflects a deep understanding of the controversies which have arisen. It is not rash or intolerant of any point of view. It does not do injustice to any section of the Nation.

But the facts related by the Commission should shatter the complacency of any American who thinks the job is done and disturb the soul of any American who is concerned about denials of justice and liberty to his fellow man. I offer the following bill of particulars:

First. In Gadsden County, Fla., there are a total of eight Negroes registered out of an adult Negro population of over 10,000. There was a registration drive from 1948 to 1950 which resulted in the registration of over 100 Negro citizens. None of the leaders of this drive live in Gadsden County any more. One of the leaders, who was fired from a good job, and allegedly threatened with physical violence, has left the State altogether.

Second. There are 300 Negro teachers in Gadsden County. They are unwilling to register because of the fear of losing their jobs or other economic reprisals.

Third. An elderly Negro who was registered to vote was asked by Commission investigators why he had not gone to the polls. He said: "I am too old to be beaten up."

Fourth. One businessman refused to be interviewed at all. His reason: "They would bomb my business out of existence if I even talked with you."

Fifth. The voting age Negro population of Mississippi is over 500,000. Yet there are 14 counties in Mississippi with over 100,000 voting age Negro residents in which not a single Negro citizen is registered.

Sixth. A Negro who attempted to pay his poll tax and register in Bolivar County, Miss., saw his bill thrown into the waste basket.

Seventh. Poll taxes are also refused in Tallahatchie County. Negroes in this county expressed fear of reprisals and were reluctant to testify at all. A public school principal who attempted to register was discharged from her post.

Eighth. In Leflore County, Miss., a Negro army veteran who had served as a technical sergeant, was visited and questioned at his home by two white men shortly after he attempted to register. Fearful of reprisals, he stopped trying.

Ninth. In Forrest County, Miss., Negroes have been told that they could not register. At other times, the registrar simply absents himself whenever Negroes apply to register. One Negro, while waiting for the registrar to return to his office, observed two white women being registered without question by a clerk who had told him she had no authority to register applicants.

Tenth. In Clarke County, Miss., the registrar turns Negroes away with the advice that they should "watch the papers and see how the mess in Little Rock and the mess in Washington worked out."

Eleventh. In Tennessee, intimidation of Negroes appears to be a problem in only three counties—Haywood, Fayette and Hardman. Twelve Negro war veterans registered in Fayette County in 1958. They were so intimidated, when they appeared to vote, that only 1 of the 12 voted, and he doubted that his ballot was counted because he thought he had handed it to someone instead of dropping it in the box. Two others were frightened away when two deputy sheriffs approached them. One was told by his banker that something might happen to him if he tried to vote. Another, who was in the hauling business, lost all his customers and the police threatened to arrest any of his drivers found on the highway in his trucks.

Twelfth. In Alabama, which has over one-half million Negroes of voting age, only 73,272 are registered. On the other hand, over 800,000 white citizens are registered out of the total voting age white population of 1,231,514.

Thirteenth. In 2 out of 12 counties in Alabama in which Negroes constitute a majority of the 1950 voting age population, not a single Negro is registered to vote. In 7 of these 12 counties, the number of Negroes registered is fewer than 7 percent of the county's Negro voting age population.

Fourteenth. Macon County, Ala., the site of Tuskegee Institute, ranks first in the State in the proportion of its Negroes of age 25 or over who have at least a high school education, and in the percentage of Negro residents who hold college degrees. After court action by Macon County Negroes to become registered, all members of the board of registrars resigned and there was not a publicly functioning board from about 1946 to 1948. The board has been periodically inoperative for long periods since that time.

Fifteenth. The voucher system is another obstacle in Alabama even when the registrars are functioning. This system requires every applicant for registration

to be accompanied by an already registered voter. But a voter can vouch for only two applicants per year and in recent years no white elector has vouched for a Negro applicant in Macon County.

Sixteenth. White and Negro applicants are registered in separate rooms. Negroes must wait 3 to 9 hours before they are admitted and are then given lengthy provisions of the Constitution to copy. Even after this rigmarole, many are never told whether they have been accepted or rejected.

Seventeenth. In Dallas County, Ala., Negro businessmen who attempted to register were refused service and deliveries by white wholesalers and other economic pressure was brought against them.

I could go on and on detailing these incidents from the official report of the Commission. But I think what I have already cited is sufficient. In the words of the Commission:

> It has become apparent that legislation presently on the books is inadequate to assure that all our qualified citizens shall enjoy the right to vote. There exists here a striking gap between our principles and our everyday practices. This is a moral gap. It spills over into and violates other areas of our society. It runs counter to our traditional concepts of fair play. It is a partial repudiation of our faith in the democratic system. It undermines the moral suasion of our national stand in international affairs. It reduces the productivity of our Nation.

This is a powerful indictment. The case has been proven by the evidence before the Commission. It is now for us to provide the remedy.

The right to vote, however, is not our only concern in this debate. Here is a bill of particulars for the field of education:

First. It has been almost 6 years since the Supreme Court's decision declaring school segregation unconstitutional. Yet, in five States—Alabama, Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi, and South Carolina—not a single Negro child has been admitted to an all-white public school.

Second. At the same time, thousands of children, white and colored, have been deprived of all schooling for periods ranging up to several months. Other thousands of school children have been forced to use inadequate makeshift facilities. It has been estimated that over 1 million pupil-days of schooling have been wasted just in the last 2 years.

Third. The extremists have resorted to every kind of device to frustrate compliance with the law of the land. In some States, a rash of pupil placement laws have been enacted, in others automatic school-closing statutes, and in still others a system of allegedly private schools supported by State funds has been instituted.

Fourth. All this frantic activity has been designed to keep Negro children from sitting next to white children in a classroom. These children are the immediate victims of a prejudice nurtured by years of unremedied, unequal treatment of Negroes, but the whole country ultimately suffers from these actions.

Fifth. There has been some progress in these last 5½ years, but we have the right to be impatient about the time it is taking to carry out the Supreme Court's ruling. We must not sit back and watch the Court's mandate die of old age.

My bill of particulars cannot stop at this point. I must mention the rash of hate bombings which have plagued our land in recent years. I must add a word about the vicious racists who have destroyed our places of education, our homes, even our sanctuaries. These deeds have disgraced the whole Nation.

I must refer to the brutally depraved mob that murdered Mack Charles Parker. This mob has thus far escaped mortal punishment. But their souls will have no peace. And their example must never be allowed repetition.

Mr. President, no one who studies the record can doubt the necessity for additional laws to protect civil rights. The only differences, after reviewing this bill of particulars and the facts, can be over what new laws should be enacted, not over whether new laws are needed.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KEATING. I am happy to yield.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The Senator made reference to the Parker case. He does recognize that, with regard to the innocence or guilt of Parker himself, who was charged with a felony at the time, it was against the law of the State, and this case was investigated on invitation of the State government by the FBI, as well as by the local officials.

Mr. KEATING. I am aware of that. I am aware of several facts—first, that Parker was charged with a very serious offense, one for which, if he had been proved guilty, he could have received severe punishment; second, that an effort was made by the State authorities to obtain an indictment, but without success; third, that the Federal Government made an effort to charge the perpetrators with a violation of the criminal statutes relating to civil rights, and the grand jury in the Federal court refused to indict. I am aware of those facts.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. In view of the fact that this case was placed before a Federal grand jury, and a Federal district attorney presented the evidence to the grand jury, and in view of the fact that the Governor of the State immediately requested the FBI to assist the local officials in investigating the case, it is difficult for me to see what additional law would have made any difference, if the law had been violated. Apparently the grand jury, upon the presentation of what evidence there was, simply did not find that sufficient evidence was presented to convict any person in connection with the alleged crime.

Mr. KEATING. However, even if there had been an indictment and the perpetrators had been found guilty in the Federal court, they would have been faced only with a $1,000 fine or a year in prison, as the maximum penalty they could receive as individuals, or a $5,000 fine and 10 years in prison if there was a conspiracy.

Obviously there was a coldblooded murder by someone. If there had been an indictment and a finding of guilt in the Federal court, I think the penalty should have been very much more severe. The proposal I make is for an amendment to the civil rights statute. It is not an antilynching bill in the same sense that many of the other bills before us are.

It would increase the penalties in case of conviction under the civil rights statute, and provide that if injury occurs, the penalty shall be greater; and if death occurs, and the jury so recommends to the court, and the court accepts the recommendation, the death penalty may be imposed.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. We in Louisiana have been extremely fortunate, insofar as lynching is concerned during the time this Senator has represented that State. I do not believe a lynching has occurred during those 12 years. I suppose it has been a very long time since there has been a lynching in that State. However, during that time there have been a great number of other murders, and unfortunately, there were a considerable number of them in connection with which no one has ever been convicted of the crimes. Someone must have committed them. It is a favorite publicity stunt for some newspapers to advertise for anyone who may know some facts about a certain crime that has been committed, and offer $1,000 or $5,000 reward, printing all the details of unsolved murders that have been committed during the past 10 to 17 years.

It seems to me that there is not much evidence to indicate that justice could not be had under the existing laws, with respect to a lynching which might occur.

The Senator says nothing about all the other murders. There have been many of them. Sometimes white persons murder whites, and at other times Negroes murder Negroes.

In still other cases perhaps a member of one race murders someone of a different race. But it is impossible for us to apprehend every criminal. The Senator well knows that the general theory of our law is that it is better to fail to punish a number of guilty persons than to punish a single innocent person who has not committed a crime, or who has perhaps been falsely accused of it.

Mr. KEATING. The Senator from New York is aware of the fact that his own State and every other State have unsolved murders. The Senator from New York is against murder in any form, as is the Senator from Louisiana, no matter what the color of the skin of the perpetrator.

Fortunately lynchings have decreased in recent years. The Mack Charles Parker case is certainly what I would call a lynching. It brought us up pretty short, because it had been quite some time since there had been another. I hope it will be an eternity before there is a repetition of such an incident.

I favor a Federal antilynching law, but I can understand the position of those who do not. I was very grateful for the opportunity to point out the respect in which the proposal I make is

not a new Federal antilynching bill. It is an amendment to existing civil rights statutes which makes it a Federal criminal offense to deprive anyone of his civil rights. I realize that the punishment under my bill is more severe than it is under most of the Federal antilynching proposals, but I believe it is a step which some would be prepared to take, whereas they would not be prepared to go as far as to vote for a Federal antilynching law.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I certainly hope that the Senator would not recommend that a man be placed on trial for his life without the right of a jury trial.

Mr. KEATING. Oh, no. Of course he would get a jury trial. I believe that the seven point program proposed by the administration embodied in the Dirksen amendments is an excellent starting point, and that its enactment would be a most significant step forward. In brief, this program includes provisions to punish interference with school desegregation orders, to enable the FBI to track down the church and school bombers, to permit schooling of children of servicemen in areas where local schools have been shut down by the State in order to avoid complying with the Supreme Court decision, to require preservation and allow inspection of voting records by the Department of Justice, to assist the States in carrying out desegregation plans; to place the Committee on Nondiscrimination Under Government Contracts on a statutory basis, and to allow the appointment of voting referees in court voting rights cases.

I shall discuss each of these provisions in more detail as this debate unfolds. But I regard this as a meaningful and effective program for dealing with most of the problems in this field and I shall give it my full support.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KEATING. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Does the Senator know offhand of any case with regard to a so-called hate bombing or with regard to a lynching occurring in recent years where the changes in the law which he recommends would actually have been effective? The point I have in mind is that the grand jury in the Parker case did not feel that it had sufficient evidence on which to base a true bill against anyone by way of indictment. It would appear to me that if that is the case, no indictment could have been returned, regardless of how the statute would have read.

Mr. KEATING. I have knowledge of such cases, and I shall be prepared to go into them in greater detail when we get to each of these specific amendments.

As I understand, a unanimous-consent request was made to consider the amendments en bloc. Objection was made. Therefore, it is necessary to consider them separately. I envision that as this debate unfolds we will be able to go into greater detail with regard to this matter.

The Senator has referred to hate bombings. My study of the problem, including, indeed, a personal visit to the areas involved, gave me a general impression which I believe is for the most part confirmed by nearly all of the local, municipal, and State officials in the States affected, who I might say were absolutely shocked by these bombings of churches and synagogues and schools just as much as anyone else from any other part of the country was shocked—a general impression that they were perpetrated by an interstate group of individuals with the characteristics of a Nazi-like group, which would do a job in Georgia, say, and then slip over to Florida and do a job there, and then slip over into Alabama and do a job there; that the explosives were carried across State lines, and that the explosives did not come from the States in which the incidents took place.

I believe it would be desirable to have the Federal Government in such a position that it could step into a situation like that at once.

I recall that after the Lindbergh Kidnapping Act was passed, it was narrowed to make it effective after 24 hours had elapsed, so that 24 hours after a person is kidnapped, it is presumed that he has been carried across State lines. That permits the FBI to come into the kidnaping almost at the beginning, and the great facilities of that fine organization are brought to bear on the solution of the crime.

I believe that has been an effective deterrent in the kidnaping field. It is relatively seldom now that one hears about a kidnaping. The same is true about white slavery and about motor vehicles and other crimes involving an interstate situation for which Federal legislation has been enacted. I believe that we should give our attention to making it possible for the FBI to step into such cases at an early stage.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Does the Senator have any doubt whatever that if a southern grand jury were presented with proper evidence it would not indict someone who had done something like engaging in hate bombing?

Mr. KEATING. I do not like to have the Senator ask me to characterize a grand jury in any one of our States. I wish he would relieve me of that necessity. Grand juries in my State sometimes have done things with which I was not in complete sympathy. The Senator from Louisiana, I am sure, realizes that grand jurors are human and are swayed to some extent by the feelings and mores of the communities in which they reside. I do not wish to characterize any group of men in any State of the Union as not fulfilling their oath of office.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Does the Senator have any knowledge of any case in which he feels the grand jury might have been presented proper evidence to indict someone for a bombing of a church or school building, but failed to do so?

Mr. KEATING. I do not think it is fair for me, as an outsider, to say with any degree of assurance that in any specific case, without being connected with the district attorney's office, and knowing exactly what the situation is, an injustice had been done. There have been cases in which I happen to think that probably an injustice was done. That is about as strong as I could conscientiously state it.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Perhaps the particular neck of woods from which the junior Senator from Louisiana hails is an exception. However, I do not think it is. We have a pretty good sheriff, and I believe a pretty good district attorney. The sheriff is the president of the National Sheriffs Association, and the district attorney is the former president of the National District Attorneys Association.

Mr. KEATING. And they have a very good Senator down there, too.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I thank the Senator. That would speak well for them. I believe it is a very fine community so far as harmony among people is concerned. I would be amazed indeed to find that in any part of the country a grand jury, with proper evidence before it, would not indict, and that the district attorney with such evidence in his possession would not prosecute to the full extent of the law, or that a judge would not punish appropriately any person that was found guilty of such activity.

It may not be a pleasant task for the local officials to act in such a case, but it is their duty to do so if they are confronted with it. It seems to me that the Federal Government should step into such a situation only if it appears that the local government has broken down. I do not know of any circumstances where they have failed to discharge their responsibility with regard to hate bombings. Does the Senator know of any case where there was any tangible evidence to indicate that these bombings were interstate in character?

Mr. KEATING. I believe it is undisputed that the pattern in many of the bombings was the same, and that the explosives used in most of them came from a State which was not involved in any bombing. I think the Senator from Louisiana will find that that understanding is quite well accepted.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I would be curious to know how that fact could be established, or even substantial evidence presented to that effect. As a former demolition man, I was under the impression that not much is left after a bombing to enable such an identification to be made. If a stick of TNT is exploded, not much is left of it to indicate its origin.

Mr. KEATING. It must be that advances have been made in demolition techniques in recent years, since the Senator from Louisiana was blowing up things, because methods were pointed out to us which enable identification to be made of the source of the explosive. In a number of instances, the explosives came from the same place. I myself did not know that until the question was raised in connection with this trip.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. My impression would be that the explosives would come from an area where such things are manufactured. Could the Senator tell me what area that would be?

Mr. KEATING. I can, but I prefer to tell the Senator privately. I do not want to involve publicly the particular State concerned. It is not New York. But I prefer to tell the Senator privately, and I shall be happy to do so.

Mr. President, having made this statement, I give full support to the Dirksen amendments. I believe, at the same time, that additional measures are justified and needed to complete the job. These include a bill to deter lynching for all time by providing a discretionary death penalty for deprivations of civil rights resulting in the murder of the victim. Under the present law, the penalties are fixed without regard to the injury of the victim. These penalties obviously are inadequate in lynching cases and must be increased. I have been advised that the Attorney General supports this particular proposal, although I understand he has not indicated his approval of other so-called antilynching bills which have been introduced. I also shall offer an amendment to give the Attorney General the right to prosecute civil actions in all cases involving denials of equal protection of the laws and not merely in voting cases. The Government has a responsibility to implement this provision of the Constitution which should not be delegated entirely to private citizens. There is precedent for such a bill in a host of Federal statutes under which the whole weight of the Federal Government, including the legal resources of the Department of Justice, are made available to enforce Federal laws. The Federal Communications Commission, for example, will argue a case all the way up to the Supreme Court to defend the granting of a license to a broadcaster or a rate increase to the telephone company. The National Labor Relations Board will exhaust every available remedy for the benefit of an employee who it finds has been subjected to antiunion discrimination by his employer or coercion by his union. The Interstate Commerce Commission will defend shippers against unfair rate charges without any investigation of the ability of the shipper to prosecute his own claim. In all these cases, there is a public interest in the enforcement of the law which we have agreed, without too much controversy, makes it appropriate for the Federal Goverment to intervene. There is no less public interest in the enforcement of the provisions of the Constitution involved in equal protection cases.

In addition to the new provisions, I will also offer some amendments to the present provisions of the seven-point administration bill. The Department of Justice has prepared an amendment to the voting referee provision, spelling out in detail the mechanics of its operation. I believe this will improve the voting referee plan, and will certainly propose, therefore, that this latest version of the bill will be substituted for the present language. I also intend to continue to work within the Rules Committee for a proposal that will deserve the support of all of us interested in action to protect the right to vote. I am still of the opinion that the referee and registrar bills are not mutually exclusive and that it is possible to combine the best features of both in one measure. It is vitally important to avoid any unnecessary division among the supporters of strong right-to-vote legislation, and I shall certainly be working for bipartisan support on this critical phase of our efforts.

I also intend to propose an amendment to the antibombing section of the administration's bill to make it applicable to homes. Our experience has been that homes have been a frequent target of the hate bombers. I see no reason to leave such incidents uncovered by any bill on this subject.

I know that other amendments will be offered during this debate which I will be able to support. But we must beware of loopholes and traps in some of these proposals. The procedures spelled out in the majority leader's bill with regard to obtaining State voting records, for example, are entirely inadequate. They do not require State election officials to preserve their records for any period of time. And they make it virtually impossible to obtain these records without the cooperation of the State Governor involved. Since some Governors have been a little less than cooperative in the past, this whole procedure may operate as a snare and a delusion. In my opinion it would worsen, rather than improve, existing conditions.

The proposal in the same bill for a Conciliation Service, I also regard as unwise. I hope we never reach the stage in this country where the judgments of a court or the requirements of law are made subject to review by a Director of a Conciliation Service. The recognition and enforcement of a person's civil rights are not subjects to be bargained about.

Mr. President, the cry of States rights will be raised against every constructive proposal in this field. I am a firm believer in protecting true States rights and avoiding any usurpation of State functions by the Federal Government. But to me it is a disservice to the cause of States rights to raise this cry in the present context, for this implies that the States have the right to discriminate against Negro citizens who attempt to exercise the privilege of voting; it implies that the States have the right to flout the law of the land requiring school desegregation; it implies that the States can allow lynch mobs to act with impunity; it implies that the States have the ability to apprehend the hate bombers who cross State lines. These implications do not stand scrutiny.

I believe in States rights because the States are closer to the people than any Federal bureaucracy and because the States can serve as a laboratory for the distillation of new and progressive ideas and programs. But this requires the States to truly reflect the will of all their citizens; and no State, under our republican form of government, can espouse programs in violation of the provisions of the Constitution. States rights will be strengthened, not weakened, by the voting and other protections which I am advocating. Let us remember that these are corrective measures only. If there are no deprivations of voting rights, no evasions of constitutional requirements, no unsolved bombings and lynchings, then there will be no occasion ever for implementation of any of these laws. Surely the States have rights; but they also have obligations. If these obligations are fulfilled, the Federal Government will never be called upon to act under any of these provisions.

Mr. President, some skirmishes in this new phase of the civil rights battle already have been fought. It is regrettable, but undeniable, that the result of these skirmishes has been to make our cause more difficult.

We failed to change the filibuster rule in any substantial respect. This will handicap efforts to invoke cloture after there has been a reasonable opportunity for debate.

In addition, we failed to bring out of committee any civil rights legislation. This has made it necessary for us to utilize an entirely irrelevant measure as a vehicle for our debate. I regret this procedure as much as does anyone else, although it should be made clear that what is being done is entirely proper and is not at all uncommon under the rules of the Senate. At the same time, it certainly would be better to have a committee-approved civil rights bill before us; and I shall continue to urge the Rules Committee to act on the voting measures it has under consideration.

Delay and confusion are among the weapons of the opposition. We all know there are many important matters which have to be acted on by the Senate prior to adjournment. Delay will lead to pressure to get the civil rights debate over with, to compromise, to yield, perhaps even to abandon the fight. Many of us, however, do not intend to be intimidated by any talkfest. We will not be bullied by a barrage of words. It must be made clear at the outset that any filibuster will be futile; that the Senate will meet day and night, and on weekends, if necessary, to allow these issues to be dealt with on their merits. If all of us who believe in this cause will join together, we can overcome any unreasonable obstacle and achieve our goals.

Let it be known now that the proponents of equal justice are resolute and indefatigable; that our cause gives us strength; and that our convictions give us determination. I believe with all my heart and soul that the measures we shall advocate are in the American tradition of justice, equality, liberty, and freedom. The real question in this debate is whether we shall be true to our heritage.

Mr. President, these issues are too vital to the welfare of our country to be buried in a wasteland of passoniate outbursts and meaningless threats. Let

us deal with these issues on their merits. Let us respect honest differences of opinion, and avoid partisan or personal characterization. Let us give everyone reasonable opportunity to be heard. Then let us act in what each of us believes is in the best interests of our country. Let our debate reflect credit on this great institution and achieve positive results which will benefit all our people.

We have a sacred duty to perform—a duty deserving of our last full measure of devotion. When this chapter in our history is written, let it be recorded that we met our duty in the tradition of America.

THE WORLD WE WANT—ADDRESS BY SENATOR McGEE

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, as part of my remarks, a very fine address by the junior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. McGEE].

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

THE WORLD WE WANT

(Address by the Honorable GALE W. McGEE, Senator from Wyoming, at the North Carolina Conference on World Affairs, Chapel Hill, N.C., February 11, 1960)

We are met here today to discuss a question that is quite unreal, "the world we want." It is unreal because I seriously question whether Americans know what kind of world they want; it is unreal because the United States cannot in itself determine the kind of world to be.

A country which has already confused consumer luxury with national prosperity; one that has long since lost its dedication to high principle amid an abundance of materialistic gimmicks; one that has surrendered ideals to gadgetry; a country which prays on its national Thanksgiving for less food because of too much; a nation which describes its greatest national blight as food surpluses while three-fourths of the people of the rest of the world cry out for more * * * these passing attributes reveal a nation and a people who have lost their way, who have lost sight of true national purpose and national objectives. People in these circumstances can hardly know what kind of world they want.

Even if we in America knew what kind of world we wanted, it would be impossible to impose that image on the rest of the world. Long since should we have disabused ourselves of the notion that the world ought to be created in our image. We cannot make little Americans out of everyone, nor should we try. There are forces in the world, and always will be, which lie quite beyond the capacities of even Democrats or Republicans to change or to do very much about.

Therefore, it is far more important that we discuss here today, not the world we want but rather the world we're likely to get. This I propose to do in the next few minutes.

What will the world of the next decade be? It will possess three or four characteristics to which all American thoughts and plans must be accommodated. First, it will be this world and not some imaginary empire in outer space. From the press and TV one could be led to believe that we were about ready to abandon the Earth in favor of the Moon. The harsh fact is that we're going to have to learn to live on this globe with the chances of escape into some other planet being desperately remote if not impossible for the most of us. The planetary binge on which many Americans now seem to be is merely another upsurge for an escape from the realities of our time. While this is a human impulse, it is not defensible among a people whose history has been written by courageous acts committed against overwhelming odds. It is time we got our heads out of the stratosphere and our feet back on the good earth and work harder at the task of learning to live with our fellow men. It would be the height of folly if in our desperate search for escape we should win the Moon and lose the Earth.

A second characteristic of the world we're likely to get is that it will be an Asian world. One does not have to be a great prophet to foretell the racial makeup of the population of the world in the decade ahead. A typical cross section of mankind reduced to 100 people looks something like this even now. Out of the 100, 4 would be from Australia, New Zealand, and the South Pacific; 5 from the United States and Canada, 6 from Latin America, 7 from the Soviet Union, 8 from Africa, 14 from Western Europe, and 56 from Asia.

The next 10 years may well be characterized by a shift of power, as well as the point of danger, from Moscow to Peiping. In any case it will be shifting to a part of the world about which we know so little and understand even less.

Few indeed are the courses in world history taught in our public and private institutions today which include the histories of the great nationalities and cultures of the East. For most Americans the world still begins with Christopher Columbus. Rare is the history curriculum which attempts to carry the story back even to the days of Greece and Rome. Of this dominating major fact of the world, a distressing number of Americans remain blissfully ignorant.

To apply American standards or judgments to the peoples or achievements of the governments of Asia could create more trouble rather than less. On a recent trip to southeast Asia I saw among the new resettlement villages in the high central plateau country of Vietnam cases in point. In one instance the resettled villagers were still hauling their water from the banks of a stream up to their new huts considerably higher than the stream bed. It seemed obvious to some of us Americans that they should have built closer to the stream so that they might have piped the water through their homes as a matter of convenience. One of the villagers was quick to explain, however, that to do so would have deprived them of their daily trips to the riverbank for water and for the women to do the family laundry, an experience which gave them their principal contacts with their neighbors and their friends and which they were desirous of retaining. While this primitive means of procuring water tends to offend the efficient habits of an American, it is well for us all to remember that people are different—especially Asian people. If we're going to survive in an Asian world, we're going to have to work at understanding the Asian mind.

A third characteristic of the world we're likely to get is that it will be a nondemocratic world. In the memory of most men still living, we have waged two world wars for democracy. It is shocking to many of our people to realize that democracy has not been the major harvest of the peace which followed either struggle. Within 10 years after World War I, which had been waged "to make the world safe for democracy," the world had, in fact, been made safe only for dictatorships. Only Great Britain, France, and a handful of smaller countries remained with the United States as outposts of democracy. In the wake of World War II nearly 2 dozen nations in Asia and Africa have become independent. Very few of these can truthfully be described as democracies.

Before deploring the lack of democracy among these new governments, however, it is well for Americans to rediscover for themselves the basic truths of a working democracy. They should recall that democracy is not something that you can buy for, or impose upon, another people. Rather, it is an attitude and a way of looking at life that is born of a certain idealism and matures in the harsh realities of day-to-day national experience. Democracy can only come from within; it cannot be assigned to a people from without.

Our own history is an excellent case in point. Although we are fond of speaking of our own Revolution in 1776 as "democratic," in fact by the time we formalized our system in the Constitutional Convention a dozen years later, little more than the words of democracy had survived. True Democrats like Samuel Adams and Patrick Henry not only had deserted the cause, they were, in fact, not wanted by the framers of the Constitution. By 1789 when the United States launched its own form of government, scarcely one male in eight had the right to vote. The Americans were far from democracy in the early years of the Republic. And now, nearly two centuries later, we are still working hard at the business of becoming more democratic.

Remembering these facts, it ill behooves us to lose faith with the new nations of today's world because they do not have democratic governments. In the early stages at least it is far more important that these peoples acquire stability, a national consciousness, and a pride in their country. Because most of the areas now emerging in independence existed for centuries under an overburdening colonialism, they have a more backward society from which to call forth the experiences leading to democracy than nearly any government or people in the West. This is all the more a reason for our patience and our understanding of what these people in the developing areas of the world are going through.

One of the ironies of the moment, indeed, is that while we worry about the rampant forces of nationalism undermining the United Nations and the concept of collective security in the West, the new nationalism of the independent areas of the East becomes the first best hope for mobilizing resistance against the encroachments of communism or of any other form of imperialistic venture.

A fourth characteristic of the world we're likely to get is that it will continue to be a world in crisis rather than a world at peace. Given the frightening power capabilities of the giants of the earth through nuclear warfare; given the explosive concomitants of population increases everywhere; given the revolutionary expectations of hundreds of millions of people, principally in Asia and Africa, it would be naive to expect the world in the next decade to become a place of idyllic peace. For these reasons we must expect the world to continue to be a place of tensions, near wars, or even limited wars for a considerable time to come.

Facing the realities of these characteristics, we can, nonetheless, influence the direction of the changes now taking place and perhaps even temper the climate of opinion which surely will emerge. I would like to suggest several ways in which American foreign policy could best hope to do so.

The first is to increase our efforts in nonmilitary activities. The nature of the Communist conspiracy in widely scattered areas of the world has required an overwhelming military commitment on our part. The staggering size of our military appropriations for

defense around the world has tended, however, to crowd nonmilitary programs out of the budget or to squeeze them down to a meaningful or ineffective size.

As a consequence, the American image abroad has acquired a negative or defensive or predominantly military character in the eyes of other peoples. Nearly everywhere in my travels most native populations understand very clearly what it is America is against.

But increasingly they are asking, "What is America for?" This is to say that we have to balance our necessary defense posture with a constructive offering of positive values and hopeful nonmilitary goals. These goals will lie largely in the area of economic development, particularly in those areas of the world which lie generally south of the Northern Hemisphere—areas that are only now developing toward higher standards of living.

In Asia, for example, population increase and military necessity have combined to diminish, if not actually negate, most of our nonmilitary economic programs. Many of our endeavors in south Asia have been laudable, constructive, and farseeing, but their net impact has been lost amid the vast populations in the area. Take Vietnam, for example. There we have spent in the 4 years of independence approximately $1 billion—a staggering sum by any standards. Yet so much of this total has had to go into military and defense programs in order to hold back the tide of encroaching communism from the north that very little, in fact, has been left for public developments so sorely needed. As a result, the economy of Vietnam has increased but 1 percent, a modest increase wiped out by population growth.

India is another case in point. Once again population is the pressing problem. India has long been unable to produce even enough food for her own people. Although the birth rate there has declined, the death rate has dropped even faster. The result is a tremendous gain of births over deaths.

Because of the vast population base—more than 450 million people—there are more millions of people being added to the country each year than the slow-moving economic system there has been able to absorb. Even as our modest help to India has increased, the need for more and more economic assistance has increased still faster. In effect India, with all of our help, is falling behind her own requirements. The net result is a lowering rather than a raising of the standard of living in many areas. For a very few years ahead India will desperately need massive economic help—perhaps double that of the present—in order to get ahead of the population pressures. Only when they are on top of this problem will they dare to think about "phasing out" their economic dependence upon more fortunate countries like the United States.

India's plight is brought more sharply into focus when it is arrayed alongside the rising threat of Communist China. The test right now is whether the Chinese system of exploiting the individual will triumph over the Indian system of respecting the individual. Only the blind could be optimistic about the outcome at this moment.

Vietnam and India are strong examples of the nature of our problems in this critical part of the world. Unless our nonmilitary economic programs are vastly increased during the next 3 to 5 years, the position of the south Asians, and indeed our own position in that part of the world, will be inundated by the combination of population, military threat, and economic inadequacy.

The United States in order to win has to meet the economic challenge of south Asia on a scale commensurate with the size of the problem. It is foolhardy to point to the numbers of dollars being spent in that part of the world without reference to what needs to be done. To take one step ahead only to slip back two or three saves money for no one. Instead, it wastes it for all. Nor can it be excused as slow progress. It would, in fact, mark a retreat into oblivion.

The time is at hand, therefore, when the American people need to be told the truth about the magnitude of the economic challenge around the world. Mr. Khrushchev has warned us many times. He seems willing to grant that in sheer military capacities his country and ours cancel one another out. But he makes no bones about the fact that the Kremlin is confident of ultimate triumph through the instrument of economic warfare.

Economic war is the most dangerous and threatening of all, not because we can't afford it, but because we refuse to recognize it for what it is. It is difficult to excite people about economic warfare. It can't be launched from Cape Canaveral. People don't die today on the economic battlefronts—the fact that they may be liquidated 5 years or 10 years hence is a ruthless fact which the public mind finds it too convenient to postpone for later contemplation.

It is important, therefore, for Americans to recognize before it is too late that the battleground for the showdown between freedom and totalitarianism has been shifted from the military to the economic arena. It is still war regardless of what names may be used to disguise the conflict.

As a nation we are far better equipped to wage and to win this kind of war than we are a strictly military conflict. To do so, however, we must recognize the danger for what it is, discipline our endeavors, determine the necessary priorities, and prepare for the sacrifices which alone will permit us the maximum effort in a free society such as ours.

A second way in which American foreign policy can strengthen its position would be to launch a massive exchange-of-persons program. Until now we have made only token efforts in this area. The kind of program I envisage would have two phases, one aimed at the Russians, the other aimed toward Asia. For the Russians, it would require bringing to the United States tens of thousands of Soviets for at least a quick "cook's tour." In my judgment there need be no regard as to the kind of Russians to be included in this program.

During my own travels in the U.S.S.R. I found the Russians at all levels intensely curious about America and envious of our standards of material achievements, particularly in the area of consumer luxuries. It would be useful, in my judgment, if we could whet the Russian appetite for more and more consumer goods. I have often advocated that Sears-Roebuck and Montgomery Ward catalogs ought to be required in the luggage of every American tourist going to the U.S.S.R. Dropped among the townsfolk in any Russian community, the catalogs would create an explosion (in the form of new expectations) which would rival that of nuclear weaponry.

Whatever else one may think of the Russian people, they remain people and possess the same human aspirations as the rest of us. The more we can contribute to their rising expectations from their own government, the more we intensify the pressures on the Kremlin to yield to consumer demands and thus to modify the otherwise total drive toward strictly military and political objectives.

We have nothing to risk nor to suffer from Russians seeing how we live in the crossroads communities of America. On the other hand, there is everything to gain. This will cost money. I submit, however, that every dollar thus spent would bring a return in our favor far greater than those dollars necessarily being spent for strictly military endeavors.

The second phase of our exchange program would apply principally to Asia but also to the so-called Dark Continent of Africa and to Latin America. We are in difficulty in those areas of the world largely because most of our people know so little about the regions. It is not a difference of principles that separates us from the developing areas but a lack of understanding and a lack of basic information about what goes on there. Those few Americans who do see Asia, for example, are generally the wrong Americans. By "wrong" I mean they are elderly citizens who in their declining years have the financial independence to finance a trip to this distant part of the world. They are not the people that would be leading our country tomorrow. Most of them, moreover, have little or no participation in the leadership of our Government even today.

It is the youth of America that must rise to the needs to which Asia is challenging us at the moment. Therefore, I propose that the Government of the United States finance, as a part of our regular higher educational system, travel and residence for several months, perhaps for as long as a year, of 1 million students annually.

In addition, one of the alternatives to compulsory military service ought to be an extended period of service overseas, particularly in underdeveloped regions and in nonmilitary roles, such as agricultural development, social services in the cities, and similar public endeavors.

Again, the cost for such a program would be considerable, but the cost should be equated with the good and the substantial steps toward our laudable goal of a more understanding world—one we understand and which understands us. We in America sent 12 million young people around the world with guns on their shoulders without batting an eye at the cost because we had to, to survive. Why can't we send other millions of youth around the world with ideas in their heads? Guns alone cannot win; ideas may.

In the struggle for the minds of men let's not forget our greatest resource. It is our historical tradition of ideas and the vigor and dynamism of our youth. These millions of young people would serve at once as America's finest ambassadors of good will. They would represent our most formidable frontline in the quest for truth and freedom; and at the same time, they would return to America as a rapidly filling reservoir of understanding and informed opinion of the critical sections of the world where the outcome of the conflict between freedom and tyranny still hangs in doubt.

A third way in which American policy would best influence the changing world around us is to recognize frankly that the peoples of the world are in revolt and that these revolutions are principally within the context of American ideals and made up of American ideas. It would be a mistake to equate these outbursts as the evil doings of Communist conspirators. Rather, they would have exploded had there never been a Karl Marx or a Bolshevik uprising in Russia in 1917. They reflect the normal aspirations of people everywhere for human dignity, for the integrity of the individual, for national independence, and for freedom from tyranny. These movements are the Spirit of 1776 turned loose in the 20th century. While they have been delayed by nearly two centuries because of the heavy hands of colonialism and imperialism, they remain, nonetheless, powerful impulses.

In short, it is the Spirit of 1776 which is exciting the world rather than the Communist revolution of Marx and Lenin. The

sooner we recognize this fact, the sooner can we hope to channel the forces of change toward constructive ends. This means that we must recognize revolution for what it is, try to understand it, and, where possible, to assist in attaining these laudable human aspirations. It ill behooves us who first set the example in our own history to look down our noses at those who have arrived 200 years late.

Nowhere have we a better example of how not to do it than in China. There the forces of revolutionary change were under way long before even the Communist revolution in Russia. Yet, we pretended not to see these changes; and as a result, our once strong position on the mainland was washed away by the flood tide of revolution. The Russians, by contrast, saw the change for what it was. While not of their making, nonetheless, they seized it and rode it in their own direction and to their own advantage. We might well learn from this unfortunate experience in our recent past.

History teaches us nothing if not the inevitability of change. For us to assert, as we seem bent upon doing at the moment, that there must be no change, or at the most that we will sit tight, hang on, and ride out the storm is only to invite greater disasters. Our static concepts, our desire to cling to the status quo can only weaken our national foundations and hasten the decline of our position of leadership in the world.

It is in these nonmilitary areas then where the future opportunity for the strengthening of America's position in the world lies. By helping other peoples in technological and economic ways to help themselves by a massive exchange of persons; and through a conscious employment of our ideals and principles as guideposts between which to channel the forces of the world revolution now sweeping the earth, we not only acquire a new sense of direction ourselves, but we offer a hope and a challenge to those millions who aspire only to a better life.

Such a program has the obvious advantage of being positive and constructive rather than negative and defensive. It is aimed at helping people just because they are people and not because the groups involved are against Russians, or against Chinese, or against totalitarianism, or are willing (or unwilling) allies.

It is time that America faced this new opportunity for exciting the peoples of the rest of the world. It is this kind of concept which represents the true goals of American society, which reflects the deep purposes of the American way of life, and which consummates what Ralph Waldo Emerson once called the American dream.

THE CHESSMAN EXECUTION

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I was quite surprised and nonplused when I read on the news ticker a few moments ago that Assistant Secretary of State Rubottom had injected his office and advice into the highly controversial Chessman case, in California. According to the ticker, the Assistant Secretary of State sent the following telegram to the Governor of California:

> Through our Embassy in Montevideo the National Council of the Government of Uruguay (the Nation's nine-member executive authority) has tonight (Thursday) brought to urgent attention of State Department grave concern of council over anticipated hostile demonstrations of student elements and others to Chessman execution when our President visits Uruguay March 2.
>
> ROY R. RUBOTTOM, Jr.,
> *Assistant Secretary for Inter-American Affairs.*

Mr. President, I have not made a search of the precedents; but to my limited knowledge, and within my experience, I believe this is an unprecedented action by the Department of State, in interfering with the normal carrying out of justice within a State.

In that connection, today's Washington Post has published, on page 13, an article which gives a summary of the reactions of various persons in Europe. I wish to read several of their comments.

From the Paris Le Monde, which is one of the leading and most influential papers in France, I read what it had to say:

> If he was guilty, why add to the death penalty the agony of 12 years?

The article states further:

> It was this aspect of the case—Chessman's long wait for death—which angered many in Europe, where few countries still have capital punishment. Europeans generally are not as concerned about the conviction as they are about his 12 years in the shadow of the gas chamber.

The Manchester Guardian wrote:

> There is something radically wrong with a judicial system that can allow delays such as the 12-year ordeal which Chessman has endured in a death cell.

L'Osservatore Romano, the Vatican newspaper, pleaded for mercy for Chessman. "It is no longer a judicial question, but only a humane question," the paper said.

Mr. President, I think it is a very disturbing element in the ordinary administration of justice within our States, that we are now being pressured either by groups of people in European countries or by incipient mobs of students in a Latin American country. I, too, think that the course of justice in this case exposes our whole country and our judicial system to ridicule and contempt by civilized people. I think the delay itself was unfortunate. But I also think the interference by the State Department in the administration of justice at the last moment, causing further delay, would likewise be regrettable.

There may be facts about the case that I do not know, but, according to the press report and the ticker tape report, I think it is a very questionable procedure.

Mr. President——

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield before he moves to another subject?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Yes, I yield to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I should like to join the Senator from Arkansas in the general context of the remarks he has just made. I read the dispatch this afternoon, and it seems to me the action by the State Department is contrary to the sense and knowledge of our judicial system as it exists in this country. I would hesitate to think, applying this question on a more local basis, that if the courts of my own State had convicted a slayer—and we still have the death penalty in Colorado—the Governor would be subject to the pressure of the State Department or any other part of our Federal Government in procuring a delay of a sentence that was about to be executed.

In other words, Mr. President, the judicial processes are accomplished through long and tedious procedures. If it had not been for the fact that every possible effort was made to be sure that protection was given to an accused criminal in our country, this man would never have been able to delay execution of the sentence for 12 years.

As a matter of fact, the delay is due to his unusual tenacity in clinging to various appeals which he thought might offer him some relief, although they were uncertain appeals and did not afford him much protection.

Behind all the circumstances of the case is lost the fact that this man is a convicted criminal and a man convicted of bestial crimes on women, crimes too bestial even to be printed in public records.

I would not want to get into the argument as to whether or not the death sentence is warranted. That question is something which each State must decide for itself and which each person must decide for himself.

Certainly, without more explanation than has been given, I cannot imagine anything that would warrant interference by the State Department. In my opinion, I think this is an unwarranted intervention in the rights of the judicial processes of a State.

If this practice were permitted, the States would soon be reduced to a status in which any minority group or any well organized group of a country could raise so much fuss about a particular conviction that soon our State Department would become concerned about it, and would then contact the local authorities. The minute such procedure would be condoned, we would have surrendered a part not only of State sovereignty, but we would have surrendered a part of our national sovereignty. I must say I agree with the Senator from Arkansas in every respect. I believe this is a very, very dangerous development.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I thank the Senator for his observation. As the Senator has said, it is a very complicated matter. There are many aspects of it, but the one for which I feel some responsibility is the intervention of the State Department. What justification the State Department has for interjecting its views into the matter is quite beyond me.

The State Department says this was done because the President is going to Uruguay. If the situation is so dangerous in Uruguay that this case would make that much of a difference, the President had better not go there. He does not have to go to Uruguay. He can go to Paraguay, or he can go somewhere else. It seems to me that is a very shallow and superficial reason to give for intervention by the State Department in this particular case.

If the Governor of the State has reasons for whatever action he may see fit to take, it is his place to act. It is not my responsibility to criticize him. I think the State Department has no business intervening in this kind of affair,

and I do not believe anybody would convince me that such action is a part of the functions of the Department.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield a little further?

The PRESIDING OFFICE (Mr. McGEE in the chair). Does the Senator from Arkansas yield to the Senator from Colorado?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Yes.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mention has been made about the Governor of California. I think we ought to make the RECORD clear that the Governor of California is endowed by the Constitution of his State with the power to exert executive clemency on whatever basis he sees fit, and none of us can question that power, and certainly not those who reside outside the State of California. It certainly is an entirely different situation when the State Department of our Nation takes a hand in the case.

I thank the Senator from Arkansas for yielding to me.

INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT ASSOCIATION

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, by request I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to provide for the participation of the United States in the International Development Association—IDA. The President's message and the report on the IDA by the National Advisory Council have been received, and I am introducing this proposed legislation in order that there may be a specific bill to which Members of the Senate and the public may direct their attention and comments.

I believe my colleagues will find it useful to have a short summary of the more notable provisions of the bill and the new institution. But first I want to take this opportunity to pay tribute to the broad vision, the initiative, and the persistence of a colleague who has done more than any other single person to bring the IDA into being. I am, of course, referring to Senator A. S. MIKE MONRONEY, whose great capabilities and whose activities in his country's behalf are too well known to require elaboration.

Mr. President, many of us in this Chamber, believing that the slogan "business as usual" is the exact antithesis of the proper approach to these dangerous and fast-moving times, have risen to deplore executive branch immobility and to call for new and imaginative proposals. All too often the response has been a figurative shrug, a challenge to name a few such proposals off the cuff, and a continued obsessive sojourn in the countinghouse counting out the money; it is regrettable, meanwhile, that the public rather than the royal nose is being tweaked.

Today, however, I am glad to have occasion to stress both an example of a fresh, imaginative proposal and a clear-cut instance of congressional initiative. We are much indebted for both to the junior Senator from Oklahoma. Yet, lest I be accused—no matter how erroneously—of speaking in a partisan manner, I hasten to add that the executive branch, having finally been persuaded of the merits of the idea, should be congratulated for moving rapidly to bring it to fruition.

Now, the bill I have been requested to introduce to provide for U.S. membership in the IDA is closely modeled upon the Inter-American Development Act, which in turn was patterned after the Bretton Woods Agreements Act. Members of the Senate, therefore, will presumably be quite familiar with the terms employed in this proposed legislation. I shall limit myself to pointing out two important provisions in the bill: First, the U.S. Governor and Executive Director and alternates of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development will act in the same capacities with respect to the IDA; second, the bill authorizes to be appropriated, without fiscal year limitation, a U.S. total subscription of $320,290,000. But it should be noted that this sum would be paid in over a 5-year period.

As indicated by the first point just made, the IDA will be a subsidiary of the World Bank; it will have the same strong management, which has built up IBRD reserves of over $450 million, and it will depend at least initially on existing staff and facilities. The same 68 member governments of the Bank are being invited to join and to subscribe funds.

The most notable feature of the IDA will be its ability to provide loans to its less-developed members on terms which are more flexible and bear less heavily on the balance of payments than those of conventional loans. This financing will in part be provided for projects of the type financed by the IBRD, and in part for development projects which are important to the area concerned but not immediately productive. Such financing will only be available if it cannot be obtained on reasonable terms from other sources.

From the U.S. point of view, the most important aspects of the IDA include its future status as the only international institution which would provide development financing on flexible terms with the broad participation of other industrialized nations besides the United States. This latter point is related to our current efforts to induce Western European and other highly developed countries to share the problem of helping less privileged nations in the free world.

The methods of providing funds for the IDA's operations are the unique feature of the institution. If all IBRD members join and accept their proportionate subscriptions, the initial resources of the IDA will total $1 billion. However, member countries are divided into two groups for subscription purposes, and the 17 more industrialized nations in group I will provide about $763 million as against the roughly $237 million subscribed by the less developed members in group II. Subscriptions will be payable over a 5-year period, and countries in both groups will make 10 percent of these payments in gold or freely convertible currencies. As for the remaining 90 percent of these initial subscriptions, they will be paid in gold or convertible currencies by group I members in five annual installments, whereas group II members will pay those installments in national currencies which the IDA cannot convert or use to finance exports from the country concerned without its consent—which the executive directors hope will be granted at an increasing rate.

Under these provisions, the first U.S. payment—combining the portions of the 10 and 90 percent components—would be approximately $74 million. Pending annual payments of about $62 million in each of 4 years thereafter, the balance of the total U.S. subscription would be held in noninterest bearing Treasury notes.

Finally, and very significantly, the IDA may also receive from any member, beyond its own subscription, supplementary resources in another member's currency provided the latter country does not object. Thus, the United States, for example, might offer to IDA some of the foreign currency holdings derived from surplus commodity sales under Public Law 480.

It should be noted that the IDA would have available during its first year of operation—which cannot begin before mid-September of 1960—less than $190 million in freely convertible currencies or gold.

Mr. President, in conclusion, I ask unanimous consent that the bill providing for U.S. membership in the International Development Association 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. 3074) to provide for the participation of the United States in the International Development Association, introduced by Mr. FULBRIGHT, by request, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, 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,

SHORT TITLE

SECTION 1. This Act may be cited as the "International Development Association Act."

ACCEPTANCE OF MEMBERSHIP

SEC. 2. The President is hereby authorized to accept membership for the United States in the International Development Association (hereinafter referred to as the "Association"), provided for by the Articles of Agreement (hereinafter referred to as the "Articles") of the Association deposited in the archives of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development.

GOVERNOR, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, AND ALTERNATES

SEC. 3. The Governor and Executive Director of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, and the alternate for each of them, appointed under section 3 of the Bretton Woods Agreements Act, as amended (22 U.S.C. 286a), shall serve as Governor, Executive Director and alternates, respectively, of the Association.

NATIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL ON INTERNATIONAL MONETARY AND FINANCIAL PROBLEMS

SEC. 4. The provisions of section 4 of the Bretton Woods Agreements Act, as amended (22 U.S.C. 286b), shall apply with respect

to the Association to the same extent as with respect to the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development and the International Monetary Fund. Reports with respect to the Association under paragraphs (5) and (6) of subsection (b) of section 4 of said Act, as amended, shall be included in the first report made thereunder after the establishment of the Association and in each succeeding report.

CERTAIN ACTS NOT TO BE TAKEN WITHOUT AUTHORIZATION

SEC. 5. Unless Congress by law authorizes such action, neither the President nor any person or agency shall, on behalf of the United States, (a) subscribe to additional funds under article III, section 1, of the articles; (b) accept any amendment under article IX of the articles; or (c) make a loan or provide other financing to the Association, except that loans or other financing may be provided to the Association by a United States agency created pursuant to an Act of Congress which is authorized by law to make loans or provide other financing to international organizations.

DEPOSITORIES

SEC. 6. Any Federal Reserve bank which is requested to do so by the Association shall act as its depository or as its fiscal agent, and the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System shall supervise and direct the carrying out of these functions by the Federal Reserve banks.

PAYMENT OF SUBSCRIPTIONS

SEC. 7. (a) There is hereby authorized to be appropriated, without fiscal year limitation, for the subscription of the United States to the Association, $320,290,000.

(b) For the purpose of keeping to a minimum the cost to the United States of participation in the Association, the Secretary of the Treasury, after paying the requisite part of the subscription of the United States in the Association required to be made under the articles, is authorized and directed to issue special notes of the United States from time to time, at par, and to deliver such notes to the Association in exchange for dollars to the extent permitted by the articles. The special notes provided for in this subsection shall be issued under the authority and subject to the provisions of the Second Liberty Bond Act, as amended, and the purposes for which securities may be issued under that Act are extended to include the purposes for which special notes are authorized and directed to be issued under this subsection, but such notes shall bear no interest, shall be nonnegotiable, and shall be payable on demand of the Association. The face amount of special notes issued to the Association under the authority of this subsection and outstanding at any one time shall not exceed, in the aggregate, the amount of the subscription of the United States actually paid to the Association under the articles.

(c) Any payment made to the United States by the Association as a distribution of net income shall be covered into the Treasury as a miscellaneous receipt.

JURISDICTION AND VENUE OF ACTIONS

SEC. 8. For the purpose of any action which may be brought within the United States, its possessions, or the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, by or against the Association in accordance with the articles the Association shall be deemed to be an inhabitant of the Federal judicial district in which its principal office in the United States is located, and any such action at law or in equity to which the Association shall be a party shall be deemed to arise under the laws of the United States, and the district courts of the United States shall have original jurisdiction of any such action. When the Association is a defendant in any such action, it may, at any time before the trial thereof, remove such action from a State court into the district court of the United States for the proper district by following the procedure for removal of causes otherwise provided by law.

STATUS, IMMUNITIES AND PRIVILEGES

SEC. 9. The provisions of article VII, section 5(d), and article VIII, sections 2 to 9, both inclusive, of the articles shall have full force and effect in the United States, its possessions, and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, upon acceptance of membership by the United States in, and the establishment of, the Association.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations not only for the introduction of the bill, but also for the kind words he said about the part the junior Senator from Oklahoma played in respect to this new international financial institution.

I should like to say that as chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency the distinguished junior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] gave us our first encouragement as to the possibilities of such an institution. It was from the Committee on Banking and Currency that the resolution urging serious study of the proposal and a report to Congress came in 1958. Without the interest of the distinguished Senator, and his aid throughout the entire period of the hearings and later modification of original form of the resolution, I am certain there would have been no International Development Association.

The interest of the distinguished junior Senator from Arkansas in foreign aid, and particularly in the development of underdeveloped countries, has been one of the significant factors in this Nation's securities in that field. Certainly this is a new phrase in which, as the Senator so aptly predicts, there is an opportunity for the developing countries of the world to join in a mutual program which can provide a fruitful, sane, commonsense effort of self-help through loans of longer duration and at lower interest than would be possible in the ordinary bank loans offered by the World Bank.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I am happy to yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I appreciate the Senator's recalling the early days with respect to the proposal. I remember when the Senator first proposed it, and I remember also the meetings and discussions in the committee as well as certain private meetings where the idea was promulgated. I think this is one of the rather rare examples where an idea which is incubated in such meetings in the committee and among Members of the Senate finally is brought to fruition. We have a bill as to which there really is agreement on the part of a sufficient number of nations—they have not formally agreed, but it is my understanding they have informally agreed—so that there is little doubt the organization will come into being.

Again I wish to express my appreciation, and I know the appreciation of the Senate and of the country, for the Senator's contribution to this organization. Under the direction of the International Bank, which has already proved its capacity and its efficiency in this field abroad, this organization will make a great contribution to the overall effort in which we are engaged in helping to develop the underdeveloped countries of the world.

This is a new approach. It is supplementary to the World Bank, and I think it is a very worthwhile organization.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I deeply appreciate what the distinguished chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee has said. However, I would be less than realistic if I did not say that if it had not been for his encouragement and his participation as chairman of the parent committee reporting the bill, there would have been no bill. Neither would there have been an International Development Association, without support from many other Members of the Senate.

One of the greatest sources of help we received was the distinguished senior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH] a Republican member of the Committee on Banking and Currency. When it appeared that we were deadlocked and could not get a bill without further explanation or persuasion on the part of people who had had experience in this field, the Senator from Connecticut got together a private meeting of the Banking and Currency Committee to receive such information as was necessary to convince several members of the full committee that this was a feasible, plausible, and profitable way for the world to join in extending credit under institutional terms, under less than banking standards, to underdeveloped areas.

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

Mr. MONRONEY. I am happy to yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Perhaps some people will be left wondering why this legislation now comes from the Committee on Foreign Relations, when the original measure was reported from the Committee on Banking and Currency. I may explain for the record that a number of years ago, under the Reorganization Act, jurisdiction over international financial organizations was clearly placed in the Foreign Relations Committee. However, the then chairman did not care to handle the subject. The Bretton Woods Agreement had been handled by the Banking and Currency Committee, so this subject was placed under the jurisdiction of that committee rather by default.

Later this year, on examination of the jurisdiction of the respective committees, it was discovered that jurisdiction really resided in the Foreign Relations Committee. So when the bill was introduced it was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations. That is why the jurisdiction appeared to shift. Actually the jurisdiction is and was in the Foreign Relations Committee.

I think it is very fortunate, because the Senator from Oklahoma was a member

of the Committee on Banking and Currency and not of the Committee on Foreign Relations. I think this accident of history was very fortunate, so far as the creation of the International Development Association was concerned.

Mr. MONRONEY. By one of the good fortunes of coincidence also, it is wonderful that the former chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency, who so ably handled international finance as well as domestic financial problems, when he became chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations took with him his wisdom and experience in this field. So we now have not only the legal jurisdiction of the Committee on Foreign Relations, but also the great experience of the junior Senator from Arkansas in this field.

A great many Members of the Senate are entitled to credit. Their number is far too large to try to mention them all without fear of leaving out a few. Those Senators have consistently given us great help, support, and encouragement. We have also received support and encouragement from members of the administration. After the ice was finally broken, and the case rather clearly developed, great leadership came from the Secretary of the Treasury, Hon. Robert Anderson. Secretary Anderson took this plan with him to the International Monetary Fund Conference at New Delhi; and engaged in many conferences with government officials interested in financial matters of the Asian countries.

Then he took it upon himself to explain it in person to representatives of the major powers. No one has done more or deserves more credit for the fruition of this plan than the distinguished Secretary of the Treasury.

The Under Secretary of State, Hon. Douglas Dillon, who was then Assistant Secretary of State, as well as the present Secretary of State, Mr. Herter, then Under Secretary of State, also interested themselves in this plan.

Because of their great help and assistance, this subject was brought before the World Bank Directors last fall. We were successful in obtaining a recommendation that the directors perfect a charter. As is well known, as of last week, the charter was approved without a single opposition vote, but with two abstentions.

I think it is very fortunate that the leaders in the executive department, as well as the chairman of our committee and others, have joined together in a partnership to bring about the desired result. I feel that this is a great forward step, and I am very happy over the progress that has been made thus far. I only wish that more adequate financing could be provided for in the initial capitalization. However, there is written into the proposed charter provisions for increases by a number of techniques. I believe this institution will grow when nations find, after what I feel will be a test period, the advantages of multilateral extension of loans rather than bilateral extension of aid or loans.

I deeply appreciate the expedition with which the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations has brought this subject to the attention of the Senate.

I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD a series of three articles on IDA written for the Houston Post by Jim Mathis, chief of that newspaper's Washington bureau.

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

[From the Houston Post, Dec. 13, 1959]

IDA—U.S. TAXPAYER, WORLD'S POOR WILL BENEFIT

(By Jim Mathis)

WASHINGTON.—In cramped rooms in the U.S. Treasury, and in the elaborate directors' offices of the World Bank a few blocks away on Pennsylvania Avenue, a fresh new buoy of hope for the world's underprivileged is being drawn into existence.

It is a slow, time-consuming business at best—this drawing of a formal charter for the latest edition of international cooperation.

Working together—not always in harmony but always seeking the possible—are lawyers, economists, financial experts, and secretaries from a dozen nations. They have labored for months.

By early January—time enough to go early before the Congress—the final form of the International Development Association will be perfected.

If Congress approves, and authorizes the appropriation and expenditure of the required $320 million, other free nations will probably fall in line.

A new approach to foreign aid will have been launched. Industrialized nations, now recovered from World War II economic depths, will share with the United States the burden of developing backward nations.

There will be two eventual winners: the poor people of the world and the U.S. taxpayer.

This may hardly seem possible, but inquiry indicates it is true. For the taxpayer, it would be a rare treat.

With the possible exception of some objections from the United Nations, which has its own ideas along similar lines, the proposed new organization seems to have a clear path ahead.

ALPHABETICAL ACCEPTANCE A BOOST

The Senate approved the plan in a broad sense in 1958. President Eisenhower gave his blessings and full support a short time later.

The 68 members of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development—the World Bank—gave it 100 percent endorsement in a meeting here in late September.

The penultimate in anticipatory acceptance in Washington is almost formal recognition of the name IDA in the alphabetical language which prevails.

Although wrapped now in purple and handled like infant royalty, IDA has not always had it so good. There were years in which IDA's life was as precarious as that of a dauphin with a dozen jealous uncles.

IDA drew its first breath in faraway and very much underdeveloped Thailand in 1956. The occasion was a visit to Bangkok by Senator A. S. MIKE MONRONEY, Democrat, of Oklahoma, chairman of the Senate international finance subcommittee.

MONRONEY went to Thailand as an official delegate to the Interparliamentary Union meeting of 49 nations. This is considered something of a freeloading junket, and nothing happening on the meeting floor greatly impressed the tall, graying Oklahoma legislator.

It was off-floor talks with Thailanders which were to profoundly impress MONRONEY, and eventually give the United States a method of shoveling off part of the growing load of foreign assistance.

"Two projects were uppermost in discussions in these informal sessions," MONRONEY recalls today. "One, in which the Thais took great pride, was an irrigation dam built on the Ghao Phya River at a cost of $53 million. It irrigated 2,247,700 acres for the production of rice, and increased their annual product by a half-million metric tons."

THAIS' PRIDE HIGHEST ON FINANCING

MONRONEY found that the Thais took pride in their self-achievement in the dam's origination, design, and constructiotn. But their greatest pride, he discovered, was in the way it was financed.

"They had borrowed, on their own credit, from the World Bank $18 million required to supplement their own funds for its construction. This meant their credit and reputation were approved by the World Bank and their project had the solid economic justification to give confidence of full repayment in 10 years," the Senator explains.

The second project was a 140-kilometer section of highway built with Americans furnishing the funds, engineering, supervision and machinery. It was a vital link from Laos to Thailand in peace or war and cost $21.1 million.

But its construction was a bitter political issue. Their pride was offended at the outright gift, and they were embarrassed.

"Throughout Asia, I found this same attitude toward most of our aid programs," MONRONEY said.

He returned to the United States convinced that some method of providing loans to nations without political strings and with their own participation must be found if our expenditures were to accomplish both friendship and development.

Some provision should be made for loans on projects not qualifying under the strict requirements of the existing World Bank, MONRONEY thought. And the multiplying millions of soft currency—money not easily spent around the world—could be put to use.

Throughout 1957, MONRONEY pursued his idea, without too much success. He continued discussions, however, and by February 24, 1958, had firmed up his thoughts enough to introduce a Senate resolution directing the executive departments to explore a development loan association affiliated with the World Bank.

He proposed loans for longer periods through the international institution, with lower interest rates than required by the World Bank, using a mixture of hard and soft currencies.

IDA, MONRONEY argued, could take care of second mortgages on projects not wholly feasible under the World Bank, which must sell its bonds to the public. A portion of a loan for a project could be made by the Bank, and the gap closed by IDA.

A multipurpose dam in India, for example, costing $100 million, could qualify for $70 million from the World Bank calling for early repayment in hard currency at high interest.

The remaining $30 million for the dam could come from IDA to be repaid in Indian rupees over 40 years, at 2 percent.

MONRONEY suggested a $2 billion capital investment for the new institution, with subscriptions to be made up partly of hard currency and partly of soft currency.

In this manner, he proposed for the United States to utilize part of the nearly $5 billion in soft money it would have on hand in 1960 as a result of the sale of surplus farm commodities.

Beyond the immediate establishment of the bank, MONRONEY foresaw a need to switch the emphasis of our foreign aid program

from revitalized industrial nations halfway around the world to underdeveloped nations.

"Almost one-third of the world's population lived in these underdeveloped countries," he argued. "The foundations for modern progress must be laid. Our approach had included too many foreign aid workers, too many programs, too much regulation, too much dictation. In short, too much 'papa fix.'"

Neither the State Department, nor others concerned with the foreign aid program and foreign policy, were too overjoyed at the changes MONRONEY insisted upon. They were surely radical.

Testimony taken before MONRONEY's subcommittee indicated lukewarm interest. But MONRONEY persisted, got his resolution out on the Senate floor and approved by a 65-to-25 vote.

With no more force than a suggestion despite the resolution, IDA appeared destined to die in its swaddling clothes.

It was not until Secretary of the Treasury Robert B. Anderson recognized the potentialities in the suggestion and argued its virtue before President Eisenhower that IDA looked as if it would survive.

Anderson saw in the resolution continued nonpartisanship in foreign policy, and an opportunity at multilateral financing of undeveloped countries that would be an opening wedge to bring the growing industrial nations into paying part of the load.

As chairman of the National Advisory Council on International Monetary and Financial Problems, and U.S. Governor for the World Bank and International Monetary Fund, only Anderson was in a position to change MONRONEY's idea into reality.

The Secretary of the Treasury saw IDA also as one more link in a chain he needed to bolster the position of the U.S. finances in the world.

[From the Houston Post, Dec. 15, 1959]

IDA—TAXPAYERS IN UNITED STATES ARE NOW ASKING WHY?

(What has gone before: Regardless of the worthiness of foreign aid plans, American taxpayers for years have groaned about the millions of dollars sent abroad. Now the countries who are economically strong because of that aid are able to help the United States carry the load. Some have indicated a desire and willingness to help under a plan conceived by Senator A. S. MIKE MONRONEY, of Oklahoma and refined by Secretary of the Treasury Robert B. Anderson. Congressional approval early next year can make the plan reality.)

(By Jim Mathis)

WASHINGTON.—There are a billion people in the world today struggling for a better way of life in 22 new nations.

The way the United States answers their needs will determine how long we can perch on top of the pile. This is an accepted foreign policy axiom in Washington.

The requirements for capital for developing these small growing nations is insatiable. Paul Hoffman, Director of the International Co-Operation Administration, has estimated the needs will run to $40 billion.

While the needs and the demand stand apparent, it has also become clear in recent years that Americans are not going to bear the entire cost alone.

"Taxpayers in the United States are asking more and more why we can't dam some of our own rivers," one high and responsible official said this week.

In an effort to resolve the conflict, a nonpartisan effort to squeeze contributions from the revitalized industrial nations—particularly West Germany and Japan—has taken shape over the last 2 years.

One form of this effort—the International Development Association—is being solidified in negotiations here now.

The International Development Association, known better as IDA, would operate with an initial capital of $1 billion as an auxiliary of present world banks to make loans with low interest rates and long payment terms. The repayments could be made in the currency of the borrower.

Capital from the bank would be drawn from among the 68 members of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development.

INDUSTRIALIZED NATIONS WANTED

The emphasis is upon getting the industrialized nations, numbering about 17, into the association, along with the 25 or so underdeveloped countries.

The industrial nations would chip about 75 percent of the capitalization funds.

President Eisenhower will probably consider the final version of IDA's charter for presentation to Congress in late January.

Predictions from concerned Senators and Congressmen are that IDA will have smooth sailing from a legislation standpoint. There may be more kicking over the first of five installments—probably around $160 million—when it hits the proper House appropriations committee.

There are two points working in its favor, however.

For many years, Senators and Congressmen have been calling, for the benefit of the people back home, for some new ideas in the way of foreign assistance. They have urged that some provisions for sharing the burden be designed.

This is it.

Not only is IDA a method leading toward eventually lightening the U.S. load, but it originated with the Senate. This is a formidable recommendation. Senator A. S. MIKE MONRONEY, who brought the idea back from Bangkok, Thailand, in 1956, pushed the resolution urging IDA through the Senate.

The administration, urged on by Secretary of the Treasury Robert B. Anderson, will be solidly behind IDA.

Senate Majority Leader LYNDON B. JOHNSON will probably support the proposal.

In a special statement on IDA, he explained his position in these words:

"Obviously these new nations don't have the capital to meet their own needs. If we wait until they can qualify as bankers' risks, we may find those nations turning to Soviet leadership rather than following our leadership. The West cannot survive as an island of freedom in a sea of Communist influence."

JOHNSON SAYS CHANGES NEEDED

"To meet this new responsibility, we are going to need some new concepts, new approaches, and new institutions. Since the end of World War II, our concept of assistance to others has been short-term, emergency-type aid. For the future, the needs will be longer term—needs for investment capital in the basic structure of a free society.

"I believe that this is a responsibility which all free nations share together and that each share according to their own rising capabilities. To do this, a new concept is necessary.

"Whether the IDA approach itself is the precise answer I don't know. But something akin to it in purpose, if not in form, should be studied and developed.

"When men go through the struggle of winning freedom, other free men have a responsibility to them to make freedom meaningful. There must be a parity of living standards among free men—and that should be the first objective of our own policies."

JOHNSON has frequently said that one of the two or three critical sectors of free world policy during the 1960's will be our response to the needs of the world's young nations.

Creation of the International Development Association will not mean an immediate cutback in U.S. contributions.

There are already more than half a dozen organizations to which we contribute in part or wholly.

The latest is the Development Loan Fund, a purely national effort spending in the neighborhood of $700 million a year.

The DLF makes loans similar to those which are contemplated by IDA but these are for purely selfish reasons—there is usually a political string attached.

"We probably always will need some such political fund," the officials quoted earlier said.

LOAN TO ARGENTINA WAS FAST

He pointed to the swift $80 million loan made to Argentina when Dictator Juan Peron was kicked out, only to leave the government in a big hole for foreign exchange.

"Had we not been able to make the loan, we would have been in no position to keep Peron out," he explained.

The eventual benefit of IDA to the U.S. taxpayer won't be so easily calculated, but it will be real, with the other industrial nations bearing a proportionate share of the cost for new projects, even to attaching their own "buy German" or "buy Japan" tags to their own financing. The overall cost to the United States will lessen.

There are vast sectors of the world awaiting some good loan terms for development. Two of the 60 to 80 which have hung fire in the World Bank because other developments get first priority on guaranteeing loans were pinpointed by the World Bank.

Negotiations on development of the Indus River Valley have gone on for more than a decade. The 1,700 mile river, called the wettest in the world, flows down the mountains of Tibet between and into India and Pakistan. The valley is the cradle of Indian civilization, and is at least 5,000 years old.

World Bank engineers have determined that a 10-year program involving numerous dams will cost $1 billion, half of which must come from outside the two countries. The World Bank cannot make multicountry loans.

IDA could.

Neither India nor Pakistan can finance the extra half billion. Both are straining to modernize transportation and other areas first.

Meanwhile, the 40 million people in the valley who would benefit are watching more water run unchecked down the Indus River to the sea than is used for irrigation each year in the United States.

A similar river project exists in the backward nations of Laos, Cambodia, Vietnam, and Thailand. This is the Mekong River—2,600 miles long, 10th longest in the world. It rises on the border of China and wanders through all four of these new nations before reaching the sea.

Three years ago a United Nations team surveyed the Mekong Valley and found considerable potential for irrigation and power projects. But no institution can make the four-country loan which is necessary to get started.

IDA could.

Of all the foreign assistance programs which grind their way through Congress under protest each year, this holds the most promise—for the weary U.S. taxpayer and for the underdeveloped countries of the world.

[From the Houston Post, Dec. 14, 1959]

IDA—LOAD-SHARING PLAN GAINED AT NEW DELHI

(What has gone before: While in Thailand in 1956, Senator A. S. MIKE MONRONEY, of Oklahoma, conceived a plan of tremendous economic significance to the world, a plan

whereby the nations who have regained their economic strength with U.S. aid could join the United States in helping still underdeveloped lands. He found a strong supporter in Secretary of the Treasury Robert B. Anderson. So was born IDA—International Development Association.)

(By Jim Mathis)

WASHINGTON.—The proposed International Development Association, born of discussions in the Far East, got its first pair of long trousers at New Delhi, India.

This was the scene, in October 1958, of the annual meeting of the governors of the existing international financial institutions, the World Bank, and the International Monetary Fund.

Secretary of the Treasury Robert B. Anderson, the U.S. Governor, had wisely chosen his first audience for IDA.

The thinking of the influential and experienced financial representatives of the 68 member nations, and their reports to their governments, would determine the future of the proffered soft loan branch.

While IDA was the one new feature proposed by the United States at New Delhi, it was only one point of a triangular program which represented the initial movement of the United States toward more universal sharing of the burden of assisting less fortunate nations of the world.

In an exchange of letters in August of 1958, Anderson and President Eisenhower had formalized the emerging new look of foreign assistance.

Anderson had become convinced soon after taking over as Secretary of the Treasury of basic facts in our international financial relations:

1. The preservation of the value of the dollar, now the standard of value, and the world's reserve currency, is of vital importance to the free world.

2. The U.S. financial transactions were leading it to an imbalance of international payments—the wrong way.

3. Continued capital must be made available to the underdeveloped nations as an important cornerstone of efforts to preserve their freedom and our own well-being.

4. The economically resurgent nations of Western Europe and Japan should shoulder part of the cost of development of backward nations.

TIME FOR CHANGE, ANDERSON FELT

In short, Anderson felt that the times called for a reorientation of the policies of the earlier postwar period.

The continued export of U.S. capital, in dollars, abroad through foreign aid, military spending, tourism, and investments in recent years had brought about two changes.

The once troublesome dollar gap had been closed. The revitalized industrial nations were competing for markets and the dollars were now congregating in Western Europe. Foreign banks backed by their governments hold $9.5 billion, in dollars, and companies and individuals hold another $6.5 billion.

The continued movement outward had led to an imbalance in international payments working against the United States. Last year, the United States ran $3.4 billion in the red. This is expected to climb even higher.

The $16 billion held abroad constituted a claim in cash or short-term notes on the United States. The $35-odd billion owed the United States is long term.

Anderson's efforts were to slow down the outward flow of dollars and gold while at the same time maintaining capital for the underdeveloped nations. And to shore up the value of the dollar.

At home, Anderson's influence was exerted toward a balanced budget and a freer hand in the management of the vast public debt.

For the international arena, the Secretary summed up his suggestions in the August 18, 1958, letter to the President.

It would seem highly desirable, he wrote, that the nations of the free world as a whole should move forward cooperatively to deal more effectively with the problem.

He suggested a doubling of the capital of the World Bank, the good loan-lending agency, and the International Monetary Fund, the stabilizer for foreign government finances.

In addition, he put forward the idea of the new International Development Association to fill in current blank spots in the World Bank's lending authority, as a separate but affiliated lending agency.

FOREIGN AID PROGRAMS OUTLINED

President Eisenhower, in his reply of August 2, outlined the advances the United States had made in its own foreign aid programs—increase in lending authority of the Export-Import Bank, incorporation of the Development Loan Fund, and other actions.

The President made three points necessary for a dynamic and financially sound economic environment for free nations:

1. A continuing growth in productive investment, international as well as domestic.

2. Financial policies that will command the confidence of the public and assure the strength of currencies.

3. Mutually beneficial international trade and a constant effort to avoid hampering restrictions on the freedom of exchange transactions.

He urged an increase in the quotas of foreign governments in the World Bank and the Monetary Fund.

The President directed Anderson to move toward establishment of the IDA.

"I believe that such an affiliate of the International Bank, if adequately supported by a number of countries able to contribute, could provide a useful supplement to the existing lending activities of the bank and thereby accelerate the pace of economic development in the less developed member countries of the Bank," the President wrote.

In this manner, the United States moved toward Anderson's goal—cooperative aid to the underdeveloped countries.

Anderson laid out only the bare outlines of IDA before the New Delhi group. There were some temporarily deaf ears present. Much more negotiating, jockeying, and outlining was to come.

In August of this year the National Advisory Council on International Monetary and Financial Problems made its formal report on IDA as instructed by Senate resolution. Anderson is Chairman of the Council.

MONRONEY PROPOSAL CUT IN HALF

The outline suggested a $1 billion capitalization, exactly half that proposed by Senator A. S. MIKE MONRONEY, Democrat, of Oklahoma, who originated the resolution. The U.S. contribution was to be $320 million over a 5-year period.

Other quotas were to be on the same percentages assigned for World Bank members.

There were limitations placed upon the use of soft currency held by the United States, a major factor in MONRONEY's plan. Part of these funds already have limitations, and their free use in underdeveloped countries could cause inflation easily.

The report indicated that a number of marginal nations—between the industrial and underdeveloped category—were still considering the balance of benefits and responsibilities involved.

IDA would be part and parcel of the World Bank, managed by the Bank's experienced staff, and its operations closely coordinated with other foreign loan and grant efforts.

The Bank's conservative-minded directorate could be expected to prevent abuse of the soft loan facilities at the expense of the tougher loan setup managed out of the main bank window.

A month and a half after making public its outline, Anderson again took IDA before the Bank's governors. In the meantime, ambassadors had been called in for talks, governors had been buttonholed, and the path generally smoothed.

Great Britain had gone so far as to endorse IDA on the floor of Parliament.

President Eisenhower made a personal appearance, and in a brief welcoming address, stressed the importance of all nations assuming their share of the development costs.

Many development projects exist, the President said, which, though economically sound, cannot be financed by existing international institutions.

"In our view, no other mechanism can perform this task for the free world as well as the International Development Association," the President said.

LENDING AGENCY NEED IS CITED

Anderson, speaking after the President, said that everyone realized that in less developed countries there were sound projects which could not be handled under the criteria set up by existing institutions.

"It would be unfortunate if we did not help in these situations, where often only a relatively small margin of capital is needed," the Secretary said.

Attached to the World Bank, he added, there would be no conflict, and membership would be made up of free nations "subscribing to the sound monetary policies" of the International Fund.

This was a lever aimed at nations reluctant to participate because of their hopes for the Special United Nations Fund for Economic Development, or SUNFED.

SUNFED proposed both long term, low-interest rates, and outright grants. Despite its happy combination of letters—it started out UNFED—the organization was bogged down in the U.N. It would include all nations.

The determination of the United States to move along its proposed policies of sharing the burden among free nations paid off. IDA was accepted without a single dissenting voice.

Mr. COOPER subsequently said: Mr. President, a few minutes ago, I heard the colloquy between the distinguished Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, and the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], on the subject of the International Development Association Fund. Great problems have been raised in this country about our foreign aid program, and they are being raised continually.

Looking ahead, I believe opportunities are offered for the consideration of multilateral efforts, whether they be through the World Bank, in the form of an association such as that sponsored by the Senator from Oklahoma, or through the Special Fund of the United Nations.

It is correct, as Mr. Hoffman says, that such multilateral efforts bring larger and more varied contributions from many countries. They remove short-term political considerations which inevitably enter into bilateral aid. I think they inspire a greater effort both upon the part of the developed countries and the developing countries toward economic and social growth.

I commend Mr. Hoffman's study to the Members of the Senate.

EXPORTS TO UNDERDEVELOPED COUNTRIES

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, Mr. Paul Hoffman, brilliant administrator of our Marshall plan which was so successful in Europe, and now Managing Director of the United Nations Special Fund, held a press conference in Washington yesterday on a new pamphlet he has written titled "One Hundred Countries—1¼ Billion People: How To Speed Their Economic Growth and Ours—in the 1960's."

A multinational approach and a sharing of responsibility through both bankable loans and long-term loans at low interest rates which are genuinely repayable and not charity, marked the press release he issued regarding the pamphlet, and I ask unanimous consent to have the release inserted in the RECORD at this point.

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

PAUL G. HOFFMAN PRESS CONFERENCE, REGARDING NEW PAMPHLET, "ONE HUNDRED COUNTRIES—1¼ BILLION PEOPLE: HOW TO SPEED THEIR ECONOMIC GROWTH AND OURS—IN THE 1960'S"

WASHINGTON, D.C.—A potential market for the United States of $14 billion of our exports to 100 underdeveloped countries in 1970—representing an increase of more than 100 percent over our 1958 exports there—was predicted today (Friday, February 19) by Paul G. Hoffman, Managing Director of the United Nations Special Fund, provided the 1¼ billion peoples of these underdeveloped countries are enabled to raise their per capita income from their annual current $100 per person to $125 per person in 1970.

A market of about $320 billion over the next decade, for the exports of all the developed countries to these same areas would also result, he added.

The statements were contained in a pamphlet (released at a press conference in Washington on Thursday, February 18), calling for United States and world recognition of the 100 underdeveloped countries as "a great new economic frontier."

Titled "One Hundred Countries—1¼ Billion People: How To Speed Their Economic Growth and Ours—in the 1960's," Mr. Hoffman's pamphlet outlines new approaches and proposals by which to achieve such growth for "powerful moral, political, and business reasons."

Mr. Hoffman, former administrator for the Marshall plan, said, "I propose that the nations of the world set for themselves the common task of assisting the people of the underdeveloped areas to increase the annual growth of their per capita income from 1 to 2 percent each year for the next 10 years. This means roughly an increase of $2 per head per year, instead of the present rate of $1 per head. Compounded over 10 years, this would raise annual per capita income from its present level of about $100 to approximately $125 by the end of 1970.

"This is a modest, but a reasonable and feasible, goal. However, to achieve it, new concepts, fresh approaches, and more adequate technical assistance and investment are required."

Among the new approaches and proposals which the pamphlet sets forth are the following:

1. Economic assistance is not charity, and it must not be so considered. "If it is considered as charity, many nations will contribute nothing because the view is widely held, and I share it, that governments should not use tax money for philanthropic purposes * * *. If economic assistance is considered charity, the effect on the recipient nations is devastating; it saps the self-reliance of both the leaders and their people in the low income countries. The correct attitude psychologically and practically for all countries, whether their incomes are high, middle, or low, is that they must in their own self-interest accept proportionate responsibility for the achievement of a rapidly expanding world economy."

2. Economic assistance should be divorced from international politics. Helping to promote greater prosperity in expanding freedom is an objective worthy to be pursued for its own sake. We must not pull the effort down to defeat with political strings, nor try to buy goodwill with it, nor try to make momentary gains in a cold war.

3. "It is urgent to speed and expand programs of technical assistance, especially work such as that of the United Nations Special Fund in surveying natural resources and training people in the skills they must have to make effective use of their rivers, forests, fields, and mineral wealth. The reason for underdevelopment is underutilization of physical and human resources."

4. "Greatly expanded use should be made of the services of the United Nations and its specialized agencies operating in the development field." Mr. Hoffman emphasizes that assistance through the United Nations is more acceptable politically to the countries receiving aid. In addition the United Nations can be "tough" with the underdeveloped countries without being accused of seeking any political or commercial advantage. He believes that better results can be obtained through the United Nations machinery in substantial savings of money.

5. A steadily expanding world economy will be necessary. This means that the industrialized countries must sustain an accelerated rate of economic growth and maintain liberal trade policies so that the developing countries may earn their way as far as possible through their own exports and savings, and so that the industrialized countries may be stimulated to ever-increasing production efficiency.

6. Greater initiative and effort on the part of leaders and people of the underdeveloped countries themselves will be necessary.

7. There will have to be an increase in the flow of public and private investment capital from the industrialized countries to the less developed countries from the present level of about $4 billion a year to an average of $7 billion a year, over the decade 1961–70, or $3 billion a year over the present level.

Mr. Hoffman calculates that, of this amount, perhaps as much as $1 billion a year can be supplied through increased private investment and through expansion of bankable loans supplied by the World Bank, the Export-Import Bank, and other national and multinational public institutions. This would leave $2 billion a year in nonbankable loans to be supplied from new sources. This will have to be public money supplied for investment in the infrastructure or underpinnings of a developing economy: highways, schools, training institutes, community services, communications, and so on—facilities which are not immediately revenue producing, but which yield large returns in the generally increasing output of a developing economy. Mr. Hoffman says that these may not be bankable loans, as they would have to be for longer and more favorable terms and at lower interest than available from public or private banking institutions, but that they would be the best investments the industrialized countries could possibly make.

8. The proposed International Development Association, Mr. Hoffman believes, is admirably suited to make loans of this kind, but its proposed capitalization is far too small. Hr. Hoffman believes that at least half of the additional $2 billion a year needed for infrastructure loans should be channeled through the proposed IDA—and that IDA should be expanded to make loans of not less than $1 billion a year, rather than that amount over 5 years as seems to be currently planned.

"If IDA is not properly expanded, after a year or so of operations, then a new institution will have to be created," Mr. Hoffman states in the pamphlet.

Mr. Hoffman emphasized that the foregoing program was not only a practical possibility but that results might actually exceed the suggested goals.

"I am encouraged in this belief," he said "by our experience with the Marshall plan. * * * After only 2½ years of that plan the work of reconstruction had gone forward with such a will that industrial production in Western Europe had jumped to 40 percent above the highest prewar figure. The job of European recovery was accomplished with U.S. aid of only about $13 billion. Why did this happen? Because of the tremendous upsurge in the spirit of the European people. You cannot measure by statistical analysis the potentialities of the human spirit."

Mr. Hoffman leaves today for a trip to India, Pakistan, Japan, and other countries.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Hoffman's bold approach to surveys of resources in underdeveloped countries through qualified experts will greatly simplify the focusing of attention on worthwhile projects and the elimination of uneconomic proposals. Thus the United Nations Special Fund run by Mr. Hoffman, the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development and the new International Development Association which I hope we soon will be operating, will be able to provide better planning, programing, and financing for economic development needed round the world.

Mr. COOPER subsequently said: Mr. President, a few minutes ago the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] commented on a report which had been made by Mr. Paul Hoffman, formerly administrator of the Marshall plan, and now the Managing Director of the Special Fund of the United Nations. Yesterday Mr. Hoffman released a booklet written by him and published by a private foundation, the Albert D. and Mary Lasker Foundation.

This is, I believe, one of the simplest and most comprehensive statements of the problem of economic growth in the less developed world that is available in brief and readable form.

It also makes, I believe, several unique contributions.

First, it reduces the complicated statistics of the problem to a basic arithmetic which is comprehensible to all. There are, he finds, 1¼ billion people, living in a hundred countries and territories in the non-Communist world, having average per capita incomes of about a hundred dollars a year—incomes which have risen at the rate of $1 a year over the past decade.

A second unique contribution made by Mr. Hoffman's new booklet is that it proposes a rough goal for the capital-exporting and the developing nations to seek together, during the decade of the 1960's. He proposes as a goal the raising of the average rate of economic growth for the billion and a quarter people in the hundred countries and territories

from a net advance of 1 percent per annum to 2 percent per annum. This would raise per capita income levels from about $100 a year to about $125 a year by 1970.

A third contribution made by Mr. Hoffman is that he has calculated the cost to the capital-exporting countries to achieve the goal he proposes. I need not remind Senators that one great advantage of the Marshall plan was that we had an objective to be accomplished within a given period of time and at a given estimated cost. Mr. Hoffman is now proposing that we can establish at least rough quantitative measurements for this completely different job of helping the less developed nations dig their way out of centuries of poverty and hopelessness.

Another contribution to our understanding of this problem is made when Mr. Hoffman stresses the point that aid is trade. He forcefully makes the point that in providing so-called aid, it does not go out in the form of dollar bills, pound-sterling notes, or French francs. It goes forth in the form of food and textiles, chemicals and machinery, equipment, and thousands of other items. He calculates that if the less developed areas as a whole do succeed in doubling their rate of growth during the present decade compared to the past decade, it would result in the growth of trade throughout the world.

Thus, by measuring the rate of progress over the past decade, by proposing an objective for the next decade, and by calculating the cost of reaching that objective, I believe Mr. Hoffman's booklet makes a very large contribution to understanding a subject which has been clouded in the past.

But to me the most encouraging thing of all in Mr. Hoffman's study is his report on the experience of the United Nations in fostering economic and social growth in the low-income areas of the world.

First, because the U.N. does not have any shortrun political aims, no military or commercial advantage to seek, no influence for sale, it can concentrate fully on economic criteria as a basis for its aid. The U.N. has been able to specify terms of performance for aid recipients which no single nation could demand without being accused of interference in the internal affairs of the other.

Second, because the U.N. makes possible a true partnership between the countries receiving assistance and the world agency which is providing it, there has developed a two-way traffic in economic cooperation. Eighty-five nations have made contributions to the U.N. technical assistance program, and most of the nations receiving U.N. technical assistance are also furnishing assistance in other fields to other countries.

Third, the United Nations has the advantage of being able to recruit technicians from all over the world—and it has done just that.

There is one statistic in Mr. Hoffman's report which should be very carefully pondered. During the first year of its operation, the U.N. Special Fund approved 44 projects to speed economic progress in 50 countries and territories. The total value of these projects is $75 million. Of this amount $44 million is supplied by the recipient countries themselves. The Special Fund contributed the other $31 million. The United States share of that was $12 million. So our contribution of $12 million helped bring about $75 million worth of resource surveys and research and training projects in 50 countries. This represents a partnership undertaking between the advanced nations and the developing nations with none of the frictions of bilateral relations.

It may be that the UN is pointing the way toward the most successful form of cooperative economic development.

In any event, I commend Mr. Hoffman's study to all Senators.

PEOPLE-TO-PEOPLE PROGRAM

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, a little less than a year ago the distinguished Senator from California [Mr. ENGLE] and I had the pleasure of partaking in the annual meeting of the civic committee of the people-to-people program and the international municipal cooperation committee of the American Municipal Association, held in Washington.

The purpose of the meeting was to discuss ways of getting more American communities interested in establishing town affiliations or sister city relationships with foreign communities, as a means of building lasting two-way relationships from which international friendships and understanding can grow.

President Eisenhower has said:

> Greater understanding among nations, on a people-to-people as well as a government-to-government basis, is a necessary part of our efforts to remove the misunderstandings that hinder disarmament, the building of a safeguarded peace, and the strengthening of freedom.

The U.S. Information Agency is doing a great deal to remove these misunderstandings, through its radio broadcasts, films, exhibits, publications, and other media. However, in many countries of the world, especially those which have known colonial domination, the most open and objective American informational activity encounters age-old suspicions which equate governmental information services with propaganda, with all of its questionable connotations.

My experiences in India and in the United Nations strengthened my belief that mistrust and distrust cannot be overcome simply by rational explanations or analytical discussion. In personal ways peoples abroad can, through association, achieve understanding of the reasons which underlie American policies and objectives.

The President's recent 11-nation tour, for example, contributed greatly to the building of faith, confidence, and understanding in a distinctly personal way. The character of Dwight D. Eisenhower shone through to millions of people in Europe, Africa, the Near and Middle East, and South Asia as that of a warm, friendly human being, and as a sincere and distinguished statesman who spoke currently on national and international objectives. And, in the eyes of the peoples of the countries he visited, he became the symbol of the American people and their dedication to the spirit of peace, and friendship in freedom.

Similarly, through their affiliations with "sister cities" overseas nearly a hundred American communities are helping to instill faith and confidence in America, and to promote better understanding of American motives and actions among peoples abroad. The way some of these communities are carrying out the objectives of the people-to-people program is described in the March 1960, issue of the Reader's Digest, in an article entitled "The Two-Way Rewards of City-to-Foreign-City Exchanges," by Marianne Besser and Joseph Alvarez. I ask unanimous consent that the article be inserted in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

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

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, the cities of Louisville, Lexington, and Versailles in Kentucky have a historical affinity for communities in France which dates back to the attachment which the new State of Kentucky, settled by many who fought in the Revolutionary War, had for the French because of their help in the struggle for freedom. The very names "Louisville" and "Versailles" bespeak a French attachment, of course, as do our Paris, Lafayette, and Bourbon County. Today Louisville maintains an active affiliation with Montpelier, France, while Lexington has close relations with Deauville, and Versailles is "twinned" with its namesake city in France.

I believe that in the pairing of cross sections of America and peoples of other countries at the community or municipal level, we can achieve pervasive and enduring relationships. Civic officials compare notes about common problems like housing, transportation, sanitation, financing, and so forth; as schools, clubs, and other institutions share information and experiences with their foreign counterparts.

In this era of rising expectations, millions of people throughout the world are turning their backs on domination, poverty, disease, and illiteracy. They aspire to better things for themselves and their offspring. The people of American communities have a great opportunity to reach out hands of friendship to communities abroad, and to share experiences and information toward these objectives.

I hopefully look to the day when American communities and communities of other countries which have natural relationships of size, topography, economy, and historical and cultural interests will be affiliated in this people-to-people movement.

I am sure that the Reader's Digest article which follows will prompt thousands of American and foreign readers to seek more information about how they and their neighbors can reap the "two-way rewards of city-to-foreign-city exchanges."

EXHIBIT 1

THE TWO-WAY REWARDS OF CITY-TO-FOREIGN-CITY EXCHANGES

(By Marianne Besser and Joseph Alvarez)

With so much talk about the unpopularity of Americans abroad, consider the following incidents:

When a middle-aged couple from Worthington, Minn., arrived in Crailsheim, a farming community in southwest Germany, people lined the streets, eager to shake their hands.

A family of five from San Jose, Calif., visiting Japan's enchanting valley city of Okayama, were given an unforgettable welcome that included dinner on a lantern-lit boat, an exhibition of cormorant fishing, and an evening at a folk-dance festival.

In the town of Mercara, India, an American publisher and his wife were warmly received by townspeople and immediately taken into their homes.

Why were these Americans greeted with such hospitality? The answer involves an encouraging development in building international relations on a people-to-people level. For these Americans were visiting the "sister cities" of their home towns. Through such town affiliations, thousands in this country are discovering that meeting people of other cultures is fun. And other thousands abroad are beginning to have a new and warm understanding of Americans.

According to the American Municipal Association, about 90 U.S. towns have active friendships with sister towns in 23 countries. Some 150 additional communities have expressed interest in starting a program.

Affiliations usually begin informally, at the suggestion of private individuals. Take the Darien-Mercara story. One spring afternoon in 1954, three women in Darien, Conn., discussing the town's celebration of United Nations Day, decided that Darien might send a gift to a foreign city. They chose India because it offered more challenge than Europe. An Indian they met suggested Mercara, capital of Coorg, a state in southwest India. Its population is roughly the same as Darien (about 14,000), and both towns are relatively wealthy and progressive. Mercara has a government college, a large public secondary school, several private schools, a hospital, and a Rotary Club.

In the years since then, many personal friendships have sprung up between citizens of the two towns. Darien keeps permanent open house for Mercarans studying or working in the United States. An Indian silk tree grows in front of Darien High School; a baby elephant trumpets on the unfamiliar shores of Long Island Sound. Hundreds of Darien schoolchildren can tell you all about monsoons, the caste system, and Mercara's coffee plantations.

For Darien's first "India Day," in the summer of 1954, Indian doctors, students, and U.N. workers in the New York area were invited to spend the day with various Darien families. High point was a community picnic to which the Indian women in their gay saris added a colorful note. India Day has become an annual fete in Darien, attended by hundreds of Darienites and as many as 70 Indians. "This program gives you a feeling of doing something direct and personal," says Jane Edmundson, an enthusiastic supporter of the project. "Our Indian guests are delighted to visit American homes. I know I would feel terribly disappointed if I went to India and never saw an Indian household."

Two Darienites who did visit Mercara were shown the same enthusiastic hospitality. Tony and Evelyn Glick, in India on a Ford Foundation study, were entertained in homes, as well as at schools, where they delivered gifts from Darien children. The Glicks showed slides of Darien and answered many questions—about women's role in America; about why we don't censor to a greater extent our sensational movies and comic books; about snow, which Mercarans have never seen.

The outstanding symbol of the Darien-Mercara friendship is Shakuntala, the baby elephant, sent by Mercara schoolchildren to the children of Darien. To pay the cost of her passage, Darienites packed a benefit performance of "The River," Jean Renoir's movie about India. Shakuntala arrived amid festivities marked by the presence of India's consul-general, Gopala Menon. The owner of the local children's zoo offered to keep the elephant for 2 years so that Darien children could visit their pet at any time. As a return gift, Mercara has received a much-needed two-room hospital ward.

The friendship between Hagerstown, Md., and Wesel, Germany, began in 1951 when Dr. Rolfe von Boenninghausen, director of Wesel's surrounding County Rees, stopped off at Hagerstown during a State Department tour through this country. The U.S. city, with its many German names and its varied industry, so reminded him of Wesel that he felt the people of the two communities would get along well.

Few Hagerstonians had ever met foreigners. "Ours was a very tight little town," says Catherine Beachley, the dynamic spirit behind the local affiliation committee. "But this program really opened the hearts and homes of our people."

Hagertown's most recent guest from Wesel was Guenther Langner, a young man with a quick smile and firm handshake. Guenther worked part time as a maintenance man for the Board of Education while attending junior college. Wesel had especially asked to send a man with a trade, to get away from the tendency to limit international exchanges to officials, teachers, and students. A carpenter when he came, Guenther returned to Wesel determined to become an architect as a result of his American studies.

Special exhibits by each city have done much to cement Hagerstown-Wesel friendship. Wesel's exhibit showed how the city looked just after the war when it was almost 90 percent destroyed, and how it looks now that it has been nearly rebuilt. The U.S. exhibit portrayed the history and daily life of Hagerstown and surrounding Washington County. Educators, officials, businessmen, and housewives worked to put it together. Students built a model of an American Indian village—one of the most popular items in the exhibit. A doctor's wife planned the medical section. A German-speaking citizen translated the text. In 2 weeks 25,000 Germans flocked to Wesel's town hall to see the exhibit.

Language has never been a barrier in city-to-city programs. Language differences actually stimulated the friendship between Arles, France, and York, Pa. In 1952, York, an industrial town in the heart of the Pennsylvania-Dutch country, began experimenting with teaching French in elementary schools. This program led York to join in friendship with Arles. Today French is taught to all fourth-, fifth-, and sixth-graders in York's 15 elementary schools, and more than 200 adults have studied it in evening classes.

An exchange of teachers has created many new friendships. When French teacher Jean Laurain, his wife and child arrived, more than 20 Yorkers lent him everything from teaspoons to a washing machine and TV set to furnish his temporary apartment. English teacher Margaret Boltz married Arles' mayor Charles Privat.

To give Arlesians a taste of an American worker's life, two York industrialists offered temporary jobs to a couple of Arlesian men. Furniture manufacturer Bruno Weill admits he expected more spiritual than financial rewards from his offer, but Edmond Venzin proved such a good worker that Weill feels he got the best of the bargain.

"When I left France," Venzin says, "I thought I would find a country where people have an easy life and don't care about others. Instead I found people proud of their country and ready to share its advantages. Now when I meet an American in France, I have the feeling that I meet, not a stranger, but a fellow countryman."

One of the most successful friendships is between Worthington, Minn., and Crailsheim, Germany. In 1958 Worthington won a World Brotherhood Award largely for the aid it rendered its sister town in the difficult postwar period. The award helped Mr. and Mrs. Charles Cashel, who had started the program, to visit Crailsheim and some Far Eastern cities, to probe the possibilities of establishing a threeway friendship among Worthington, Crailsheim, and an Asian town.

Two California cities—San Diego and San Jose—exchange with two cities in Japan—Yokohama and Okayama. Montclair, N.J., and Graz, Austria, have exchanged students and visitors. And a Graz doctor recently saved an Austrian boy's life with methods he learned while he was serving in a Montclair hospital.

Most town-to-town friendships work closely with the People-to-People Civic Committee, headed by Mark Bortman. Any individual can spark an affiliation in his own community, but these friendships take patience, planning, and enthusiasm, and the support of city government, civic and service clubs, schools, and newspapers. The first contact with the foreign city is usually made through the mayors of the two towns. The American Municipal Association, 1612 K Street NW., Washington 6, D.C., cooperating with People-to-People and with city governments all over the country, has prepared a pamphlet to help in planning a town affiliation. "Your Community in World Affairs" is free to anyone upon request.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD at this point a statement prepared by the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT] and a letter on this subject.

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

STATEMENT OF SENATOR SCOTT ON TOWN AFFILIATIONS AND PEOPLE-TO-PEOPLE

I commend the distinguished senior Senator from Kentucky for calling to the attention of the Senate the importance of town affiliations of the President's people-to-people program.

It is most appropriate that Senator COOPER should introduce this material onto the floor because of his long and valuable service to the United States as Ambassador to India. But almost all of us in the Senate should have a deep interest in the town affiliations program since more than 100 American communities have affiliations overseas.

This program arranges sister cities between one community in the United States and another in a nation abroad. The cities then exchange people and ideas, bringing the citizens of both lands to a closer and better understanding of one another.

The article, "Two-Way Rewards of City-to-Foreign-City Exchanges," appearing in the March issue of Reader's Digest, tells of the active and happy relationship between Arles, France, and York in my State of Pennsylvania. I understand that this relationship took on a romantic and legal aspect when an English teacher, Margaret Boltz, married Arles' mayor, Charles Privat.

Other sister city arrangements in Pennsylvania include Chambersburg and Gotemba, Japan; Cheltenham with Chelten-

ham, England; Manheim with Mannheim, Germany; and Swarthmore with Stadt, Germany.

It is encouraging to see the increase in this activity which brings people closer to one another. One other of these arrangements, although not in the town affiliations program, was undertaken in Scranton, Pa., between its high school students and students in Japan.

JANUARY 13, 1960.

Mr. GEORGE E. CLARK,
The Scranton Times,
Scranton, Pa.

DEAR MR. CLARK: I read with great interest the article in the December 18 Scranton Times, which described the novel telephone conversations between students in Scranton and Japan.

The pages from the Times were put on my desk just after I returned from a congressional inspection tour of several parts of the world, including Japan. So I read it with a background of some recently acquired knowledge of the desire of the Japanese to strengthen their bonds with the United States.

Congratulations to the Scranton Rotary Club and the many people who cooperated to make the project a success. I hope there will be more. Anything that helps people to better understand one another is a step toward world peace. We, the adults of the world, have been only partly successful in that endeavor. We must encourage future generations to do an ever better job.

Kindest regards.

Sincerely yours,

HUGH SCOTT.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, I am happy to associate myself with the remarks which have been made by my distinguished colleague from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] concerning the great value of our people-to-people program and the township-affiliation activities associated with it. Of all the projects that have been developed under this people-to-people program, I can think of none that has made a greater contribution to international understanding than the "sister city" affiliations. American cities are linked together with foreign cities in bonds of friendship, with the selection of the "sisters" based, in most instances, on mutual interest. The American Municipal Association performs a valuable service in helping local communities find foreign cities to affiliate with, based as much as possible on bringing together communities which have like problems and interests.

I am proud to say that the cities in the State of California have provided much of the leadership and inspiration in this program. According to latest reports, California has more affiliated cities than any other State, 17 of the more than 100 cities now actively engaged in this outstanding venture in international good will. Of these 17 cities, 8 have Japanese sister cities, 2 have French sister cities, and there is 1 affiliation each with El Salvador, Chile, England, Germany, Italy, Sweden, and Turkey. When the American Municipal Association recently made awards to the five leaders in this program, two were chosen from California, Mayors Robert C. Doerr, of San Jose, and Charles C. Dial, of San Diego. These men were hailed for their active participation in efforts to develop grassroots relationships between the people of the free world.

I believe this to be one of the most dynamic developments in the field of U.S. foreign relations since World War II. The diplomats have difficulty in bridging the gap between different cultures and traditions. There is no substitute for getting to know the cultures of other people in practice. The close human relationships that have developed under the township-affiliation program have done much to give flesh and blood to our formal diplomatic agreements. And yet we have only begun to realize on the great potential for peace contained in this program. All Americans must be aroused to take an interest in and give active support to the program. This is one answer to the question the average citizen asks: "What can I do to further the cause of world peace?" The threat of war will fade away as the people of the world come together in bonds of friendship and mutual understanding.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, in response to President Eisenhower's call for participation of millions of individual Americans, California cities have been quick to assist in strengthening our Nation's ties with various foreign lands by joining enthusiastically the international town affiliation phase of the people-to-people program. It is gratifying indeed to observe that my native State, a large proportion of whose population is only one or two generations removed from other countries of the globe or sister States of our own Union, is in the front rank of the commonwealths which have established intimate ties with sister cities.

With what I hope may be pardonable pride, I point out to the Senate that California, whose ocean shores constitute more than two-thirds of our Nation's continental Pacific coastline, reflects a high degree of cognizance of the importance of developing warm relations with America's loyal, thriving ally of the Orient, Japan. This is especially significant in view of the fact that less than two decades ago virtually all residents of Japanese ancestry—even, our American-born nisei—were regarded with widespread suspicion, if not outright hostility.

The fact that eight separate communities of Japan have been adopted by a like number of California cities should be an impressive message to the entire world that Americans not only are forgiving and tolerant people. This aspect of our participation in the program demonstrates a fervent desire to improve the international, political, and economic climate by taking positive action to wipe out unfortunate misunderstandings of the past and by joining hands in a global march toward lasting peace and security.

As befits a State with residents whose roots extend in all directions far beyond its borders, California cities have extended the hand of international friendship to communities of three other continents—Europe, South America, and Asia. It is noteworthy that one of our California communities seeking to improve international friendship has created relations with cities of both the Orient and Europe. The forward-looking citizens of Pasadena have affiliations with Mishima, Japan and with Ludwigshafen, Germany. Thus, all together, 15 California cities have adopted a total of 16 communities in 9 other lands.

In the hope of encouraging other municipalities to take part in this effort in "grassroots diplomacy," I request unanimous consent to have published as part of my remarks the list of California communities engaging in the town program and the names of their affiliated sister cities in other lands.

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

Alameda—Lidingo, Sweden.
Los Angeles—Nagoya, Japan.
Napa—Como, Italy.
Pasadena—Mishima, Japan, and Ludwigshafen, Germany.
Riverside—Sendai, Japan.
San Bernardino—Tachikawa, Japan.
San Diego—Yokohama, Japan.
San Francisco—Osaka, Japan.
San Jose—Okayama, Japan.
Santa Ana—Santa Ana, El Salvador.
Santa Cruz—Ajaccio, France.
Sausalito—Vina del Mar, Chile.
South Gate—Southgate, England.
Stockton—Shimizu, Japan.
Torrance—Konya, Turkey.

PAYOLA

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, in recent weeks we have been bombarded with a variety of testimony reported in a variety of ways on the subject of payola. It would appear, if we are to believe all that we read and hear, that everyone is guilty, and that no one is guilty; that money has been paid either for special favors or for bona fide professional services; that the public has been bilked by unscrupulous manipulation of program format, or that television programs have merely been made more exciting for the viewing public.

In the wake of this tumult have come suggestions, demands, orders, and threats that someone must be made to pay. Notwithstanding a need for corrective action, I suggest an even greater need to permit those agencies responsible a sufficient time to make adjustments within the framework of their operation.

On the one hand, the Federal Communications Commission is adequately prepared to handle gross misuse of our airwaves. On the other, our broadcasting networks have demonstrated a willingness and ability to properly control their programing.

Mr. President, the facts have long since been established in any number of ways. It is time now for us to pause and see what is being done, not plunge ahead recklessly with legislation which might, in the long run, prove more harmful than good.

In this connection, two splendid published accounts have recently come to my attention. On February 10, 1960, the Rocky Mountain News published a very thoughtful, objective analysis of the situation; in its issue of February 12, the Saturday Review of Literature contained an article by Elmo Roper along these same lines.

Mr. President, so that my colleagues may obtain the same basis for study which I found in these articles, I ask

unanimous consent that they be printed in full at this point in my remarks.

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

[From the Rocky Mountain News, Feb. 10, 1960]

THE LAW AND TV

On the one hand, says the House Committee on Legislative Oversight, the Federal Communications Commission and the Federal Trade Commission already have the power to "eradicate most, if not all, of the deceptive and corrupt practices in broadcasting." (This is what Attorney General Rogers said a while back.)

On the other hand, the committee says, the evidence it has gathered in its hearings on payola and rigged quiz shows points unmistakably to the need for further legislation which it recommends.

The committee says it doesn't trust the TV industry to clean its own house and deplores the passive attitude of the FCC and FTC in the past. But it notes a burst of regulatory energy since the hearings began last fall.

It is true the cleanup by TV officials and the busy crackdown initiated by FCC and FTC in recent weeks could have been started long ago if all these people had been hep to what was going on. But the Van Doren testimony and the other revelations now have shocked all hands into facing their problems.

This is what always happens when the facts get told. The public itself is the best policeman on the beat. Fear of public relation is the most effective type of regulation. In getting the story to the public, the House committee did its best work.

Whether new law is needed is something else. Most laws, especially in the field of industry regulations, could stand updating after a while. But giving any Government agency flat power to rule what's in the public interest and what isn't is risky. The public is the best judge of that.

Before it accepts the House committee proposal on this point, Congress ought to think it over pretty carefully. An overdose of bureaucracy is no cure for anything, and can be worse than the evil it is created to correct.

[From the Saturday Review, Feb. 12, 1960]

RIGGED QUIZZES: THE PUBLIC'S VIEW

(By Elmo Roper)

Exposed to the drama of the rigged TV quiz shows complete with sin and confession, villains, and victims, and a background chorus bewailing the downfall of national morality, the American public has refused to become hysterical. Rather, a nationwide cross section has just made the following evaluation of television vis-a-vis the quiz show scandals:

These disclosures show just how bad television is, 4 percent.

These practices are very wrong and should be stopped immediately, but you can't condemn all of television because of them, 65 percent.

No one can really be in favor of this kind of thing, but there's nothing very wrong about it either, 17 percent.

What happened is a normal part of show business and is perfectly all right, 7 percent.

Don't know, 7 percent.

The public, then, does not take the cynical view that "It's just show business," nor have people succumbed to a blanket condemnation of the whole television industry. Their appraisal has been sharp, but limited to the actual offenses that have been revealed.

Basically, our study was to determine the effect of the quiz show exposures on television as a whole. The resulting mosaic of opinion shows the public to be certain about some things, and divided about others, but in the final analysis capable of putting fraudulent quiz shows in a pretty sane perspective, saner than that of many of the newspaper headline writers.

Asked about a number of practices, associated with television, that have come under criticism recently, only the rigged quiz shows and "payola" received the clear and strong disapproval of the public. The public was divided in its opinion of TV ratings, free plugs, performers pretending to sing while their voices are supplied electronically, and canned laughter (which some people commented might not be immoral but was awfully annoying). Most people had no objections to advance rehearsals of interview shows with famous people.

The biggest question mark in the public's mind was over how thorough a cleanup job would be done by the television industry (39 percent expected a thorough job to be done, 37 percent thought only the most publicized abuses were being corrected, 9 percent thought not much of anything was being done, 15 percent just didn't know). Yet despite this skepticism as to how pure television practices are now and are likely to become in the future, the public gave television in general a heavy vote of confidence. Asked which medium they could least do without—radio, television, newspapers, or magazines—television topped the list, and by a big margin. Such a result might mean addiction rather than faith, but answers to a question on believability indicated the latter interpretation. Of the same four media, newspapers were considered by the public both the most and least believable, with television nudging newspapers for the "most believable" position, and seldom mentioned as "least believable." Radio was mentioned infrequently as either most or least believable, but magazines, on balance (presumably news magazines) got the lowest believability score. Thus while the public sees newspapers as running the gamut from integrity to irresponsibility, television is given a good score for general reliability.

But most of all, the public's sanity was demonstrated by the place it accorded quiz show rigging in a list of recent issues reported in the newspapers. Here are the percentages calling each "a serious moral problem":

The increasing amount of juvenile delinquency, 89 percent.

Dishonest labor leaders, 88 percent.

Government officials accepting bribes, 81 percent.

Policemen taking graft, 74 percent.

School segregation, 71 percent.

False advertising claims, 67 percent.

International disarmament, 66 percent.

The testing of atomic bombs, 65 percent.

Fixed boxing matches, 45 percent.

Congressmen putting their relatives on U.S. payrolls, 42 percent.

Rigged quiz shows on TV, 41 percent.

Disc jockeys taking payola, 34 percent.

Some may take the public's answers on this issue to indicate a moral callousness and complacency which bodes ill for the future of our society. I do not make this interpretation. Twenty-six years of asking the public thousands of questions on hundreds of subjects have convinced me that the public is usually pretty sound. It is true that occasionally a burst of emotion, usually inspired by widespread dissemination of misinformation, may cause them to go astray momentarily, but our research has shown that they are soon back on the path of commonsense, and I think I might even be pardoned if I use the word wisdom. The public, if it is anything, is human and it knows that wherever one finds human beings, one will find instances of great merit, instances of mediocrity and instances of shabbiness.

In this case the public seems to have concluded that while corruption should be stamped out wherever discovered, the fact of corruption is likely to be always with us, and the best we can do is fight its various forms as they turn up. But they haven't taken the quiz show revelations as conclusive evidence of this country's cultural degradation or decided that all entertainers are crooks, any more than they damned the entire Eisenhower administration for the peccadilloes of Adams or the entire American labor movement for the sins of Hoffa.

LAMAR, COLO.: ALL-AMERICA CITY

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I am constantly impressed with the great vitality that lies in the heart of the small communities of this country. Having lived for the last 30 years in Lamar, Colo., a rather small city, at least, small when measured by most standards, and having been a part of the growth and development of that city, I am, of course, very proud of it.

I am particularly proud at the moment that Lamar, Colo., is one of the cities which has been selected as an all-America city by Look magazine and the National Municipal League in the contest which has just closed.

Mr. President, the basis of this award is "energetic, purposeful, intelligent citizen effort in attaining specific civil improvements in the public interest."

In the case of my own city of Lamar, Colo., the situation is that here is a city which has gone through the Dust Bowl of the thirties, and more recently the very stringent drought period of the fifties, but has nevertheless been able to accomplish things which would shock most larger cities.

In 1956 the city set a goal of some 12 points which it intended to accomplish. These included three new schools, a completely new water system, including storage facilities, as well as the supplying of supplemental water, a modern sewage system, an airport, a swimming pool, and a better hospital, the hospital having doubled in capacity partially through the efforts of the local citizens and partially through the sisters who operate it.

Last year, determined to remain a regional hub, it began to diversify its industries, and this year it has added a new industry.

In this accomplishment I believe no small credit should go to Mr. C. O. Bowman, the present mayor and the mayor during a good portion of this time of development, as well as to Mr. C. E. Beggs, who has just concluded his term as mayor of this city.

Truly here is a city which has not had the benefit of any great wealth or any great deposits of uranium or any great deposits of oil—nothing but a great deal of hard work and elbow grease and a real ambition to place their community on the map and to make it a better place in which to live. I for one am proud to be a member of this community, and I wish here to express my congratulations to all members of that community who have done so much to merit the award which has just been made.

THE STELLA SCHOOL DISTRICT

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, before I suggest the absence of a quorum, I wish to refer to a comment made yesterday by the distinguished minority

leader [Mr. DIRKSEN] with further reference to the Stella School District. He said, as appears in the RECORD of yesterday at page 2856:

The Army is not disposed to press the claim, so long as there is a possibility of handling the matter by legislation.

I am fully aware of the great influence of the minority leader on the Army and the executive branch. I feel certain that so long as he is the minority leader, and is willing and able to hold up action, he can do so. But I really do not believe this is satisfactory to the people of Stella, Mo. They are "under the gun" to the tune of $6,200, at least. They do not have $6,200. It is very embarrassing to self-respecting people in their area to have hanging over them, in my opinion, an unjustified bill.

The bill may die on the calendar. For example, at the end of this session, if the bill does not pass, the people of Stella, Mo., will be left without any possibility of relief. There will be nothing to prevent the Army, except the good will of the Senator from Illinois, from proceeding to press its claim.

Again I recommend to the minority leader that he consider the passage of a bill which will excuse this claim without any further delay, so that the financial solvency of the people of Stella, Mo., may not any longer be under a cloud.

The debate the other evening generally developed the thesis that it was a mistake to try to charge $6,200 rent for this old officers' club.

Again I recommend to the Senators that they reconsider their attitude with regard to this minor bill, and see whether it will be possible to reach a unanimous-consent agreement to pass the bill, so as to free the Stella School District from this unjustified and much too large rental for the officers' club.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, at this point will the Senator from Arkansas yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield for a question.

Mr. KEATING. I wish to make a comment and also ask a question, but I am sure that both will be brief.

Today, I have been touched—as I was the last time—by the solicitude of my friend, the Senator from Arkansas, for Stella, Mo. If I did not know of the great activities and the distinguished service the Senator from Arkansas performs in this body and the assiduous way in which he goes about the performance of his duties, I would think he was a public-relations counsel for Stella, Mo.

Today, one of the distinguished Senators from Missouri spoke at great length on national defense, but never mentioned the situation at Stella, Mo., as constituting a problem of great concern to him.

Again I say that I think this matter is of primary concern to the Senators from Missouri. I believe they should be the ones who at least should join in the request for immediate action on the bill which deals with this problem.

I can say—because I talked with the distinguished minority leader about this matter—that action is not being taken by the Army simply because of the intervention of the distinguished minority leader. The Army feels that under the circumstances, with this bill pending, it would be inappropriate for it to proceed. So the Army is awaiting the outcome of this proposed legislation.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I do not think the Senator from New York should minimize the influence of the Senator from Illinois. He is a very important figure in Washington.

Mr. KEATING. I fully realize that; he has great influence with me and with everyone else. But in this case I think the Senator from Arkansas would equally be able to get the Department of Defense not to press this claim, because I feel sure that the pending measure will eventually become law. In fact, this bill, together with very important amendments to it, should become law in the very near future.

I am sure that in connection with passage of the bill, the interest of the Senator from Arkansas in the people of Stella, Mo., will be so great that he will be happy to support the bill, no matter what amendments may be attached to it.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the call of the roll be rescinded.

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

Is there further business to come before the Senate?

PROGRAM FOR NEXT WEEK

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I have been requested by the majority leader to announce that next week there will be a number of late sessions and a Saturday session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Did the Chair correctly understand the Senator from Arkansas to say there will be a Saturday session?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Yes, a Saturday session next week, not tomorrow.

RECESS TO MONDAY

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate at this time, then, in accordance with the order previously entered, I move that the Senate now stand in recess until Monday at 12 o'clock meridian.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 6 minutes p.m.) the Senate took a recess, under the order previously entered, until Monday, February 22, 1960, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate February 19 (legislative day of February 15), 1960:

U.S. DISTRICT JUDGE

Olin Hatfield Chilson, of Colorado, to be U.S. district judge for the district of Colorado, vice William L. Knous, deceased.

U.S. ATTORNEY

William C. Spire, of Nebraska, to be U.S. attorney for the district of Nebraska for the term of 4 years. He is now serving in this office under an appointment which expires April 24, 1960.

U.S. MARSHALS

Lyle F. Milligan, of Wisconsin, to be U.S. marshal for the eastern district of Wisconsin for the term of 4 years. He is now serving in this office under an appointment which expires March 1, 1960.

Santos Buxo, Jr., of Puerto Rico, to be U.S. marshal for the district of Puerto Rico for the term of 4 years. He is now serving in this office under an appointment which expires March 1, 1960.

U.S. TARIFF COMMISSION

Glenn W. Sutton, of Georgia, to be a member of the U.S. Tariff Commission for the term expiring June 16, 1966. (Reappointment.)

FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION

Earl W. Kintner, of Indiana, to be a Federal Trade Commissioner for the term of 7 years from September 26, 1960. (Reappointment.)

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

The following-named Foreign Service officers for promotion from class 2 to class 1:

Ralph J. Blake, of Oregon.
James E. Brown, Jr., of Pennsylvania.
Joseph B. Costanzo, of New Jersey.
H. Francis Cunningham, Jr., of Nebraska.
Olcott H. Deming, of Connecticut.
Andrew G. Lynch, of New York.
Lionel M. Summers, of the District of Columbia.
Gerald Warner, of Massachusetts.
Barr V. Washburn, of Utah.

The following-named Foreign Service officers for promotion from class 2 to class 1 and to be also consuls general of the United States of America:

Patten D. Allen, of New York.
Norbert L. Anschuetz, of Maryland.
Miss Ruth Bacon, of Massachusetts.
Milton Barall, of New York.
J. Paul Barringer, of Pennsylvania.
Wymberley DeR. Coerr, of Connecticut.
Earl T. Crain, of Virginia.
Robert H. S. Eakens, of Texas.
John W. Evans, of the District of Columbia.
William A. Fowler, of Washington.
Eugene A. Gilmore, Jr., of Nebraska.
Sam P. Gilstrap, of Oklahoma.
John Goodyear, of New York.
Marshall Green, of Massachusetts.
Wesley C. Haraldson, of Virginia.
Ralph Hilton, of Texas.
Robert G. Hooker, Jr., of California.
Raymond G. Leddy, of New York.
Roy M. Melbourne, of Virginia.
Frederick T. Merrill, of the District of Columbia.
Armin H. Meyer, of Illinois.
John Ordway, of the District of Columbia.
Walter A. Radius, of Virginia.
Milton C. Rewinkel, of Minnesota.
Rufus Burr Smith, of Montana.
Charles Nelson Spinks, of California.
C. Allan Stewart, of Arizona.
William W. Walker, of North Carolina.
George Lybrook West, Jr., of California.
William A. Wieland, of New York.

The following-named Foreign Service officers for promotion from class 3 to class 2:

Kenneth B. Atkinson, of Virginia.
Taylor G. Belcher, of New York.
Donald C. Bergus, of Maryland.
Lee B. Blanchard, of Oklahoma.
Louis C. Boochever, of Maryland.
Howard Brandon, of Georgia.
John L. Brown, of Massachusetts.
Stanley S. Carpenter, of Massachusetts.
Albert E. Carter, of Tennessee.
Clyde L. Clark, of Iowa.
Otho T. Colclough, of North Carolina.

William B. Connett, Jr., of the District of Columbia.
Roy T. Davis, Jr., of Maryland.
Donald A. Dumont, of New York.
William B. Dunham, of Virginia.
Robert A. Fearey, of the District of Columbia.
Seymour M. Finger, of New York.
Richard B. Finn, of New York.
Edmund E. Getzin, of New York.
Joseph Godson, of New York.
Leo M. Goodman, of New York.
Windsor G. Hackler, of Nebraska.
Theo E. Hall, of Virginia.
Paul W. Hallman, of Virginia.
Norman B. Hannah, of Illinois.
John Hay, of Virginia.
Alton W. Hemba, of Mississippi.
David H. Henry 2d, of New York.
Jack A. Herfurt, of California.
William K. Hitchcock, of Virginia.
A. Guy Hope, of Virginia.
Albert E. Irving, of Maryland.
Frederick Irving, of Rhode Island.
William G. Jones, of Maryland.
John Keppel, of the District of Columbia.
Alexander F. Kiefer, of New York.
Clinton E. Knox, of Maryland.
Max V. Krebs, of California.
John A. Lacey, of Ohio.
Edward T. Lampson, of Connecticut.
Guy A. Lee, of Maryland.
Jack W. Lydman, of New York.
Eugene V. McAuliffe, of Massachusetts.
James A. McDevitt, of Illinois.
Adrian T. Middleton, of Texas.
George T. Moody, of Maryland.
George S. Newman, of New York.
Dana Orwick, of Ohio.
Albert Post, of the District of Columbia.
Donald L. Ranard, of Vermont.
Alfred Reifman, of Maryland.
Idar Rimestad, of North Dakota.
Edward F. Rivinus, Jr., of Pennsylvania.
Robert Rossow, Jr., of Indiana.
M. Robert Rutherford, of Montana.
Edwin L. Smith, of Arkansas.
John L. Stegmaier, of Massachusetts.
John H. Stutesman, Jr., of New Jersey.
Charles Wilson Thomas, of Utah.
Miss Margaret Joy Tibbetts, of Maine.
Richard W. Tims, of Maryland.
S. Roger Tyler, Jr., of West Virginia.
Sheldon B. Vance, of Minnesota.
William L. Wight, Jr., of Virginia.
Joseph O. Zurheilen, Jr., of New York.

The following-named Foreign Service officers for promotion from class 4 to class 3:
Rodger C. Abraham, of Connecticut.
William O. Anderson, of Indiana.
John A. Armitage, of Tennessee.
Laurin B. Askew, of Tennessee.
John R. Barrow, of California.
Chester E. Beaman, of Indiana.
Frederic H. Behr, of New Jersey.
Miss Elizabeth Ann Brown, of Oregon.
Emerson M. Brown, of Michigan.
Stephen J. Campbell, of California.
Allan Chase, of Virginia.
Dennis A. Collins, of Ohio.
Stephen A. Comiskey, of Colorado.
Douglas W. Coster, of New York.
Leonard R. Cowles, of Florida.
Oliver S. Crosby, of Washington.
David C. Cuthell, of Connecticut.
Robert W. Dean, of Illinois.
Thomas J. Duffield, of Massachusetts.
William R. Duggan, of Colorado.
Lester E. Edmond, of Maryland.
David H. Ernst, of Massachusetts.
Charles C. Finch, of Kansas.
Miss Edelen Fogarty, of New York.
David L. Gamon, of California.
Edwin J. Garrity, of Virginia.
Scott George, of Kentucky.
Charles Gilbert, of New York.
William Giloane, of Maryland.
John K. Hagemann, of Maryland.
Philip E. Haring, of Pennsylvania.
Thomas R. Hodet, of Connecticut.
Adolf B. Horn, Jr., of the District of Columbia.
Alan G. James, of the District of Columbia.
Walter E. Jenkins, Jr., of Texas.
Jack R. Johnstone, of Washington.
Harold G. Josif, of Ohio.
Morris Kaufman, of New York.
William M. Kerrigan, of Ohio.
Thomas D. Kingsley, of Maryland.
Northrop H. Kirk, of California.
David Klein, of Kansas.
Francis X. Lambert, of Massachusetts.
Jerome R. Lavallee, of Massachusetts.
Frederick D. Leatherman, of Ohio.
Armistead M. Lee, of Vermont.
W. J. Lehmann, of the District of Columbia.
James F. Leonard, Jr., of Pennsylvania.
Guy O. Long, of Pennsylvania.
Albert K. Ludy, Jr., of Arizona.
Frederic K. Lundy, Jr., of Pennsylvania.
Dayton S. Mak, of New Mexico.
David J. S. Manbey, of California.
James H. McFarland, Jr., of Michigan.
Clarence J. McIntosh, of Florida.
Everett K. Melby, of Illinois.
John E. Mellor, of Connecticut.
Bruce H. Millen, of Louisiana.
George Moffitt, Jr., of Connecticut.
Neil N. Muhonen, of Virginia.
George F. Muller, of Maryland.
James F. O'Connor, Jr., of New York.
John G. Oliver, of Texas.
Miss Mary S. Olmsted, of New York.
Melville E. Osborne, of New York.
James P. Parker, of Connecticut.
Robert Person, of Virginia.
Robert M. Phillips, of California.
David Post, of Pennsylvania.
Sandy MacGregor Pringle, of New York.
Vladimir P. Prokofieff, of Virginia.
Normand W. Redden, of New York.
Robert J. Redington, of Connecticut.
Jordan T. Rogers, of South Carolina.
Morris Rothenberg, of Maryland.
J. Phillip Rourk, of California.
William T. Sandalls, of Connecticut.
Dwight E. Scarbrough, of Minnesota.
Robert R. Schott, of Oregon.
George W. Skora, of Arizona.
Walter W. Sohl, of Illinois.
Albert W. Stoffel, of New York.
William N. Stokes, of North Carolina.
William H. Sullivan, of Rhode Island.
Harrison M. Symmes, of North Carolina.
M. Gordon Tiger, of Virginia.
Francis T. Underhill, Jr., of New Jersey.
Christopher Van Hollen, of the District of Columbia.
Hendrik van Oss, of New Jersey.
Bertus H. Wabeke, of Massachusetts.
Milton C. Walstrom, of Hawaii.
Wayland B. Waters, of Michigan.
Harry J. Wetzork, of Pennsylvania.
Louis A. Wiesner, of New Hampshire.
Miss Jean M. Wilkowski, of Florida.
William H. Witt, of South Carolina.
Chalmers B. Wood, of Virginia.
Parker D. Wyman, of Illinois.

The following-named Foreign Service officers for promotion from class 5 to class 4:
Miss Hilda M. Anderson, of Maryland.
Daniel M. Arzac, Jr., of California.
Robert J. Ballantyne, of New Jersey.
John H. Barber, of California.
George M. Barbis, of California.
Robert E. Barbour, of Tennessee.
St. John Bargas, of Louisiana.
Robert S. Barrett IV, of Virginia.
William R. Beckett, of Michigan.
Norman J. Bentley, of California.
David B. Bolen, of Colorado.
Lewis W. Bowden, of District of Columbia.
Mrs. Mildred L. Brockdorff, of Maryland.
John A. Brogan III, of New York.
Jack B. Button, of Kansas.
William C. Canup, of Michigan.
Charles C. Carson, of the District of Columbia.
Peter R. Chase, of Massachusetts.
Willis B. Collins, Jr., of Alabama.
William F. Courtney, of Michigan.
Miss Virginia I. Cullen, of Pennsylvania.
Joseph H. Cunningham, of Nebraska.
Frank A. Davis, of Ohio.
David Dean, of Florida.
Francois M. Dickman, of Wyoming.
Arthur R. Dornheim, of Maryland.
Stephen Duncan-Peters, of New York.
William L. Eagleton, Jr., of Illinois.
Virgil M. Elliott, of Florida.
George A. Ellsworth, of Georgia.
Lawrence B. Elsbernd, of North Dakota.
Elden B. Erickson, of Kansas.
Guy Ferri, of Pennsylvania.
Thomas M. Gaffney, of Massachusetts.
Miss Elizabeth G. Gallagher, of Pennsylvania.
Millard L. Gallop, of Virginia.
Samuel R. Gammon III, of Texas.
John L. Gawf, of Colorado.
Richard D. Geppert, of New Jersey.
Loren L. Goldman, of Maryland.
H. Kent Goodspeed, of California.
Malcolm P. Hallam, of South Dakota.
Miss Betty R. Hanes, of Ohio.
William N. Harben, of New York.
William C. Harrop, of New Jersey.
Arthur A. Hartman, of New Jersey.
Robert C. Hayes, of Maryland.
Harry W. Heikenen, of Minnesota.
Mrs. Hallye A. Heiland, of California.
Herschel Hancock Helm, of Kentucky.
William A. Helseth, of Florida.
Gregory Henderson, of Massachusetts.
Richard V. Hennes, of Illinois.
Gerrit J. W. Heyneker, of the District of Columbia.
Max E. Hodge, of New York.
Paul R. Hughes, of California.
Thomas J. Hunt, of New York.
Johannes V. Imhof, of California.
Joseph R. Jacyno, of Massachusetts.
Gordon D. Johnson, of California.
Gerald G. Jones, of California.
Howard D. Jones, of Oklahoma.
Walter T. Kamprad, of California.
George R. Kaplan, of Massachusetts.
William G. Keen, of Tennessee.
George R. Kenney, of Illinois.
Miss Virginia L. King, of Nebraska.
Richard F. Kitterman, of Maryland.
William S. Krason, of New York.
John Krizay, of Pennsylvania.
Lyle F. Lane, of Washington.
Miss Lillie Levine, of Iowa.
Miss Eleanor V. Levy, of the District of Columbia.
Samuel W. Lewis, of Texas.
Philip M. Lindsay, of California.
John L. Loughran, of Pennsylvania.
Miss Doris Meltana Luellen, of California.
Mrs. Andrée P. Maddox, of the District of Columbia.
LeRoy Makepeace, of Connecticut.
Donald C. Mansfield, of Virginia.
Robert J. Martens, of California.
Miss Roberta McKay, of Michigan.
Delano McKelvey, of the District of Columbia.
Warren H. McMurray, of Georgia.
John A. McVickar, of New York.
Jack C. Miklos, of Idaho.
Paul M. Miller, of Maryland.
Robert H. Miller, of Washington.
William B. Miller, of Ohio.
George C. Mitchell, of Nebraska.
George C. Moore, of California.
Laurent E. Morin, of New Hampshire.
Albert D. Moscotti, of New Jersey.
Charles Willis Naas, of Massachusetts.
Michael H. Newlin, of North Carolina.
Edward P. Noziglia, of New York.
Frank V. Ortiz, Jr., of New Mexico.
John B. Penfold, of Missouri.
Peter J. Peterson, of California.
Lyle R. Piepenburg, of Wisconsin.
Onesime L. Piette, of New Hampshire.
Clifford J. Quinlan, of Minnesota.
James A. Ramsey, of Massachusetts.
Miss Catherine A. Rock, of Pennsylvania.

Woodward Romine, of Indiana.
Miss Helen W. Rose, of Minnesota.
Robert W. Ross, of California.
Frederick H. Sacksteder, Jr., of New York.
Edwin E. Segall, of Nebraska.
Robert G. Shackleton, of Ohio.
Lawrence W. Sharpe, of Ohio.
Max L. Shimp, of Ohio.
Emery Peter Smith, of the District of Columbia.
Paul A. Smith, Jr., of Virginia.
Eldridge A. Snight, of Virginia.
Herbert Spielman, of Maryland.
Christopher A. Squire, of the District of Columbia.
William A. Stoltzfus, Jr., of New Jersey.
Miss Cherry C. Stubbs, of Minnesota.
Michael H. Styles, of Delaware.
Sidney V. Suhler, of Texas.
Ralph C. Talcott, of Tennessee.
Robert J. Tepper, of New York.
Erwin C. Thompson, of California.
Arthur T. Tienken, of New York.
William D. Toomey, of North Dakota.
Richard D. Vine, of New York.
Robert H. Wenzel, of Massachusetts.
Miss Josephine D. Wharton, of Florida.
Frank S. Wile, of Michigan.
Robert B. Williams, of Kentucky.
Daniel L. Williamson, Jr., of North Carolina.
J. Robert Wilson, of Pennsylvania.
William D. Wolle, of Iowa.
Samuel H. Young, of Florida.

The following-named Foreign Service officers for promotion from class 6 to class 5:
Paul S. Dwyer, of Ohio.
Chris C. Pappas, Jr., of New Hampshire.

The following-named Foreign Service officers for promotion from class 6 to class 5 and to be also consuls of the United States of America:
Miss Jane S. Abell, of New Hampshire.
Dwight R. Ambach, of Rhode Island.
Miss Leona M. Anderson, of Iowa.
Robert F. Andrew, of California.
George R. Andrews, of Tennessee.
Richard B. Andrews, of Illinois.
Sam G. Armstrong, of Texas.
James H. Bahti, of Michigan.
Richard W. Barham, of Texas.
Kyle D. Barnes, of Alabama.
Charles White Bass, of Tennessee.
Frederick O. Beattie, of Virginia.
Joel W. Biller, of Florida.
Martin S. Bowe, Jr., of New Hampshire.
Merritt C. Bragdon, Jr., of Maryland.
Michael Buzan, Jr., of Florida.
Byron E. Byron, of California.
Norman L. Cansler, of the District of Columbia.
Frank C. Carlucci, of Pennsylvania.
Robert W. Chase, of Massachusetts.
Ward Lee Christensen, of Oregon.
Joseph A. Cicala, of Connecticut.
Miss Joan M. Clark, of New York.
Charles B. Cook 3d, of Pennsylvania.
Dwight M. Cramer, of Nebraska.
Miss Maurine Crane, of Utah.
Miss Jane A. Culpepper, of Louisiana.
Martin A. Dale, of New Jersey.
Allen C. Davis, of Tennessee.
Thomas W. Davis, Jr., of California.
John L. De Ornellas, of Alabama.
Willard A. De Pree, of Michigan.
Morris Draper, Jr., of California.
Frank D. Durfey, of Minnesota.
Richard W. Dye, of New York.
Harland H. Eastman, of Maine.
Raymond W. Eiselt, of California.
Michael E. Ely, of New York.
Edward B. Fenstermacher, of Pennsylvania.
Richard W. Finch, of Ohio.
Eric W. Fleisher, of Maryland.
Francis L. Foley, of Colorado.
Richard Forschner, of New Jersey.
Theodore T. Franzen, of Massachusetts.
C. Jefferson Frederick, of Washington.
Gerald A. Friedman, of Florida.
Jack Friedman, of the District of Columbia.
Miss Ellen Gavrisheff, of Texas.
Robert K. German, of Texas.
Miss Eleanor Van Trump Glenn, of Georgia.
Dirk Gleysteen, of Pennsylvania.
Roderick N. Grant, of California.
William B. Grant, of Massachusetts.
James M. Hall, of Washington.
Nez C. Hallett, Jr., of Texas.
C. Norman Hanley, of Washington.
Tobias Hartwick, of Montana.
Miss Edele P. Hauber, of Minnesota.
Frank J. Haughey, of California.
Mrs. Hertha Wegener Heiss, of New York.
Clarence J. Heissel, of California.
Brewster R. Hemenway, of New York.
Charles W. Henebry, of California.
Miss Frances D. Howell, of North Carolina.
James A. Howell, of Texas.
George O. Huey, of Illinois.
Mrs. Ellen G. Johnson, of Missouri.
Richard C. Johnson, of Massachusetts.
Miss Bernice T. Jones, of California.
Miss Betty-Jane Jones, of Wisconsin.
Robert V. Keeley, of Virginia.
Miss Alice E. Kinnare, of Illinois.
Roger Kirk, of Michigan.
Henry G. Krausse, Jr., of Texas.
P. Wesley Kriebel, of Pennsylvania.
Archibald Lappin, Jr., of California.
Burton Levin, of New York.
Orville M. Lewis, of Virginia.
Robert A. Lewis, of New York.
David E. L'Heureux, of New Hampshire.
Jack Liebof, of New York.
Miss Marcia N. Lindgren, of California.
Stephen Low, of Ohio.
Miss Helen K. Lyons, of California.
John W. MacDonald, Jr., of New York.
Julian F. MacDonald, Jr., of Ohio.
Byron P. Manfull, of Utah.
Ernest J. Mansmann, Jr., of Massachusetts.
Hugh J. McCall, of New York.
Franklin O. McCord, of Iowa.
John M. McIntyre, of Illinois.
Frazier Meade, of Virginia.
Calvin E. Mehlert, of California.
Miss Ruth G. Michaelson, of Michigan.
Curtis L. Mills, of West Virginia.
John L. Mills, of Georgia.
Leo J. Moser, of California.
Harry J. Mullin, Jr., of Kentucky.
Frederick E. Myers, of Ohio.
Philip M. Nagao, of California.
Ernest A. Nagy, of Ohio.
Leonardo Neher, of Illinois.
Miss Jeanne C. Nelson II, of Arizona.
Joseph B. Norbury, Jr., of New York.
Miss Geraldine M. Oliva, of Oregon.
Miss Nancy Ostrader, of Indiana.
John G. Panos, of Illinois.
Gabriel J. Paolozzi, of Nevada.
Grenfall L. Penhollow, of Nebraska.
Frederick P. Picard III, of Nebraska.
Arthur L. Price, of Illinois.
Leon Pukach, of Maryland.
Harry A. Quinn, of California.
Miss Nancy V. Rawls, of Georgia.
Owen W. Roberts, of New Jersey.
J. Leopoldo Romero, of California.
Miss Brynhild C. Rowberg, of Virginia.
Paul Sadler, of Tennessee.
Edward W. Schaefer, of Connecticut.
Alfred Schelp, of Missouri.
Miss Ruth Schneider, of New York.
Gerald Schwab, of New Jersey.
Mrs. Ree C. Shannon, of North Carolina.
Harry W. Shlaudeman, of California.
George W. Small, of West Virginia.
Miss Violet Smith, of New York.
Michael Smolik, of Oregon.
Raymond J. Swanson, of California.
Joseph Terranova, Jr., of Maryland.
Ross P. Titus, of Illinois.
Terence A. Todman, of the Virgin Islands.
Donald R. Toussaint, of California.
Miss Frances A. Usenik, of Minnesota.
Nicholas A. Veliotes, of California.
Leland W. Warner, Jr., of Kansas.
Mrs. Margaret P. A. Welsh, of Louisiana.
John P. Wentworth, of Washington.
John Quincy White, of Minnesota.
Frontis B. Wiggins, Jr., of Georgia.
Miss Suzanne S. Williams, of Ohio.
Victor Wolf, Jr., of New York.
Arthur H. Woodruff, of the District of Columbia.
Miss Olga M. Zhivkovitch, of Illinois.

The following-named Foreign Service officers for promotion from class 7 to class 6:
Anthony C. Albrecht, of Virginia.
J. Bruce Amstutz, of Massachusetts.
Andrew Andranovich, of Connecticut.
Oler A. Bartley, Jr., of Delaware.
Frank L. Berry, of Kenutcky.
David A. Betts, of New York.
H. Eugene Bovis, of Florida.
Everett E. Briggs, of Maine.
Bazil W. Brown, Jr., of Pennsylvania.
Thomas R. Buchanan, of Illinois.
Charles R. Carlisle, of Florida.
Gordon Chase, of Massachusetts.
Richard S. Dawson, Jr., of California.
Miss Stella M. Deinzer, of New York.
Robert W. Drexler, of Wisconsin.
Thaddeus J. Figura, of Illinois.
Robert L. Flanegin, of Illinois.
Robert L. Funseth, of New York.
Paul F. Gardner, of Texas.
Miss Kathryn M. Geoghegan, of Colorado.
Ralph H. Graner, of New York.
Carl J. Grip, of California.
Walter V. Hall, of Virginia.
Charles R. Hartley, of the District of Columbia.
Roger P. Hipskind, of Illinois.
Thomas J. Hirschfield, of New York.
Robert M. Immerman, of New York.
George W. Jaeger, of Missouri.
James T. Johnson, of Montana.
Donald A. Johnston, of New York.
Robert M. Kline, of Connecticut.
Tadao Kobayashi, of Hawaii.
Larry E. Lane, of Texas.
Robert Gerald Livingston, of Connecticut.
Alan Logan, of California.
Peter P. Lord, of Massachusetts.
James Gordon Lowenstein, of Connecticut.
Paul B. McCarty, of Massachusetts.
Robert Marden Miller, of California.
Jay P. Moffat, of New Hampshire.
Beauveau B. Nalle, of Virginia.
Edward R. O'Connor, of New York.
John L. Offner, of Pennsylvania.
Charles R. O'Hara, of Maryland.
Mark S. Pratt, of Rhode Island.
John D. Scanlan, of Minnesota.
David E. Simcox, of Kentucky.
Edward H. Springer, of Oregon.
Roger W. Sullivan, of Massachusetts.
Miss Thelma R. Thurtell, of California.
D. Dean Tyler, of California.
William Watts, of New York.
William B. Young, of New Hampshire.
Albert L. Zucca, of New York.

The following-named Foreign Service officers for promotion from class 8 to class 7:
Dan Alexander, of Washington.
George Aneiro, of Ohio.
Terrell E. Arnold, of California.
Thomas H. Baldridge, of Iowa.
David P. Banowetz, of Louisiana.
Thomas J. Barnes, of Minnesota.
John M. Barta, of California.
Eugene J. Bashe, of California.
Frank C. Bennett, Jr., of California.
Harry E. Bergold, Jr., of New York.
Miss Emma Bernardon, of New York.
Richard C. Bialock, of Oklahoma.
Michele C. Bozzelli, of Ohio.
Carroll Brown, of Alabama.
Eugene B. Bruns, of Maryland.
Alanson G. Burt, of California.
Robert S. Cameron, of California.
William Clark, Jr., of California.
John R. Clingerman, of Michigan.
Richard T. Conroy, of Tennessee.
Goodwin Cooke, of New York.

Emmett M. Coxson, of Illinois.
John E. Crump, of Kansas.
Robert R. Dennis, of Pennsylvania.
Robert B. Dollison, of New York.
Miss Suzanne E. Dress, of Pennsylvania.
Robert W. Duemling, of California.
Ernest A. Duff, of Virginia.
William L. Dutton, Jr., of Iowa.
Richard A. Dwyer, of Indiana.
William J. Dyess, of Alabama.
Raymond C. Ewing, of California.
Miss Mary L. Eysenbach, of Connecticut.
Charles E. Finan, of Washington.
Miss Alta F. Fowler, of Virginia.
Howard V. Funk, Jr., of New York.
George A. Furness, Jr., of Massachusetts.
Herbert Donald Gelber, of New York.
Richard J. Gibson, of Michigan.
James L. Gorman, of Oregon.
John M. Gregory, Jr., of New York.
Philip J. Griffin, of the District of Columbia.
John C. Griffith, of Connecticut.
William H. Hallman, of Texas.
Miss Jo Ann Hallquist, of Wisconsin.
Clifford H. Harpe, of Tennessee.
Miss Ange Belle Hassinger, of Louisiana.
Ashley C. Hewitt, Jr., of California.
John W. Holmes, of Massachusetts.
James R. Holway, of Illinois.
Michael P. E. Hoyt, of Illinois.
Martin Jacobs, of New York.
Alton L. Jenkens, of Massachusetts.
Warren Mark Johnson, of California.
Peter E. Juge, of Louisiana.
Frederick T. Kelley, of Massachusetts.
Edson W. Kempe, of California.
James E. Kerr, Jr., of the District of Columbia.
Walter F. Keville II, of Ohio.
John W. Kimball, of California.
Robert Kurlander, of New York.
David C. Lacey, Jr., of Ohio.
Miss Morelle Lasky, of California.
Alan F. Lee, of Illinois.
Sam E. Lesher, of Colorado.
Melvin H. Levine, of Massachusetts.
Wingate Lloyd, of Pennsylvania.
Roger S. Lowen, of New York.
George Q. Lumsden, Jr., of New Jersey.
Edward J. Maguire, Jr., of California.
Edward J. Malonis, of Massachusetts.
Wade H. B. Matthews, of North Carolina.
Henry Ellis Mattox, of Mississippi.
James A. Mattson, of Minnesota.
W. Douglas McLain, Jr., of Illinois.
Noble M. Melencamp, of Kansas.
Stanley R. Miller, Jr., of Florida.
Herbert T. Mitchell, Jr., of North Carolina.
John C. Monjo, of Connecticut.
John T. Morgan, of Illinois.
Gottfried W. Moser, of New York.
Robert B. Oakley, of Louisiana.
Oscar J. Olson, Jr., of Texas.
Ronald D. Palmer, of Michigan.
Thomas J. Pape, of Texas.
Sydney E. Paulson, of Michigan.
George A. Pavlik, of Iowa.
John A. Perkins, of California.
Miss Emily Perreault, of Illinois.
Lawrence Pezzullo, of New York.
Homer R. Phelps, Jr., of New York.
Martin Polstein, of New York.
Dale M. Povenmire, of Ohio.
Frederick D. Purdy, of Pennsylvania.
Walter G. Ramsay, of Virginia.
William E. Rau, of Missouri.
Miss Rozanne L. Ridgway, of Minnesota.
George B. Roberts, Jr., of Pennsylvania.
John T. Rogerson, Jr., of Florida.
George M. Scanlan, of New York.
Orville H. Schmidt, of Minnesota.
Roger C. Schrader, of Missouri.
Glenn E. Schweitzer, of California.
Leslie Andrew Scott, of New York.
Arthur P. Shankle, Jr., of Texas.
David D. Shobe, of Illinois.
Robert Lee Shuler, of Virginia.
John P. Shumate, Jr., of California.
William L. Simmons, of Mississippi.
Clint E. Smith, of New Mexico.
Joseph L. Smith, of Indiana.
Walter Burges Smith II, of New York.
Wayne S. Smith, of California.
C. Richard Spurgin, of Illinois.
Linwood R. Starbird, of Maine.
Andrew L. Steigman, of New York.
Gerald M. Sutton, of California.
John J. Taylor, of Tennessee.
James M. Thomson, of Minnesota.
Thomas A. Thoreson, of Illinois.
Donald C. Tice, of Kansas.
Blaine C. Tueller, of Utah.
John T. Vanderveen, of California.
Leonard A. Warren, of California.
Ronald A. Webb, of California.
Benjamin Weiner, of New York.
Alfred J. White, of the District of Columbia.
Albert W. Whiting, of Kansas.
James P. Willis, Jr., of California.
Dawson S. Wilson, of Florida.
Herbert Gilman Wing, of Pennsylvania.
Edward C. Woltman, Jr., of Indiana.
Brooks Wrampelmeier, of Ohio.
Edward E. Wright, of Louisiana.

George Dolgin, of Maryland, for appointment as a Foreign Service officer of class 2, a consul, and a secretary in the diplomatic service of the United States of America.

The following-named persons for appointment as Foreign Service officers of class 3, consuls, and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:
Merrill M. Blevins, of Kentucky.
Horace F. Byrne, of New York.
Edward A. Dow, Jr., of New York.
Thomas H. Englesby, of the District of Columbia.
Elmer M. Falk, of Virginia.
Jorma L. Kaukonen, of California.
James F. Magdanz, of Virginia.
William J. Tonesk, of Alabama.
Paul A. Toussaint, of New Hampshire.
Mrs. Virginia C. Westfall, of Virginia.
Mrs. Doris S. Whitnack, of Virginia.

The following-named persons for appointment as Foreign Service officers of class 4, consuls, and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:
John Royle Baxter, of Maryland.
George M. Bennsky, of Virginia.
Irving G. Cheslaw, of Maryland.
David S. Ennis, of Florida.
Edzard S. Hermberg, of California.
Murray E. Jackson, of Illinois.
John Church Renner, of Ohio.
W. John Wilson, of California.

The following-named persons for appointment as Foreign Service officers of class 5, consuls, and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:
Lawrence H. Harris, of California.
Harry V. Ryder, Jr., of Pennsylvania.
Miss Elizabeth B. Tolman, of Massachusetts.

The following-named persons for appointment as Foreign Service officers of class 6, vice consuls of career, and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:
Miss Bernice M. Kelly, of Texas.
Elwood J. McGuire, of Connecticut.
William G. Murphy, of Massachusetts.

The following-named persons for appointment as Foreign Service officers of class 7, vice consuls of career, and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:
Burton M. Chadbourne, of the District of Columbia.
Miss Rose M. Dickson, of New York.
Lyman W. Priest, of Arkansas.
Miss Marjorie A. Sutton, of Colorado.
James A. Verreos, of Missouri.

The following-named persons for appointment as Foreign Service officers of class 8, vice consuls of career, and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:
Morton I. Abramowitz, of Massachusetts.
Francesco J. Alberti, Jr., of California.
Scott I. Amour, of California.
Carl A. Bastiani, of Pennsylvania.
Miss Lyndall G. Beamer, of Illinois.
Calvin C. Berlin, of Ohio.
David E. Biltchik, of New York.
John A. Bushnell, of California.
David W. Carr, of Massachusetts.
Anthony S. Dalsimer, of New York.
V. Raymond Dickey, of South Dakota.
Richard A. Dugstad, of Virginia.
Jay P. Freres, of Illinois.
Miss Marlene W. Futterman, of New York.
George G. B. Griffin, of South Carolina.
Miss Lois Haase, of Missouri.
Gabriel C. Hanson, of Illinois.
Pierre M. Hartman, of Colorado.
Martin G. Heflin, of Florida.
David C. Holton, of Virginia.
Richard F. King, of Louisiana.
Anthony S. Kochanek, Jr., of New Jersey.
William E. Landfair, of Ohio.
Paul A. London, of New York.
David W. McClintock, of California.
Harry Macy, Jr., of Florida.
Miss Priscilla E. Mitchell, of Indiana.
Miss Sandra A. Nelson, of New Jersey.
Donathon C. Olliff, of Alabama.
Gerald G. Oplinger, of Pennsylvania.
Miss Alison Palmer, of New York.
Frederick J. Piotrow, of New York.
Allen Van Potts, of Utah.
Anthony C. E. Quainton, of Washington.
Thomas J. Roesch, of Ohio.
David Rowe, of Maryland.
Thomas J. Scanlon, of California.
Miss Marilyn M. Shepherd, of North Carolina.
Richard W. Smith, of New York.
Roger A. Sorenson, of Utah.
Frederic N. Spotts, of Massachusetts.
Dirck Teller, of Maryland.
Richard S. Thompson, of Washington.
George R. Trolles, of Ohio.
Gary L. Vyne, of Arizona.
Raymond J. Wach, of Ohio.
John D. Whiting, of Wisconsin.
William B. Whitman, Jr., of Illinois.
Roderick M. Wright, of California.

Arthur J. Laemmerzahl, of New Jersey, for appointment as a Foreign Service officer of class 8, a vice consul of career and a secretary in the diplomatic service of the United States of America. (This nomination is submitted for the purpose of correcting an error in the nomination as submitted to the Senate on August 4, 1959, and confirmed by the Senate on August 12, 1959.)

The following-named Foreign Service Reserve officers to be consuls of the United States of America:
Martin H. Armstrong, of Washington.
Willard B. Devlin, of Pennsylvania.
John A. Noon, of Maryland.
Edward Stansbury, of Connecticut.

Richard P. Mitchell, of Pennsylvania, a Foreign Service Reserve officer, to be a consul and a secretary in the diplomatic service of the United States of America.

The following-named Foreign Service Reserve officers to be vice consuls of the United States of America:
Maurice J. Gremillion, of Texas.
Russell S. Hibbs, of Missouri.
F. Raymond Senden, of California.

The following-named Foreign Service Reserve officers to be secretaries in the Diplomatic Service of the United States of America:
Richard T. Akins, of California.
Edwin U. C. Bohlen, of Maine.
G. Stanley Brown, of Oklahoma.
James P. Burke, of Maryland.
William A. Campbell, of California.
Harold C. Champeau, of Maryland.

Thomas J. Flores, Jr., of New York.
Joseph E. Lazarsky, of Virginia.
Robert D. Murphy, of Maryland.
Oliver M. Silsby, of Maryland.

The following-named Foreign Service staff officers to be consuls of the United States of America:

Roger K. Ackley, of Maryland.
Arthur C. Bartlett, of Connecticut.
William L. Green, Jr., of North Carolina.
Preston Valien, of Tennessee.

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:

Maj. Gen. John Albert Dabney, O16602, U.S. Army, in the rank of lieutenant general.

The following-named officers under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 3066, to be assigned to positions of importance and responsibility designated by the President under subsection (a) of section 3066, in rank as follows:

Lt. Gen. James Edward Moore, O15650, Army of the United States (major general, U.S. Army), in the rank of general.

Maj. Gen. Earle Gilmore Wheeler, O18715, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army), in the rank of lieutenant general.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

University of Hartford

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PRESCOTT BUSH
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, February 19, 1960

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a statement which I have prepared, for the information of the Congress and other readers of the RECORD.

We in Connecticut are proud of the rapid development and growth of the University of Hartford.

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

UNIVERSITY OF HARTFORD

The growth and development of the University of Hartford, in Connecticut, is a noteworthy example of the effectiveness of private initiative in alleviating the shortage of facilities in the field of higher education.

The University of Hartford was formed in 1957 through a combination of three well-established institutions—Hartford Art School, Hartt College of Music, and Hillyer College, including its technical institute—the Ward School of Electronics.

Over 10,000 students are now enrolled at the University of Hartford, Connecticut's largest nontax supported educational institution, advancing their education in the fields of engineering, education, business administration, liberal arts, music, fine arts, and other fields.

Classes at the university are now being held in owned or leased facilities which are widely scattered, principally in the city of Hartford. Through private initiative and private fundraising efforts, 250 acres of land have been acquired on which a modern, fully integrated university campus will be built.

In the 1960 "Report to the People of Connecticut From the Founders of the University of Hartford" there is comment that will interest the American people and point the way toward the solution of one of our most urgent problems.

Alan Tompkins, Dr. Moshe Paranov and Dr. Alan S. Wilson, the administrators of these three colleges respectively, have this to say: "In many parts of the country the great increase expected in college enrollments in the next few years is being viewed with a pessimistic alarm which is certainly not justified. In Connecticut these increasing numbers of young men and women, eager for advanced education, are welcomed joyously for the strength they represent in our State and for the challenge presented by their need for education."

I commend to the Senate the University of Hartford for its forward-looking attitude. Thanks to the leadership of men such as Alfred C. Fuller, head of the Fuller Brush Co., more than $3 million has been raised toward creating a new university campus. A general classroom building and central heating plant are now under construction and another building started by the end of the year is a possibility, according to Austin D. Barney, chairman, university building and development committees.

There are no dormitories in the building plans of the University of Hartford. All money contributed goes into classrooms, laboratory, and other instructional facilities. Students attending its classes commute. They live at home and by so doing they save about 50 percent of the cost of a college education.

In the American tradition is the fact that 70 percent of these students hold jobs in addition to their studies.

To the people of this Nation, the University of Hartford can be cited as an example of America's ability to solve its problems—in this instance the tremendous wave of college enrollments due to our population explosion. At the same time the university stands as a tribute to our young people who, by their own efforts, are determined to secure the benefits of a college education.

In this same founders report, University Chancellor Vincent Brown Coffin states that building a new campus goes hand-in-hand with the educational program. "The second is the more important," Chancellor Coffin said, "but it cannot function without the first."

The University of Hartford, as pointed out by Chancellor Coffin, has 230 founders who are men of leadership within the State. In the Chancellor's words: "They have dedicated themselves to the deep concern shared by most of our citizens that Connecticut shall become an even better place to live." As one of the founders of the university I heartily associate myself with his statement.

It should be of interest to the Members of the Senate and the House of Representatives that such a significant accomplishment has come about in the field of education through private initiative.

Perhaps it can serve as a model for the establishment of other community colleges and universities throughout the land. In this way we may alleviate the critical shortage of facilities for higher education, simultaneously preserving the historic tradition of education free from Government control.

This is America as we all like to think of it: people, young and old, joined in a voluntary effort for the common good.

SENATE

MONDAY, FEBRUARY 22, 1960

(Legislative day of Monday, February 15, 1960)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess, and was called to order by the President pro tempore.

The Reverend Walter G. J. Hards, Th. D., rector, St. David's Episcopal Church, Baltimore, Md., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, our Heavenly Father, who hast given us this good land for our heritage, we humbly beseech Thee that we may always prove ourselves a people mindful of Thy favor by striving to do Thy will. Save us from seeking easy solutions to perplexing problems, and from making simple matters into insoluble difficulties.

Grant wisdom and understanding to these, Thy servants, to whom has been entrusted the authority of government, that our Nation may be saved from confusion and complacency, from materialism and myopia, from pride and prejudice, and from violence and vassalage. Defend our liberties from the machinations of every foe, and liberate our defenders from the fatigue of every frustration.

Give to each one of us a due sense of our traditions, forged on the anvil of sacrifice, sagacity, and suffering, that we may preserve them inviolate for those who shall follow us. We thank Thee, O God, for the Father of our Nation; for his honesty, his humanity, and his humility. We thank Thee, O Lord, for the countless men and women of past generations whose dedicated service has made our Nation strong and free. We thank Thee, O Father, for the opportunity of serving Thee in our day as they did in theirs.

May Thy spirit direct this Senate as it seeks understanding. May Thy grace make the pertinent issues clear. May Thy presence enable this body to solve the problems which confront it.

These prayers and thanksgivings we offer unto Thee, O Father Almighty, to the glory of Thy holy name, through Jesus Christ, our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Friday, February 19, 1960, was dispensed with.