

SENATE

THURSDAY, APRIL 19, 1962

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by the President pro tempore.

Rev. Dr. Ludvik Nemeč, chaplain of Braddock General Hospital, Braddock, Pa., offered the following prayer:

In the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit. Amen.

Eternal Father, as we pause at this moment to invoke Thy blessing upon this august Senate of the United States of America which is graciously extending its wise and powerful hand to relieve the slavery of nations behind the Iron Curtain, grant it the light to recognize the means, and the grace to use the opportunity, to overcome the evil of atheistic communism, that seeks to destroy the dignity and rights of men and the nations they have formed in the mold of Christian principles.

Thou who, in Thy providence, didst enlighten the minds of the Founding Fathers of the United States to write into their Constitution the freedoms which the enslaved nations seek to regain, impart to the legislators of this great Nation a sympathy and an understanding of the problems which beset their brothers abroad. In their present position as leaders in the free world, let them not lose their sense of dedication to the cause of justice and right. Let them recall that the tragedy by which Czechoslovakia was forced under the heel of communism is not an isolated incident. May they recognize the fact that that pattern of perfidy has spread ever nearer to the shores of this great American Nation. Let them view with horror the martyrdom, the imprisonment, and the exile of the civil and spiritual leaders of their enslaved brothers in Czechoslovakia; the denial and the thwarting of divine worship, the closing of private schools, the suppression of the free press, curtailment of the free pursuit of the arts and sciences, the imposition of false teaching and the insidious deception of their youth. May these legislators do all in their power to relieve the suffering that follows stark fear, hunger, the displacement, and the massacre of thousands of innocent people. May they recognize their opportunity to resist this, the most violent barbarism in history. Make known to all the free world the inspirational leadership of those silenced at home, as well as those in exile. Bless the deliberations of the scholars presently engaged in the first Congress of the Czechoslovak Society of Arts and Sciences in America, so that their work may reflect truth as a liberating and prevailing principle. Grant that truth will prevail and justice shall not perish.

From Thee, O benign dispenser of all good, the great and small nations await the bestowal of Thy blessing, so that they may enjoy freedom with the dignity of men, in love, in peace, and in justice, and that having shared in today's pas-

sion, they may know the fulfillment of tomorrow's resurrection in the pursuit of happiness under God. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. HUMPHREY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, April 17, 1962, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—
APPROVAL OF BILLS

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on April 16, 1962, the President had approved and signed the following acts:

- S. 193. An act for the relief of Rev. Patrick Floyd;
- S. 270. An act for the relief of Mrs. Jeliza Prendic Milenovic;
- S. 1305. An act for the relief of Kazuo Ito and Satomi Ito;
- S. 1520. An act for the relief of Mary Elizabeth Sidor Polkowska;
- S. 1578. An act for the relief of Edward Yin Liang;
- S. 1638. An act for the relief of Felix Ledina Mendoza;
- S. 1841. An act for the relief of Maria Zambetoulla;
- S. 1874. An act for the relief of Roland Fernando Mishutani; and
- S. 2101. An act for the relief of Alda Mary Sorino Bocalery.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 205) to expedite the utilization of television transmission facilities in our public schools and colleges, and in adult training programs.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills and joint resolution, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

- H.R. 1404. An act for the relief of Mrs. Frances Mangiaracina;
- H.R. 1653. An act for the relief of William Falby;
- H.R. 2103. An act for the relief of Antonio C. Ysrael;
- H.R. 2187. An act for the relief of Augustin Ramirez-Trejo;
- H.R. 2198. An act for the relief of Carlos Sepulveda Abarca;
- H.R. 2672. An act for the relief of Sonia Maria Smith;
- H.R. 3595. An act for the relief of Anna Isernia Alloca;
- H.R. 3633. An act for the relief of Angeline Rainone;
- H.R. 3714. An act for the relief of Janina Maciejewska;
- H.R. 4655. An act for the relief of Adele Anis Mansour;
- H.R. 5061. An act for the relief of James L. Merrill;
- H.R. 5916. An act for the relief of Miss Susanna Moscato (Reverend Mother Caritas);
- H.R. 6021. An act for the relief of Lt. Don Walsh and Lt. Lawrence A. Shumaker;

- H.R. 6330. An act for the relief of Vincent Edward Hughes, his wife, Carmel Philomena Hughes, and their alien children;
- H.R. 6386. An act for the relief of Cleo A. Dekat;
- H.R. 7332. An act for the relief of Mrs. Ethel Knoll;
- H.R. 7617. An act for the relief of John W. Schleiger;
- H.R. 8134. An act to authorize the sale of the mineral estate in certain lands;
- H.R. 8321. An act for the relief of Maj. Clara May Matthews;
- H.R. 8631. An act for the relief of David B. Kilgore and Jimmie D. Rushing;
- H.R. 8946. An act for the relief of Mary R. Galotta;
- H.R. 9466. An act for the relief of Sfc. Jesse O. Smith;
- H.R. 9669. An act for the relief of Molly Kwauk;
- H.R. 9782. An act for the relief of Col. A. A. Watson;
- H.R. 10026. An act for the relief of Thomas J. Fitzpatrick and Peter D. Power;
- H.R. 10314. An act for the relief of William Radkovich Co., Inc.;
- H.R. 10440. An act to authorize the acquisition, training, and maintenance of dogs to be used in law enforcement in the District of Columbia;
- H.R. 11032. An act granting a renewal of patent No. 92,187 relating to the badge of the Sons of the American Legion;
- H.R. 11033. An act granting a renewal of patent No. 55,398 relating to the badge of the American Legion Auxiliary.
- H.R. 11034. An act granting a renewal of patent No. 54,296 relating to the badge of the American Legion;
- H.R. 11289. An act making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and for other purposes; and
- H.J. Res. 677. Joint resolution relating to the admission of certain adopted children.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the following concurrent resolutions, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

- H. Con. Res. 438. Concurrent resolution to provide for a joint committee of the Congress to represent the Congress at ceremonies celebrating the 375th anniversary of the landing of the Lost Colony and the birth of Virginia Dare; and
- H. Con. Res. 465. Concurrent resolution that when the House adjourns on Thursday, April 19, 1962, it stand adjourned until 12 o'clock meridian on Monday, April 30, 1962.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT
RESOLUTION SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker has affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills and joint resolution, and they were signed by the President pro tempore:

- S. 205. An act to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to establish a program of Federal matching grants for the construction of television broadcasting facilities to be used for education purposes;
- S. 505. An act for the relief of Seymour Robertson;
- S. 508. An act for the relief of John E. Beaman and Adelaide K. Beaman;
- S. 704. An act for the relief of Marlys E. Tedin and Elizabeth O. Reynolds;
- S. 1057. An act to provide for a National Portrait Gallery as a bureau of the Smithsonian Institution;
- S. 2151. An act for the relief of Harvey Burstein;
- S. 2319. An act for the relief of Harry E. Ellison, captain, U.S. Army, retired;

S. 2549. An act for the relief of Edward L. Wertheim;
H.R. 11027. An act to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended; and
H.J. Res. 449. Joint resolution providing for the establishing of the former dwelling house of Alexander Hamilton as a national memorial.

HOUSE BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

The following bills and joint resolution were severally read twice by their titles and referred as indicated:

H.R. 1404. An act for the relief of Mrs. Frances Mangiaracina;
H.R. 1653. An act for the relief of William Falby;
H.R. 2103. An act for the relief of Antonio C. Ysrael;
H.R. 2187. An act for the relief of Augustin Ramirez-Trejo;
H.R. 2198. An act for the relief of Carlos Sepulveda Abarca;
H.R. 2672. An act for the relief of Sonia Maria Smith;
H.R. 3595. An act for the relief of Anna Isernia Alloca;
H.R. 3633. An act for the relief of Angelina Rainone;
H.R. 3714. An act for the relief of Janina Maciejewska;
H.R. 4655. An act for the relief of Adele Anis Mansour;
H.R. 5061. An act for the relief of James L. Merrill;
H.R. 5916. An act for the relief of Miss Susanna Moscato (Reverend Mother Charitas);
H.R. 6021. An act for the relief of Lt. Don Walsh and Lt. Lawrence A. Shumaker;
H.R. 6330. An act for the relief of Vincent Edward Hughes, his wife, Carmel Philomena Hughes, and their alien children;
H.R. 6386. An act for the relief of Cleo A. Dekat;
H.R. 7617. An act for the relief of John W. Schleiger;
H.R. 8321. An act for the relief of Maj. Clara May Matthews;
H.R. 8631. An act for the relief of David B. Kilgore and Jimmie D. Rushing;
H.R. 9466. An act for the relief of Sfc. Jesse O. Smith;
H.R. 9669. An act for the relief of Molly Kwauk;
H.R. 9782. An act for the relief of Col. A. A. Watson;
H.R. 10026. An act for the relief of Thomas J. Fitzpatrick and Peter D. Power;
H.R. 10314. An act for the relief of William Radkovich Co., Inc.;
H.R. 11032. An act granting a renewal of patent No. 92,187 relating to the badge of the Sons of the American Legion;
H.R. 11033. An act granting a renewal of patent No. 55,398 relating to the badge of the American Legion Auxiliary;
H.R. 11034. An act granting a renewal of patent No. 54,296 relating to the badge of the American Legion; and
H.J. Res. 677. Joint resolution relating to the admission of certain adopted children; to the Committee on the Judiciary.
H.R. 7332. An act for the relief of Mrs. Ethel Knoll;
H.R. 8946. An act for the relief of Mary R. Galotta; to the Committee on Finance.
H.R. 8134. An act to authorize the sale of the mineral estate in certain lands; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.
H.R. 10440. An act to authorize the acquisition, training, and maintenance of dogs to be used in law enforcement in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H.R. 11289. An act making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION REFERRED

The concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 438) to provide for a joint committee of the Congress to represent the Congress at ceremonies celebrating the 375th anniversary of the landing of the Lost Colony and the birth of Virginia Dare, was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That there is hereby created a joint committee to be composed of six Members of the House of Representatives to be appointed by the Speaker of the House and six Members of the Senate to be appointed by the President of the Senate to represent Congress at ceremonies to be conducted at Roanoke Island, North Carolina, during the week August 12 to August 18, 1962, inclusive, jointly by the committee and by the Governor's Commission for the celebration of the three hundred and seventy-fifth anniversary of the birth of Virginia Dare, in commemoration of the three hundred and seventy-fifth anniversary of the landing of Sir Walter Raleigh's colony on Roanoke Island, North Carolina, and the birth of the first English child in America, Virginia Dare. The members of the joint committee shall select a chairman from among their number.

The expenses of the joint committee incurred in carrying out the purposes of this resolution, not to exceed \$10,000, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House of Representatives upon vouchers authorized by such joint committee and approved by the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives.

LIMITATION OF DEBATE DURING MORNING HOUR

On request of Mr. HUMPHREY, and by unanimous consent, statements during the morning hour were ordered limited to 3 minutes.

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. HUMPHREY, and by unanimous consent, the Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly of the Committee on the Judiciary was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

WITHHOLDING FROM PAY OF CIVILIAN EMPLOYEES OF THE UNITED STATES DUES FOR MEMBERSHIP IN CERTAIN EMPLOYEE ORGANIZATIONS

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the withholding from the pay of civilian employees of the United States the dues for membership in certain employee organizations (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO THE BUDGET, 1963, FOR DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR (S. Doc. No. 88)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting an amendment to the budget for the fiscal year 1963, involving an increase in the amount of \$2 million, for the Department of the Interior (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

REPORT ON NOTICE OF DEPARTMENTS OF THE ARMY AND AGRICULTURE TO INTERCHANGE JURISDICTION OF CERTAIN LANDS

A letter from the Secretary of the Army, and Secretary of Agriculture, reporting, pursuant to law, on the intention of their Departments to interchange jurisdiction of military and national forest lands (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

AMENDMENT OF CERTAIN PROVISIONS OF EXISTING LAW, RELATING TO RELATIONSHIP OF THE COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY TO THE AIR FORCE

A letter from the Under Secretary of the Air Force, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend certain provisions of existing law concerning the relationship of the Coast and Geodetic Survey to the Army and Navy so that they will apply with similar effect to the Air Force (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Armed Services.

EXTENSION OF DEFENSE PRODUCTION ACT OF 1950 AS AMENDED

A letter from the Director, Office of Emergency Planning, Executive Office of the President, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to extend the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORT ON BACKLOG OF PENDING APPLICATION AND HEARING CASES IN FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

A letter from the Chairman, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the backlog of pending applications and hearing cases in that Commission, as of February 28, 1962 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Commerce.

REPORT ON CONTRACTS NEGOTIATED FOR EXPERIMENTAL, DEVELOPMENTAL, OR RESEARCH WORK

A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on contracts negotiated for experimental, developmental, or research work, for the 6-month period ended December 31, 1961 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT ON REVIEW OF AUTOMATIC DATA PROCESSING OF SERIES E U.S. SAVINGS BONDS, BUREAU OF THE PUBLIC DEBT (PARKERSBURG, W. VA., OFFICE)

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the review of automatic data processing of series E U.S. savings bonds, Bureau of the Public Debt (Parkersburg, W. Va., office), Treasury Department, dated April 1962 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT ON REVIEW OF MANAGEMENT, UTILIZATION, AND MAINTENANCE OF SELECTED LAND AND BUILDINGS IN THE 1ST AND 12TH DISTRICTS, U.S. COAST GUARD

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the review of management, utilization, and maintenance of selected land and buildings in the 1st and 12th

Districts, U.S. Coast Guard, Treasury Department, dated April 1962 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT ON REVIEW OF SELECTED SUPPLY MANAGEMENT FUNCTIONS AND RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE MILITARY CLOTHING AND TEXTILE SUPPLY AGENCY, DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the review of selected supply management functions and responsibilities of the Military Clothing and Textile Supply Agency, Department of Defense, Philadelphia, Pa., dated April 1962 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT ON EXAMINATION OF PROCUREMENT OF CERTAIN FUEL TANKS BY DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the examination of procurement of 1,700-gallon unassembled jettisonable fuel tanks by the Department of the Air Force under negotiated fixed-price contracts with Beech Aircraft Corp., Wichita, Kans., and Fletcher Aviation Corp., Rosemead, Calif., dated April 1962 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

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

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

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

"SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 9

"Resolution relative to ratifying the 15th amendment to the Constitution of the United States

"Whereas the 15th amendment to the Constitution of the United States was proposed to the legislatures of the States of the United States by the 40th Congress on the 26th day of February 1869; and

"Whereas the said 15th amendment was declared to have been ratified in a proclamation by the Secretary of State on the 30th day of March 1870, and thus became a constitutional provision; and

"Whereas the objective of this amendment was to forbid depriving Negroes of their voting rights on the basis of race or previous condition of slavery; and

"Whereas the Legislature of the State of California has not heretofore ratified said amendment; and

"Whereas the said 15th amendment has long been a vital part of the Constitution of the United States and should be ratified by the State of California to show the concurrence of this great State with the principles therein enunciated; and

"Whereas the said 15th amendment to the Constitution of the United States provides as follows:

"SECTION 1. The right of citizens of the United States to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of race, color, or previous condition of servitude.

"SEC. 2. The Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and the Assembly of the State of California (jointly, a majority of all the members elected to each house of said Legislature voting in favor thereof), That the said 15th amendment to the Constitution of the United States be and the same is hereby ratified by the Legis-

lature of the State of California; and be it further

Resolved, That certified copies of the foregoing preamble and resolution be forwarded by the Governor of the State of California to the President of the United States, the Secretary of State of the United States, the President pro tempore of the Senate of the United States and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States."

MEDICAL CARE FOR THE AGED—RESOLUTION

Mr. SMITH of Massachusetts. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the City Council of the City of Worcester, Mass., favoring the enactment of legislation to place medical care for the aged under social security.

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

Be it resolved, That the city council request the Ways and Means Committee of the Congress of the United States to take favorable action on the King-Anderson bill placing medical care for the aged under social security.

YOUTH CONSERVATION CORPS—RESOLUTION

Mr. SMITH of Massachusetts. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the county commissioners of Essex County, Mass., relating to the Youth Conservation Corps.

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

At a regular meeting of the county commissioners held at Salem on Tuesday, April 10, 1962, Chairman Cahill and Commissioners Burke and Pratt were present.

Upon motion of Mr. Pratt, duly seconded, it was unanimously voted that the county

commissioners endorse H.R. 10682 re Youth Conservation Corps, and that they request Senators LEVERETT SALTONSTALL and BENJAMIN SMITH, and Congressmen WILLIAM H. BATES, THOMAS J. LANE, F. BRADFORD MORSE, and TORBERT H. MACDONALD, to do all possible to secure passage of this most desirable legislation.

NATIONAL AND STATE BANKING SYSTEMS IN OREGON—RESOLUTION

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, recently I received from John Steelhammer, executive director of the Independent Bankers of Oregon, a resolution adopted by its board of directors on February 15, 1962. It describes the activities of the National and State banking systems in Oregon. It calls attention to what the board feels is growing domination of Oregon banking by two national banks operating statewide in the State, and urges that the dual banking system be encouraged.

I ask unanimous consent to have this resolution appear in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and I particularly call it to the attention of the Comptroller of the Currency, Federal Reserve Board, and the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation.

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

RESOLUTION OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS, INDEPENDENT BANKERS OF OREGON, FEBRUARY 15, 1962

Whereas the dual banking system has long been recognized in the State of Oregon as a system accruing to the best interests of all of the people of the State of Oregon; and

Whereas the dual banking system has prohibited the monopolistic domination of the banking industry in the State of Oregon by any one or any combination of large statewide national branch banking systems; and

Whereas the following statement is compiled as of December 30, 1961, from the reports of condition of all of the banks in Oregon, to wit:

	Deposits	Percent	Loans	Percent	Total assets	Percent
The First National Bank of Oregon.....	\$932,500,000	-----	\$486,255,000	-----	\$1,024,995,000	-----
The United States National Bank of Portland.....	906,712,000	-----	427,073,000	-----	1,002,087,000	-----
Total.....	1,839,212,000	79.2	913,326,000	79.3	2,027,082,000	79.5
The Bank of California N.A.....	102,520,000	4.4	51,074,000	4.4	105,315,000	4.2
All other banks in Oregon, including 8 smaller independent national banks.....	381,057,000	16.4	187,356,000	16.3	416,457,000	16.3
Total, all banks in Oregon as of Dec. 30, 1961.....	2,322,789,000	100.0	1,151,758,000	100.0	2,548,854,000	100.0

Whereas currently the First National Bank of Oregon and the U.S. National Bank of Portland together operate 167 branches, which, with the home banks, total 169 banking offices now operating within the State of Oregon, and whereas there are 40 State charter banks having 38 branches, and 9 national banks and the Bank of California, totaling 88 banking offices now operating in the State of Oregon.

Whereas there is concentrated in two statewide national banking offices 79.5 percent of the banking assets of the State of Oregon, and in the State-chartered banks, other national banks, including the Bank of California, only 20.5 percent of the banking assets of the State of Oregon.

Whereas the above figures disclose that the two statewide national banking offices in

Oregon are approaching monopolistic domination of the banking industry in the State of Oregon: Be it

Resolved by the board of directors of the Independent Bankers of Oregon, That the dual banking system be encouraged and continued and that all efforts be made to perpetuate the dual banking system in the State of Oregon; be it further

Resolved, That the increasing concentration of the banking assets in the State of Oregon in the hands of the statewide national banking offices be called to the attention of the Comptroller of the Currency, Federal Reserve Board, and the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation; that copies of this resolution be forwarded to each of the Senators and Representatives in the Congress from the State of Oregon.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. SPARKMAN, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, with amendments:

S. 2919. A bill to authorize retired personnel of the U.S. Government to accept and wear decorations, presents, and other things tendered them by certain foreign countries (Rept. No. 1344).

By Mr. MORSE, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, without amendment:

H.R. 8916. An act to authorize grants for planning and carrying out a project of construction for the expansion and improvement of the facilities of George Washington University Hospital in the District of Columbia (Rept. No. 1345).

By Mr. MORSE, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, with an amendment:

S. 1834. A bill to further amend the Act of August 7, 1946 (60 Stat. 896), as amended, by providing for an increase in the authorization funds to be granted for the construction of hospital facilities in the District of Columbia; by extending the time in which grants may be made; and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1346); and

S. 3011. A bill to amend section 4 of the Act of Congress approved March 1, 1899, entitled "An act to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to remove dangerous and unsafe buildings and parts thereof, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1347).

By Mr. SMITH of Massachusetts, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, without amendment:

S. 2793. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Traffic Act, 1925, as amended, to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to assess reasonable fees for the restoration of motor vehicle operators' permits and operating privileges after suspension or revocation thereof (Rept. No. 1352); and

H.R. 7752. An act to amend the District of Columbia Alcoholic Beverage Control Act, as amended, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1351).

By Mr. SMITH of Massachusetts, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, with an amendment:

H.R. 9699. An act to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to sell certain property owned by the District of Columbia located in Prince William County, Va., and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1350).

By Mr. SMITH of Massachusetts, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, with amendments:

S. 3086. A bill to provide for a reduction in the workweek of the Fire Department of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1348); and

H.R. 2838. An act to exempt from taxation certain property of the Army Distaff Foundation (Rept. No. 1349).

By Mr. BEALL, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, without amendment:

S. 2357. A bill to provide for the regulation of credit life insurance and credit accident and health insurance in the District of Columbia (Rept. No. 1353); and

S. 2795. A bill to prohibit the use by collecting agencies and private detective agencies of any name, emblem, or insignia which reasonably tends to convey the impression that such agency is an agency of the government of the District of Columbia (Rept. No. 1355).

By Mr. BEALL, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, with an amendment:

S. 699. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to incorporate the Hungarian Re-

formed Federation of America," approved March 2, 1907, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1354).

By Mr. HARTKE, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, with amendments:

S. 2250. A bill to provide for the incorporation of the National Woman's Relief Corps, Auxiliary to the Grand Army of the Republic, organized 1883, 78 years old (Rept. No. 1356); and

H.R. 6967. An act to provide for the incorporation of certain nonprofit corporations in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1357).

BILLS INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. YARBOROUGH:

S. 3197. A bill for the relief of Clara B. Fry; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORSE:

S. 3198. A bill for the relief of Renata Lattanzi; and

S. 3199. A bill for the relief of Peter K. Bechtold; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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

By Mr. BEALL:

S. 3200. A bill to amend the act of August 13, 1946, relating to Federal participation in the cost of protecting the shores of the United States and its territories and possessions; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. HUMPHREY (for himself and Mr. MCCARTHY):

S. 3201. A bill to amend section 401 of the act of June 15, 1935 (49 Stat. 383; 16 U.S.C. 715e), in order to authorize increased payments to counties in which Federal wildlife refuges are situated, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. ROBERTSON (by request):

S. 3202. A bill to amend the Federal Reserve Act to adjust the terms of the Chairman and Vice Chairman of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, to increase the salaries of members of such Board, and for other purposes; and

S. 3203. A bill to extend the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

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

By Mr. CHURCH:

S. 3204. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to confirm in the State of Idaho clear title to certain school indemnity lands heretofore selected by the State; and

S. 3205. A bill to afford relief for deficiencies in grants for school, college, and university purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

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

RENATA LATTANZI

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill for the relief of Renata Lattanzi. I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MUSKIE in the chair). The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 3198) for the relief of Renata Lattanzi, introduced by Mr.

MORSE, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of sections 101(a)(27)(A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Renata Lattanzi, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Mrs. Mary DiLoreto, a citizen of the United States: *Provided,* That the natural parents of Renata Lattanzi shall not, by virtue of such parentage, be accorded any right, privilege or status under the Immigration and Nationality Act.

PETER K. BECHTOLD

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill for the relief of Peter K. Bechtold. I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed in the RECORD.

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. 3199) for the relief of Peter K. Bechtold, introduced by Mr. MORSE, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Peter K. Bechtold shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of May 16, 1956.

TERMINATION DATES OF CHAIRMAN, VICE CHAIRMAN, AND MEMBERS OF BOARD OF GOVERNORS OF FEDERAL RESERVE SYSTEM

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, by request, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill which would amend the Federal Reserve Act by changing the termination dates of the Chairman, Vice Chairman, and members of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System. It would also increase their salaries.

This bill was proposed by the President in his letter of April 17, 1962. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point the President's letter and the text of the bill.

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

The bill (S. 3202) to amend the Federal Reserve Act to adjust the terms of the Chairman and Vice Chairman of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, to increase the salaries of members of such Board, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. ROBERTSON, by request, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, 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 second paragraph of section 10 of the Federal Reserve Act (12 U.S.C. 242) is amended by striking out the third sentence of such paragraph which now reads: "Of the persons thus appointed, one shall be designated by the President as chairman and one as vice chairman of the Board, to serve as such for a term of four years," and by inserting in lieu thereof the following four sentences:

"The term of each member of the Board lawfully in office on January 31, 1964, shall expire on January 31 of the year following the year in which his term would have expired in accordance with his appointment. One member of the Board shall be designated by the President as chairman and one as vice chairman of the Board, each to serve as such for a term of four years expiring on January 31 of the year in which the term of office of the President expires, and the terms as chairman and vice chairman of the members serving as such on January 31, 1965, shall expire on that date. Upon the expiration of the term for which a member of the Board is designated as chairman or vice chairman of the Board, such member shall continue to serve as chairman or vice chairman, as the case may be, until his successor as such is designated by the President. Whenever a vacancy shall occur, other than by expiration of term, in the office of chairman or vice chairman, another member of the Board shall be designated by the President to fill such vacancy and shall hold such office for the unexpired term of his predecessor."

Sec. 2. The Federal Executive Pay Act of 1956 is amended, effective at the beginning of the first pay period commencing after the date of enactment of this legislation,

(a) by adding at the end of section 102 of such Act (5 U.S.C. 2201) the following:

"(11) Chairman, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System.;"

(b) by adding at the end of section 103 of such Act (5 U.S.C. 2202) the following:

"(b) The annual rate of basic compensation of members (excluding the chairman) of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System (6) shall be \$22,000.;"

(c) by deleting paragraph (8) of section 105 of such Act (5 U.S.C. 2204) and changing the numbering of succeeding paragraphs accordingly; and

(d) by deleting from the list of agencies set forth in paragraph (45) of section 106(a) of such Act (5 U.S.C. 2205(a)) the words "Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System (6)".

The letter presented by Mr. ROBERTSON is as follows:

APRIL 17, 1962.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: In my Economic Report to the Congress on January 20, I recommended two reforms affecting the Federal Reserve System: (1) revision of the terms of the Chairman and other members of the Board of Governors so that a new President will be able to nominate a Chairman of his own choice at the beginning of his term, and (2) giving adequate recognition to the important responsibilities of the Board of Governors by increasing their salaries.

Both of these reforms were proposed by the independent and nonpartisan Commission on Money and Credit in its report last year. Both were endorsed in the Annual Report of the Joint Economic Committee of the Congress on my January 1962, Economic Report.

1. REVISION OF TERMS

The Board consists of seven Governors appointed by the President with the advice and consent of the Senate for terms of 14 years, staggered so that one term expires on January 31 every second year. The Board shares important responsibilities for the policies of the System with Presidents of the

12 Federal Reserve Banks. By these arrangements the Congress has assured the System both continuity and independence from political influence.

Federal Reserve monetary policies affect, and are affected by, the economic and financial measures of other Federal agencies. Federal Reserve actions are an important part, but not the whole, of Government policies for economic stabilization and growth at home and for the defense of the dollar abroad. Therefore, as has been recognized throughout the history of the Federal Reserve, the principal officer of the System must have the confidence of the President. This is essential for the effective coordination of the monetary, fiscal, and financial policies of the Government. It is essential for the effective representation of the Federal Reserve System itself in the formulation of Executive policies affecting the System's responsibilities.

Prior to 1935 the Federal Reserve Act provided that one member of the Federal Reserve Board "be designated by the President as Governor and one as Vice Governor" and specified no definite terms for these officers. Until 1927 the President customarily designated the Governor for 1 year at a time. Thereafter, until the Banking Act of 1935, a Board member was designated as Governor "until otherwise directed." The Banking Act of 1935 amended the act to provide that the President shall designate a Chairman and Vice Chairman from the membership of the Board of Governors "to serve as such for a term of 4 years." Evidently the term was set at 4 years in order to relate it to the Presidential term. However, the timing was not specified, and in practice the terms of the officers of the Board have never coincided with the Presidential term. In fact, the timing is a matter of chance, subject to change whenever the offices of Chairman and Vice Chairman are vacated by death or resignation. From 1936 to 1948, each term of the Chairman expired on January 31 of the final year of the Presidential term. At present it expires on March 31, 1963.

The draft bill which I am transmitting with this letter embodies amendments to the Federal Reserve Act to revise the terms of office as follows:

"(a) Beginning in 1965, the term of the Chairman and Vice Chairman will be 4 years beginning each February 1 following the election of the President. Should either office be vacated by death or resignation, the President would designate a member of the Board of Governors to fill the vacancy, not for 4 years but for the unexpired term. As a transitional arrangement, the term of a Chairman or Vice Chairman appointed prior to January 31, 1965, will expire on that date.

"(b) In order that the President may be able to appoint a Chairman of his own choice shortly after his inauguration, he must have an opening on the Board of Governors to fill at the same time. The terms of members of the Board now expire on January 31 in even years. To make them expire in odd years instead, it is proposed that the terms of incumbent Governors be extended by 1 year."

Chairman Martin of the Board of Governors concurs in these proposed changes.

2. INCREASE IN SALARY STATUS

The Board of Governors has immense responsibilities for the health of the U.S. economy. The performance of its tasks requires specialized knowledge and good judgment in exceedingly complex fields of domestic and international economics and finance. The salaries of the Governors should be commensurate with their grave responsibilities, sufficient to attract outstanding men and to give them the prestige and status necessary for effective performance of their duties. As I said in my Economic Report, "The United States is behind

other countries in the status accorded, by this concrete symbol, to the leadership of its 'central bank,' and I urge that the Congress take corrective action."

From 1913, when the Federal Reserve System was established, until 1925, and from 1935 to 1949, the salaries of members of the Board were the same as those of Cabinet members. At present, under the Federal Executive Pay Act of 1956, the salary of the Chairman is \$20,500 and the salary of other Governors is \$20,000. I recommend that the salary of the Chairman be fixed at \$25,000, equal to that of department heads; and that the salary of other Governors be fixed at \$22,000. The Chairman and the other Governors should, of course, receive further salary increases in accordance with their new status whenever the general scale of salaries of Federal executives is revised upward to make it consistent with the increases in civil service salaries I recommended in my message of February 19 on Federal pay reform. The draft bill transmitted herewith provides for the necessary amendments of the Federal Pay Act of 1956.

Sincerely,

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

EXTENSION OF DEFENSE PRODUCTION ACT OF 1950

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, by request, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill which would extend the Defense Production Act of 1950 for 2 years and would make a number of other changes in the act.

This bill was proposed by Mr. Edward A. McDermott, the Director of the Office of Emergency Planning. I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD Mr. McDermott's letter and the statement and draft bill which he enclosed with his letter.

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

The bill (S. 3203) to extend the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. ROBERTSON, by request, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, 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 Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, is hereby further amended as follows: Section 303(a) is amended by deleting from the parenthetical clause the word "domestic".

Sec. 2. Section 303(b) is amended by inserting a comma and the words "except for sales or contracts for processing or refining," after the phrase "but not extending".

Sec. 3. Section 303(f) is amended by adding the following paragraph at the end of the section:

"In lieu of such transfers, metals, minerals, and materials so acquired may be used to make payment in kind for the refining or processing into a form better suitable for stockpiling of any materials held in, or to be transferred pursuant to this subsection, to the national stockpile established pursuant to the Act of June 7, 1939, as amended (50 U.S.C. 98-98h). Such use shall otherwise be treated as a transfer under this subsection."

Sec. 4. Section 304(b) is amended by inserting the following after the first two words of the penultimate sentence: "incurred for the purpose of carrying out trans-

actions under section 302". Section 304(b) is further amended by inserting after the penultimate sentence the following:

"Notes or obligations issued on amounts borrowed or which may be borrowed from the Secretary of the Treasury to carry out activities under section 303 shall not bear interest after June 30, 1961, and interest accrued or owing to the Treasury on such notes or obligations is hereby canceled."

SEC. 5. Section 304 of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(c) The net unrecovered loss, including nonrecoverable expenses and the unrecovered balance of exploration grants, incurred prior to and including June 30, 1961, by departments, agencies, officials, and corporations of the Government through the use of funds borrowed from the Treasury of the United States pursuant to this section shall, with the approval of the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, be written off by such departments, agencies, officials, and corporations, and the notes, debentures, bonds, or other obligations issued to the Secretary of the Treasury in connection therewith shall be reduced or canceled accordingly. Upon the cancellation of any such notes or other obligations issued to the Secretary of the Treasury, the aggregate amount of borrowing which may be outstanding at any one time under section 304(b) of this Act, as amended, shall be reduced in an amount equal to the amount of such notes or to the obligations so canceled. *Provided*, That nothing herein shall be construed to reduce or write off the liability of any person, association, or corporation to the United States."

SEC. 6. The first sentence of section 717(a) is amended by striking out "June 30, 1962" and inserting in lieu thereof "June 30, 1964".

SEC. 7. This Act may be cited as the "Defense Production Act Amendments of 1962".

The letter presented by Mr. ROBERTSON is as follows:

APRIL 19, 1962.

HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
The President of the Senate,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: There is forwarded herewith a draft of proposed legislation "To amend the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, and for other purposes." It is proposed that (1) the Government be enabled to sell excess materials at prices which are competitive with those of other sellers; (2) contracts of sale and contracts for the upgrading of materials be exempted from the time limitations of section 303(b); (3) excess materials may be used as payments in kind for the upgrading of materials held under the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act and materials so used shall otherwise be treated as if transferred to the stockpile under section 303(f); (4) unpaid interest on funds borrowed from the Secretary of the Treasury to carry out section 303 provisions be canceled or waived as appropriate; (5) outstanding notes issued to the Treasury in the amount equal to unrecovered losses to date be canceled, accompanied by a corresponding reduction of the borrowing authority; and (6) the act be extended for a period of 2 years to June 30, 1964. Discussion of each of the foregoing is presented below in the above sequence.

1. In attempting to comply with the President's request that surplus materials be employed in the foreign aid program to the greatest extent practicable, we have encountered an apparent statutory obstacle (viz, metals and minerals shall not be sold at less than the current domestic market price), which in many cases has made it impossible for the Government to sell its

materials at prices prevailing in foreign markets or which are quoted for materials to be delivered to foreign markets. In order to eliminate this difficulty it is proposed that the Government be granted authority to sell excess materials at prices which are competitive with those of other sellers in the same markets.

2. Section 303(a) of the Defense Production Act of 1950 authorized the President to make purchases or commitments to purchase, and sales of, metals, minerals, and other materials. By means of this authority the Government brought about an expansion of the metals and minerals industry to satisfy defense demands. The main device used by the Government was the type of contract which assured a producer that if he expanded his production and subsequently was unable to sell the increased production, the Government would purchase it for a stated price during a stipulated period.

As a consequence of many factors, the Government has had to purchase substantial inventories of various metals and minerals in excess of its requirements. Notable among these factors were the economic recession of a few years ago and a drastic change in mobilization planning. The former caused producers to exercise their rights to put production to the Government. The latter stipulated that mobilization planning was to be based on a 3-year emergency rather than the 5-year period which had previously been in use. This cutback resulted in immediate excesses since in many cases amounts which had already been acquired were more than the 3-year requirement.

Section 303(b) of the act provides that purchases or sales can be made during the period ending June 30, 1965. In order for the Government to be able to liquidate the excesses referred to above in an orderly manner and recover its investment without disturbing the economy, it may be necessary in some instances to enter into long-term contracts for refining or processing materials to more useful products as well as into long-term sales contracts. Accordingly, it is requested that section 303(b) be modified in such a manner as to exempt sales of materials and upgrading contracts from the time limitation of the provision.

3. The Independent Offices Appropriation Act for the fiscal year 1962 specifically provides for the use, without reimbursement, of Defense Production Act inventories for the upgrading of materials in the national stockpile. This authority is desirable in that it makes the best use of surplus materials. However, it also has the unfortunate consequence of having the borrowing authority account reflect as outstanding indebtedness, the acquisition cost of such materials even after they have been used for stockpile purposes.

Section 303(f) of the act authorizes the transfer of these excess materials to the stockpile and the cancellation of the outstanding notes. It is proposed that in lieu of such transfer, excess materials may be used as payment in kind for upgrading materials held under the Strategic and Critical Materials Stockpiling Act and that such use will otherwise be treated as transfers, i.e., outstanding notes may be canceled.

(4) The costs of the section 303 expansion programs and the loan program under section 302 are financed by funds obtained from the Treasury through borrowings authorized by section 304(b). Under the last-named section, agencies carrying out functions under section 302 or 303 are authorized to issue notes, debentures, bonds or other obligations to the Secretary of the Treasury. The section stipulates that such instruments shall bear interest at a rate determined by the Secretary.

Under section 302 the Government lending agency charged interest on the loans it made

and, in turn, paid interest to the Treasury, in accordance with the statute, on money borrowed for this purpose.

Moneys which were borrowed to carry out section 303 purposes, however, were not lent to producers. Rather they were used to pay premium prices and subsidies and to make other similar types of nonrecoverable expenditures. In many cases the Government purchased large amounts of low-grade materials which had no commercial markets, but which could have been used in the direct circumstances of all-out war. In other cases the Government committed itself to buy material when the market could not absorb it. It was recognized that there would be losses on these programs and that the notes issued to finance them would, with the approval of Congress have to be written off. To put it another way, it was not anticipated that such programs would produce income against which interest on borrowed capital would be a proper charge. In these circumstances the payment of interest to the Treasury serves no purpose other than to increase the indebtedness.

Historically, it should be noted that the provision for payment of interest on borrowings from the Treasury was included in the act because of the precedent established in World War II when the various subsidiary corporate entities of the RFC, e.g., the Rubber Reserve Corporation and the Metals Reserve Corporation, paid interest on their borrowings. However, it should also be noted that at the time the Government was the sole purchaser and seller for a large number of materials, including tin and rubber. As a consequence it could assure that the sales prices included the cost of the interest. There is no such assurance in section 303 programs.

As indicated above, neither logic nor actual experience will provide a rational support for the requirement that interest be paid on Treasury borrowings which are made for noneconomic defense-required programs. Section 303 activities were undertaken because the defense of the country demanded them, not for the purpose of producing cash profits. If after all expenses are paid, there remains some available funds, they should be "covered into" the Treasury. If after all expenses are paid, the Treasury is holding unredeemed notes, provision will need to be made for their cancellation.

In view of the foregoing, section 304 should be amended to eliminate the requirement that interest be charged on notes issued to carry out section 303 programs.

5. Many programs undertaken under the Defense Production Act by the various departments and agencies have been completed, and it is unlikely that any new programs will be required in the foreseeable future. Here, too, the continuation of financing under the act which includes provision for payment of interest to the Treasury for borrowings for these purposes is inappropriate. The recommended amendment would permit provision to be made for the closing out of these programs and the settling of outstanding accounts.

The proposed amendments described in 4 and 5 above would result in the cancellation of notes and other obligations in the amount of \$445.2 million for the period ending June 30, 1961. Interest for the fiscal year 1962 has been estimated at \$71 million. Minor savings amounting to several thousands of dollars a year, would result from reduced administrative and bookkeeping costs on the programs which would be terminated.

(6) It is proposed that the act be extended for an additional 2 years to June 30, 1964. Under the act the President has authority; to require priority of performance of defense contracts and to allocate materials for defense purposes; to guarantee loans made in connection with defense contracts; to

make loans, purchases, and purchase commitments to bring about an expansion of defense capacity and to assure adequate supplies of materials required for defense; to approve, and thereby exempt from the antitrust laws, certain voluntary agreements and programs entered into by businessmen to further the purposes of the act; and to establish and train a reserve of executive personnel for employment by Government during periods of emergency.

Enclosed is a document which describes in more detail each of the foregoing authorities. They provide substantial support to current defense programs and a nucleus of power to mobilize the industrial and civilian economy in the event of emergency. Accordingly the act should be extended to June 30, 1964.

This legislative proposal constitutes a part of the program of the President. It is respectfully requested that it be introduced in order that it may be considered for enactment.

Sincerely,

EDWARD A. McDERMOTT.

DEFENSE PRODUCTION ACT OF 1950, AS AMENDED

The following is a brief discussion of the parts played by the authorities now existing in titles I, III, and VII of the Defense Production Act both in the conduct of current defense activities and in the improvement of our state of readiness for an emergency production program should that become necessary.

The priorities and allocations authorities of title I of the act are the keystone of emergency production controls. By their use the Government man make certain that "first things come first." At the present time production contracts which are let by the Department of Defense and the Atomic Energy Commission carry with them the requirement that the manufacturers give such preference to their performance as is necessary to meet delivery schedules. This requirement for preference extends also to the delivery of components and supplies for the use of the contractor. Such preferential treatment guarantees prompt handling of defense orders.

The defense materials system, operated by the Department of Commerce under a delegation of title I authority, involves the determination of requirements, the application of priorities, and the submission of reports. It requires producers of basic forms and shapes of steel, copper, aluminum, and nickel alloys to reserve certain percentages of their production for the filling of identified defense orders. This, incidentally, accomplishes a distribution of defense orders among the various producers of these basic items, assuring to each producer of such materials a large share of his production for supplying his customers in the civilian market.

Quite properly, the use of priorities and allocations is presently limited to assuring adequate handling of direct defense orders. The law does not authorize control of the distribution of goods in the civilian elements of the economy, unless heavy defense demands should result in significant dislocations in the civilian market to such a degree as to create appreciable hardship.

In addition to usefulness in the conduct of current procurement programs the defense materials system provides us with a readiness measure of great importance. It is a mechanism in being which could be quickly expanded in time of mobilization to control all use of critical materials throughout the economy. Based on the Korean experience, it would take at least 3 months to put a similar system in operation starting from scratch.

Title III of the act provides various powers designed to assure productive capacity

and supply both for current programs and for the development of a mobilization base adequate to an emergency. The loan guarantee provisions are useful to the procuring agencies as a means of assisting their contractors, particularly smaller contractors, to secure working capital and additional equipment needed for the performance of defense contracts. The other authorities in title III for direct loans, procurement for Government use or resale, and so forth, have been used sparingly in recent years but have substantial importance as tools to meet new production requirements which may result from changing technology and military strategy. Accelerated research and development of new weapons may in the future require greater production of key materials and the development of new processes requiring such forms of financial assistance as are available under title III.

As of September 30, 1961, there were approximately \$938 million worth of materials in the Defense Production Act inventory. Because of the ample production of most metals during the last few years, the Government has had no alternative but to hold on to these inventories. Current policy calls for disposing of excess inventories, but only when it can be done in an orderly manner. The size of a disposal must depend on the capacity of the market to absorb the material.

It should be pointed out also that we are engaged in a broad study to determine the materials requirements which would follow a nuclear attack on the United States. In order to avoid the possibility of having to buy back materials after such requirements are computed, it has been determined that, meanwhile, inventories will not be reduced below levels which would meet the normal requirements of industry for a 6 months' period.

Besides being a necessary measure of preparedness in the light of world conditions, the continuation of title III authority provides a tool for overcoming defense deficits as they develop, and the flexibility required in the management of the inventories which have already been acquired.

Title VII of the act contains various general provisions and authorities in support of those in the other two titles. Of great importance among these is the voluntary agreement authority. This makes possible the use of the joint experience of defense contractors in improving and speeding the output of weapons, through integration committees in which technical advances and know-how can be shared, without danger of violating the antitrust laws. A number of existing integration committees of the Department of the Army depend upon this authority, and the development of new weapons will no doubt give rise to a need for others.

Of importance, too, is the authority provided by title VII to train a reserve of officials capable of doing the many executive jobs in Government that must be done in time of mobilization. Executive reserve programs have been undertaken by 17 Government departments and agencies. Over 2,600 reservists are presently being trained, and more will undoubtedly be added as the field programs are developed in the States.

CLEARING OF TITLE TO CERTAIN SCHOOL INDEMNITY LANDS IN IDAHO

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to confirm in the State of Idaho clear title to certain school indemnity lands heretofore selected by the State.

The lands in question are now owned by the State of Idaho, subject to a reservation in the United States of rights to the phosphate in them. They were selected as indemnity for lands which would have been granted to Idaho, under the admission act, but for the circumstances that they fell within the boundaries of national forests, national monuments, Indian reservations, fractional townships, or were for other special reasons unavailable. The admission act authorized the State, in lieu of such lands, to select from the vacant and unappropriated public domain other lands of equal value.

Difficulties arose when the State undertook to make these selections, however, because other lands of equal value simply were not available. In the early decades of this century, the hard-pressed State government, needing school revenue, accepted certain sections as indemnity lands in which the phosphate minerals were reserved. The bargain was a bad one for Idaho, entered into under circumstances which rendered it impossible for the State to obtain the benefits clearly intended by the Congress when the admission act was approved.

The purpose of the bill I now introduce is to rectify this inequity by granting to the State of Idaho clear title to the lands and minerals in question. I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill may appear in the RECORD following these introductory remarks.

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

The bill (S. 3204) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to confirm in the State of Idaho clear title to certain school indemnity lands heretofore selected by the State, introduced by Mr. CHURCH, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized and directed to amend the certificates attached to Clear Lists numbered 15, 16, 18, 21 and 25, approved by the Department of the Interior on January 31, 1918, March 27, 1918, July 10, 1918, December 27, 1919 and October 13, 1920, respectively, by deleting from each such certificate all reference to a reservation in the United States of phosphate in the lands covered by said Clear Lists, thereby confirming to the State of Idaho full and clear title to the school indemnity lands so listed, without reservation.

The Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to assign to the State of Idaho the interest of the United States in any lease or contract affecting the lands described herein to which the United States is a party.

RELIEF FOR DEFICIENCIES IN GRANTS FOR SCHOOL, COLLEGE, AND UNIVERSITY PURPOSES

Mr. CHURCH. Next, Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference, a bill of general application to afford relief for deficiencies in State land grant selections made available by Congress in support of public education.

In nearly all the public lands States, certain sections out of each township were set aside, under the various admission acts, for the benefit of the State public school systems. The intent of the Congress, in making these grants, was to compensate the States, in part, for the fact that much of the land within their borders is in the public domain, and produces little tax revenue.

In cases where the sections granted to the States had been withdrawn, or were later withdrawn, by the Federal Government for special uses—as was done when the national forests were established—the laws generally provided that the States could select other land, of equal value, from the public domain, as indemnity for their losses. But many of the States have not in fact been made whole by these provisions, for the reason that other lands of equal value, on a section-for-section basis, have simply not been available.

The bill I now introduce is intended to be of general application in all such cases, and to carry out the intent of the Congress in making the original grants. It directs the striking of a balance, under which the States could not obtain, from the public domain, lands equal in value to the original grants.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be published in full at this point in the RECORD.

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. 3205) to afford relief for deficiencies in grants for school, college, and university purposes, introduced by Mr. CHURCH, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) in any case where a State has been granted under Federal law, other than under the indemnity laws, land for school, college, or university purposes, and such State has not received the full title to all the lands granted to it in place or selected by it pursuant to a quantity grant, whether by reason of appropriation, withdrawal, reservation, or mineral character of any of the lands, such State may within two years from the effective date of this Act notify in writing the Secretary of the Interior of its election to obtain the benefits of this Act.

(b) Such election shall constitute a full and final waiver of any right of the State under any other law to apply for and receive indemnity for any deficiency in school, college, or university grants.

SEC. 2. Any State which has elected to come within the purview of this Act shall be entitled to apply for and receive patent to lands and mineral interests in lands equivalent in value to (1) the full value of the lands, and minerals therein, in place or selected by it which did not vest but would have vested in the State, but for appropriation, withdrawal, or reservation of any such lands, or the mineral character of any of the lands, less (2) the value of all lands, and interests therein received by such State by reason of (a) the original grants or (b) any indemnity or lieu selection law.

SEC. 3. A complete description of the lands and mineral interests selected under this Act shall be submitted to the Secretary of the

Interior within five years after the effective date of this Act. In addition to such description there shall be submitted to the Secretary of the Interior at the same time a description of the lands or mineral interests therein for which relief is sought under this Act.

SEC. 4. All determinations of value under this Act shall be made by the Secretary of the Interior through appraisal as of the date of the filing of the election specified in section 1 of this Act, with the Secretary of the Interior.

SEC. 5. (a) Selections under this Act may be made in accordance with, and subject to the limitations of, section 2276 of the Revised Statutes, as amended and supplemented, 43 U.S.C. 852. However, no requirement therein as to the nature of the base land shall in any way affect the right to selection under this Act.

(b) Any selection under this Act shall be subject to classification by the Secretary of the Interior under the principles of section 7 of the Taylor Grazing Act, 43 U.S.C. 315f, as amended.

SEC. 6. There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary for carrying out the provisions of this Act.

AMENDMENT OF URBAN MASS TRANSPORTATION ACT

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, by request, I submit, for appropriate reference, an amendment to S. 3126, the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1962, to provide greater continuity of Federal financing in the development of comprehensive and coordinated mass transportation systems in metropolitan and other urban areas.

Mr. President, a number of organizations requesting the submission of this amendment have stressed to me the importance of continuity in Federal financing if this proposed mass transportation program is to succeed. A number of Senators have indicated to me that the method of financing enacted last year by Congress for the mass transportation demonstration program, which was hamstrung during the closing hours of the session last year, should be preserved and continued for the proposed long-term grant program.

Therefore, I am submitting this amendment, so that this important question may be fully discussed during hearings on the legislation, and so that the Senate may be permitted to express its will, as it was unable to do in the closing hours of the session last year.

Mr. President, I should like for a moment to describe some of the arguments that have been made to me on behalf of this amendment, by a number of different organizations and individuals. They stem from two aspects of the President's legislative recommendations which I had the pleasure of introducing on April 5.

First, the President stressed the importance of developing the planning, organization, and financing mechanisms necessary to achieve a coordinated urban transportation system as a part of the comprehensively planned development of urban areas. Quite obviously, this is not going to be an easy task. It is going to require a high degree of cooperative effort on the part of many separate political jurisdictions, over a long period of time.

Secondly, the President's proposals recommend that the Federal grants be not only matched by local contributions, but also be applied only to the net cost of any mass transportation project. The net project cost would be the part of the project cost which cannot reasonably be financed from revenues. In other words, this means that some part of the cost—and in many cases a major portion of the cost—will be borne by private financing, probably through the issuance of revenue bonds.

It was for these reasons that the President stated in his message that—

Only a program that offers substantial support and continuity of Federal participation can induce our urban regions to organize appropriate administration arrangements and to meet their share of the costs of fully balanced transportation systems.

Clearly, State governments and local governments in metropolitan and other urban areas are not going to undertake the difficult and time-consuming efforts to plan and organize for the development of comprehensive urban transportation systems unless they have assurance that the proposed assistance will actually be forthcoming when they have completed their efforts.

Perhaps even more important is the relationship between Federal assistance and private financing.

Let us assume that a city wishes to undertake a \$50 million mass transportation project to provide a rapid transit line from an outlying suburb to the downtown area of the city; and let us assume that it is determined that \$20 million of the cost should be privately financed out of either estimated project revenues or other revenues of the system. That leaves a net project cost of \$30 million, which under the proposed bill would be shared two-thirds by the Federal Government and one-third by the State or local government.

Clearly, the Federal Government cannot commit its share of the \$20 million in this instance in a single year for a single project in a single city, given the total amounts provided in the bill. It will have to space the grants for the project over a number of years, if the assistance is to be of help to more than a handful of cities.

The important point here is that State or local governments would find it extremely difficult, and most public authorities would find it virtually impossible, to arrange for private financing of the original \$20 million portion of the project if they must wait year by year to find out whether the full Federal grant will be forthcoming.

In other words, it is impossible to "sell" an incomplete financing package to private investors, especially in a field such as mass transportation, which never has been an attractive investment field. In order to finance privately the original \$20 million, the investors must be assured that the full \$20 million in Federal grants and the full \$10 million in State or local contributions will be committed to the project.

Therefore, many individuals and organizations have emphasized to me their belief that the authorization and annual

appropriation process proposed in Senate bill 1326 would make it very difficult to make long-term commitments and to formulate the financing package that would make possible substantial private investment. This would be especially true in undertaking major new mass transportation systems.

The proposed amendment would not eliminate a review of the program by the annual appropriations process; but it would give the administrator of the program a definite authority of \$500 million over 3 years, or whatever amount Congress might decide to approve, with which the administrator could make contract commitments. In this way the State and local governments could make their long-term plans and financial arrangements with assurance that there would be continuity in Federal financing; and Congress would still exercise its annual appropriation review process.

This is the procedure which has been adopted by Congress for the urban renewal and other programs, and it has worked exceedingly well. Those who urge this amendment for the mass transportation program contend that the need here is even more compelling.

It is my hope, Mr. President, that this amendment will serve to provide the opportunity for a careful, thorough, and responsible exploration of this question by the committee and by the Senate, for it does seem to me that the arguments raised on behalf of the amendment are worthy of serious consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be received, printed, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

COSPONSORS OF URBAN MASS TRANSPORTATION BILL, S. 3126

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, on April 5 I had the pleasure of introducing the administration's urban mass transportation bill, S. 3126. I would like to inform the Senate at this time that the following Senators joined in sponsoring this measure, and had their names added to the bill when a star print was made to correct errors in the bill: Senators BEALL, BIBLE, BUSH, CASE of New Jersey, CLARK, COOPER, DODD, DOUGLAS, ENGLE, GRUENING, HUMPHREY, JAVITS, KUCHEL, LONG of Hawaii, LONG of Missouri, MORSE, MUSKIE, SMITH of Massachusetts, SYMINGTON, and YOUNG of Ohio.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the distinguished junior Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON] be added as a cosponsor of the bill at its next printing.

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

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF EZRA GLASER TO BE ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, on behalf of the Subcommittee on Patents, Trademarks, and Copyrights, of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to

give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Friday, April 20, 1962, at 10 a.m., in Room 2228 New Senate Office Building, on the nomination of Ezra Glaser, of Virginia, to be Assistant Commissioner of Patents.

At the indicated time and place persons interested in the hearing may make such representations as may be pertinent.

The subcommittee consists of the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT], and myself, as chairman.

NOTICE OF RESCHEDULING OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF THURGOOD MARSHALL TO BE U.S. CIRCUIT JUDGE, SECOND CIRCUIT

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], and on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to give notice that the public hearing scheduled for Tuesday, April 24, 1962, on the nomination of Thurgood Marshall, of New York, to be U.S. circuit judge, second circuit, has been rescheduled for Tuesday, May 1, 1962 at 10:30 a.m., in room 2228, New Senate Office Building.

At the indicated time and place persons interested in the hearing may make such representations as may be pertinent.

The subcommittee consists of the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], as chairman, the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA], and myself.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON NOMINATION OF STEPHEN J. ROTH TO BE U.S. DISTRICT JUDGE, EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN

Mr. HART. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Thursday, April 26, 1962, at 10:30 a.m., in room 2228 New Senate Office Building, on the nomination of Stephen J. Roth, of Michigan, to be U.S. district judge for the eastern district of Michigan, vice Clifford O'Sullivan, elevated.

At the indicated time and place persons interested in the hearing may make such representations as may be pertinent.

The subcommittee consists of the Senator from Missouri [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. FONG], and myself, as chairman.

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, April 19, 1962, he presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills:

S. 205. An act to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to establish a program

of Federal matching grants for the construction of television broadcasting facilities to be used for educational purposes;

S. 505. An act for the relief of Seymour Robertson;

S. 508. An act for the relief of John E. Beaman and Adelaide K. Beaman;

S. 704. An act for the relief of Marlys E. Tedin and Elizabeth O. Reynolds;

S. 1057. An act to provide for a National Portrait Gallery as a bureau of the Smithsonian Institution;

S. 2151. An act for the relief of Harvey Burstein;

S. 2319. An act for the relief of Harry E. Ellison, captain, United States Army, retired; and

S. 2549. An act for the relief of Edward L. Wertheim.

HATTON W. SUMNERS

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, we have just received the sad news that a distinguished statesman of this country—Hon. Hatton W. Sumners—passed away this morning at Dallas, Tex., at age 87.

He retired voluntarily from Congress in 1946, after having served for 34 years in the House of Representatives; and for many years of his service there he was chairman of the powerful House Judiciary Committee.

Hatton Sumners, like many other Texans, including Davy Crockett, Sam Rayburn, Sam Houston, and others—was a native of Tennessee. He was born in Tennessee in 1875, came to Texas at age 18, and was admitted to the Texas bar in 1897. He was elected prosecuting attorney of Dallas County in 1900, and served two terms, during which he was president of the District and County Attorneys' Association of Texas.

He was elected to Congress in 1912, and came to Washington in March 1913. He served through succeeding Congresses until January 1947.

Chairman Sumners was recognized as one of the outstanding constitutional lawyers of the Nation. He achieved great distinction in the House of Representatives, and he lived out that distinction to the end.

He was beloved by the people of Texas. After his retirement from Congress, he lived in Lawyers' End, at the Southwestern Legal Institute, on the campus of Southern Methodist University.

Mr. President, later today I shall make an appropriate motion.

It is with great regret that we have learned of the passing of Hatton W. Sumners.

RECOMMENDATIONS OF FREEDOM OF COMMUNICATIONS SUBCOMMITTEE

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, there has been a great deal of interest in the recommendations of the Freedom of Communications Subcommittee with regard to political candidates and their use of Government licensed media radio and television stations. I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD the text of the unanimous report of the subcommittee, as filed with the Commerce Committee.

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

RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE FREEDOM OF COMMUNICATIONS SUBCOMMITTEE

1. INTRODUCTION

In dealing with that part of the public domain known as the broadcast spectrum, the Congress has been confronted with unique and varied problems. The impact of this technological revolution in communications upon traditional concepts and institutions has been felt in almost every phase of the American way of life.

From the inception of commercial radio broadcasting, Congress has been concerned with the use of the air waves as a vital means of communication, capable of making a major contribution toward an informed public, which is indispensable to the proper functioning of our democratic system. It is to encourage the full realization of these capabilities within our institutional framework of freedom that the Congress has legislated in this field. So, it is in the best American tradition that the Congress, in granting access to broadcasting facilities to a limited number of private licensees, has required that these public franchises be used in the public interest. There can be no question that, since the use of air waves is a privilege granted by the people to private licensees, it is within the right of the people, acting through the Congress, to attach such conditions to the use of that privilege as they may deem wise, reasonable, and prudent.

Our primary concern has been the use of this technology as a communications link between candidates for public office and the people. Section 18 of the Radio Act of 1927, carried forward later as section 315 of the Communications Act of 1934, delineated the basic safeguards which Congress believed were minimal regarding the use of broadcast facilities by candidates for public office. Section 315, popularly called the "equal-time provision," simply stated, required equal-time opportunity for all candidates for a particular office, once any candidate was allowed use of broadcast facilities.

Congress, in section 315, purposed to preserve for the public the benefit of the viewpoint of all of the candidates for a given office, whenever broadcast facilities were used for the viewpoint of one candidate. Equal time was not conceived to serve candidates for public office. Equal time was designed to serve the public. Licensees were denied the privilege of deciding arbitrarily that one candidate could be heard by the electorate, while another candidate for the same office could not be heard.

It is within a very limited legislative framework, then, that these vital means of political communication—radio and television as we know them today—have developed.

Regulations by the Federal Communications Commission in this general area have, likewise, been limited. Since the "Report on Editorializing by Broadcast Licensees," issued by the Federal Communications Commission on June 2, 1949, it has been incumbent upon the licensees to "devote a reasonable percentage of their broadcast time to the discussion of public issues of interest in the community served by their stations and that such programs be designed so that the public has a reasonable opportunity to hear opposing positions on the public issues of interest and importance in the community."

It is this concept of the paramount right of the public to hear different attitudes and viewpoints, and the responsibility of the licensee to present opposing viewpoints on controversial issues, which has come to be known as the "fairness doctrine."

"Equal time" applies only to candidates for political office, while the scope of the

"fairness doctrine" extends to discussion by anyone of a controversial issue over the airwaves.

Few people realize the freedom of political expression which licensees enjoy. It is not commonly known that any radio or television station can use a reasonable part of its time to editorialize—and that includes editorializing on behalf of a candidate for public office or for or against an issue before the public which is to be voted on in an election. A licensee can use any hour of the day or night, or any number of minutes he may desire for such editorializing. A licensee may put on a program about a candidate whom he favors, or a documentary presentation favoring one side of a controversial issue. A licensee could run an editorial program an hour a day on a radio or television station—the only restraint being the obligation at all times to operate in the public interest, and the mandate of the "fairness doctrine" that opposing positions must also be presented.

By law and regulation, the broadcast spectrum has been kept free from governmental dictation, on the one hand, and free alike from similar restraints by the private licensees, on the other.

In 1959, by the passage of Public Law 274 of the 86th Congress, the Congress for the first time modified the "equal-time" requirement in the use of broadcast facilities by legally qualified candidates on bona fide newscasts, bona fide news interviews, bona fide news documentary, and on-the-spot coverage of bona fide news events.

In 1960, by the passage of Public Law 86-677, approved August 24, 1960, the Congress suspended the equal-opportunity provisions of section 315(a) for the period of the 1960 presidential campaign, with respect to nominees for the offices of President and Vice President of the United States.

Senate Resolution 305, adopted by the Senate on June 14, 1960, authorized this subcommittee "to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of any and all matters pertaining to (1) Federal policy on uses of Government-licensed media for the dissemination of political opinions, news, and advertising, and the presentation of political candidates; and (2) a review and examination of information and complaints concerning the dissemination of news by such media."

The dissemination of news, particularly during a political campaign, by radio and television stations is a public service function which requires the highest standards of integrity and a comprehensive understanding of the nature of the democratic process. The American people have a right to be informed on all sides of public questions. Only by hearing opposing positions on public issues of interest, importance, or, perhaps, survival, can the American people exercise their collective judgment intelligently at the ballot box.

It would be utopian to expect complete impartiality. But it is incumbent upon every radio and television newscaster to bear in mind at all times, in the selection and manner of presentation of political news, that the medium being utilized belongs to the public. It is this aspect—the ownership of the airwaves by the public as contrasted to the private ownership of newspapers and news magazines—which places radio and television newscasts in a different frame of reference.

A newspaper publisher or news magazine publisher can color or shade or emphasize or ignore in handling political news; but there is no statutory requirement that he has to act in the public interest. But here again we recognize that the elimination of bias and the achievement of impartiality is difficult. There is no question but that con-

siderable latitude in the exercise of editorial judgment by licensees is necessary.

No licensee has time to report all of the news fit to be broadcast. However, in the sifting and selection process of what news is to be reported over radio and television, the licensee has to be constantly aware of his public-interest obligation. Particularly in reporting political news and discussion of controversial issues, the licensee has to walk a tightrope. But this is simply a measure of responsibility, and those unwilling to act responsibly in utilizing a public privilege are subject to the loss of the use of that privilege.

The licensee has been encouraged to editorialize; and we would not want to deter editorializing; however, many licensees are loath to follow through, once the medium has been used to editorialize on one side of a public issue, and see to it that the public has a reasonable opportunity to hear the opposing position.

The subcommittee determined at the outset of its work that it could only practice hindsight in examining complaints concerning the dissemination of news by Government licensees. To try to take up each complaint concerning newscasts, as distinguished from straight political broadcasts, with the networks and licensees as they came in during the heat of the campaigns of 1960 would have led to the charge that some manner of censorship or Government control was attempting to be exercised by the subcommittee on newscasts. Consequently, the subcommittee requested the nationwide radio and television networks to provide the subcommittee with scripts used by their newscasters of all 15-minute newscasts for the period September 26 through November 7, 1960. This the networks have done. In most cases we were able to reconstruct the nationwide news programs for the period set. In a few cases the scripts of newscasts simply were lost, or misplaced, or unavailable for one reason or another. We are confident that the networks cooperated to the best of their ability; but, just as some of the speeches of the presidential candidates, themselves, were lost, some news scripts were lost.

In part IV of this report, we have printed these newscasts. In attempting to analyze in depth the news in the presidential campaign so presented, it became immediately apparent that any such analysis would require as well the news source material, i.e., what the candidates were actually saying from day to day.

Parts I, II, and III of this report present in full the speeches, remarks, press conferences, study and position papers, and statements of Senator Kennedy and Vice President Nixon.

2. ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The preparation of parts I, II, III, and IV of this report would not have been possible without the cooperation and assistance of many people. Acknowledgment must be made to Sam Brightman, Muriel Hart, Mary Clyne, Clara Boone, Jack Christy, Mrs. Reggie Schuebel, and Maurice Keville, of the Democratic National Committee staff; Elizabeth Fielding, of the Republican National Committee staff; Mrs. Christine Grimsley, Office of the Press Secretary, the White House; Mrs. Dorothy Cosby, of Vice President Nixon's office; and Ben Franklin, librarian, of the New York Times.

In addition, the subcommittee is appreciative of the willingness of the following people who helped in obtaining material for the volumes:

Alfred Beckman, American Broadcasting Co.

Jack L. Bell, Associated Press.

Ed Bunker, Columbia Broadcasting System.

Dr. Clay Cochran, AFL-CIO.

Clyde Ellis, National Rural Electric Cooperative Association.

Norman Gelman, Commerce Committee Staff, U.S. Senate.

Ted Koop, Columbia Broadcasting System.

Stephen J. McCormick, Mutual Broadcasting System.

Howard Monderer, National Broadcasting Co.

Morris Novik, radio consultant, New York City.

Mr. and Mrs. Nelson Poynter, Congressional Quarterly.

Ben Stong, Interior and Insular Affairs Committee staff, U.S. Senate.

In particular, the cooperation and assistance of Dr. Hugh Elsbree, Director of the Legislative Reference Service, Library of Congress, and his staff were invaluable.

Special acknowledgment is made to Aaron Blauer, Laurence Frank, and Joseph Roth, of the Government Printing Office, and to William Throckmorton, of the subcommittee staff, who have rendered invaluable assistance in the preparation of this report.

3. NETWORK NEWSCASTS IN THE PRESIDENTIAL CAMPAIGN

Insofar as the two major Presidential candidates are concerned, and with regard to nationwide network newscasting, the subcommittee has presented in the first four parts of this report the raw material for an analysis of the dissemination of news by radio and television networks. The volumes of each of the four parts have been set up in chronological order, so that it is a relatively easy matter to read, for any given day in the Presidential campaign, what both candidates said on that day; and then by checking part IV, one can find what the network radio and television newscasters were reporting of what the candidates said. It is in the exercise of editorial judgment of what to report, out of the daily volume of words which seems the imperative of Presidential campaigning, that radio and television newscasters exercise a tremendous power over the formation of public opinion during a Presidential campaign.

It is also fruitful to read the various newscasts on any given day and compare what was considered significant by individual newscasters.

It is possible to follow the development of such 1960 campaign issues as religion, national growth, the prestige of America abroad, etc., as they were developed or defended by the candidates themselves and as reported by the newscasters. In some instances, it is interesting to read what the candidates actually said, alongside of what some of the newscasters said they said.

In most cases, network newscasting was balanced as to time spent on reporting each of the two major candidates. Quantitatively, at least, the scales were balanced in most cases. Qualitatively, we must simply defer judgment. [Individual members of this subcommittee reserve their personal opinions as to this matter of qualitative coverage.]

In only one instance brought to the subcommittee's attention did a network newscaster openly endorse and editorialize in favor of one of the two major candidates. (See the broadcast of Fulton Lewis, Jr., November 7, 1960, p. 1156, part IV of this report.) That this was a clear abuse of newscast time, there can be no doubt. The 1959 amendment, modifying the equal-time requirement on newscasts, specifically charged broadcasters with the obligation, in connection with the presentation of newscasts, "to operate in the public interest and to afford reasonable opportunity for the discussion of conflicting views on issues of public importance." So-called newscasters who abuse the public franchise in such a manner should probably be barred from use of the medium. [Senator Scott dissents

from this conclusion, on the ground that there is insufficient evidence of a demand for equal time.]

There were myriad complaints about individual network newscasts. On a given day, perhaps a hundred people over the country would complain that a particular newscast was biased in favor of one of the two major candidates. In most cases, complaints would also be heard about the very same newscast as being biased in favor of the other candidate. Complaints about camera angles, lighting, bad sound recording, selective camera shots (such as ones showing empty seats at a rally), etc., were numerous.

It is on the local level that the opportunity for abuse in newscasting is most prevalent. Under the umbrella of "editorial judgment," the process of selectivity can block out a congressional or senatorial candidate. In communities where a black-out of political personalities and controversial ideas is maintained by the newspapers, then, it is imperative that radio and television fill the gap and supply the knowledge to keep the democratic process functioning. Grave questions arise as to whether licensees who exercise their editorial judgment, to the point of censorship of news of candidates and issues of which they disapprove, should continue to enjoy the privilege of a public franchise.

After considering the many complaints received by the subcommittee during September, October, and November, 1960, the most representative were selected for public hearings held in Washington, D.C., March 27, 28, and 29, 1961. These hearings, with extensive exhibits in the appendixes, are printed in full as part V of this report.

It is from these hearings, and a consideration of the other complaints and information received by the subcommittee, that the following recommendations are derived:

4. RECOMMENDATIONS

I

Section 312(a) of the Communications Act provides that the FCC may revoke any station license "(4) for willful or repeated violation of * * * any rule or regulation of the Commission."

The report on editorializing, adopted by the FCC on June 1, 1949, should now be re-adopted by the FCC—and codified either by reference or inclusion—as a rule, a violation of which would be a cause for revocation of a station's license.

At no time in our Nation's history has it been so important that the public be informed. It is out of the conflict of ideas, the delineation of alternate courses, the discussion of controversial issues, that the public will garner the information necessary for the intelligent collective judgment, which is the genius of our democratic processes.

Licensees should editorialize. Strong convictions are to be encouraged. It is in the quagmire of moderation that intellectual integrity suffers the most. Individual licensees have the responsibility for determining specific material for broadcast. This responsibility, however, carries with it the obligation on the part of the licensee not to impose personal private restraints which deprive the public of its right to hear opposing positions on the critical issues. Above all, the principle of absolute fairness should apply.

A licensee may entertain the personal opinion that officeholder "A" should be retired from public life, or that candidate "B" would be a better public servant. But this opinion may not extend to the point that news bureaus and television cameramen are instructed to ignore officeholder "A" and what he has to say to the public, or to cover only candidate "B" and his program to the exclusion of his opposition. Partisan, one-

sided presentation of issues and candidates by a private licensee to the point of excluding contrary views and personalities is not to be tolerated.

The Federal Communications Commission should be able to act promptly for an immediate review of the performance of a licensee upon complaint of abuse in this area, rather than wait on a renewal proceeding.

II

Licensee editorializing on behalf of a political candidate or a political party requires some ground rules. The Federal Communications Commission should consider a series of rules to cover the situations which have developed. Some ground rules are here suggested:

1. When a licensee editorializes on behalf of or against a candidate or party, the script of the broadcast, if on radio, or a film or tape, if on television, should be required to be kept on file and available for inspection by interested parties for a reasonable period of time, not less than 1 week.

2. Advance notice that an editorial is to be broadcast should be given to the candidate or candidates or political party against whom the editorial is directed so that it may be observed or monitored.

3. Equal opportunity to use the station's facilities to answer such editorial should accrue to the candidate or party against whom the editorial is directed.

4. Candidates and parties editorialized against should have the right to designate the person or persons to appear and present the opposing view to such editorial.

5. A reasonable cutoff time on such editorials, prior to an election, should be set—at least 48 hours before the opening of the polls.

6. Licensee promotion of an editorial, spot announcements, and other advertising should also be equalized for the opposing viewpoint to such editorial.

7. Where a licensee editorializes on behalf of a slate of candidates in one time segment (say, 5 minutes) but the time spent on any one candidate is minimal—a few seconds for the mentioning of his name—the opposing candidate or candidates should in fairness be allowed sufficient time for his representative to present adequately the opposing position (say, 2½ minutes?).

III

The Federal Communications Commission should modify the rule or regulation under which licensees may require the advance filing of scripts of the speeches of political candidates. Candidates should not be required to file scripts in advance. Licensees may not censor the material in political broadcasts, and duly qualified candidates should be able to speak extemporaneously or from scripts revised at the last minute or even during a broadcast, if they so desire. In lieu of filing scripts, candidates, if timely notice be given, should be able to order and pay in advance, at the going rate charged by the licensee, for a tape recording to be made of a political speech during delivery of same, said tape to remain on file at the station and be available for hearing or reproduction by interested parties.

IV

The Federal Communications Commission should prescribe appropriate rules and regulations under section 315 covering the use of licensee facilities by legally qualified candidates for public office to the effect:

1. That licensees who determine in advance of a political campaign that time will not be made available to any candidate in a particular race may not change said determination without the acquiescence of all candidates in said race.

2. That licensees may not arbitrarily set a cutoff date for the sale of political time prior to an election. Once time is made

available, the use and timing thereof is a political judgment of which timing is a most important element. Licensees should not have the power to guide the course of a political campaign as they see fit, to the exclusion of the public's right to hear candidates as the candidate determines best.

V

Section 326 of the Communications Act should be amended to provide additionally: "Nothing in this act or the foregoing sentence shall prevent the Federal Communications Commission, acting upon a complaint in an 'editorial fairness' case, to direct a licensee to make time available and present the opposing position or a particular person in order that the paramount right of the public to be informed on all sides of public issues be preserved."

VI

The Federal Communications Commission should study in depth the use of broadcast time for discussion of controversial issues. Some guidelines should be established for the licensee to follow in presenting both sides of such issues:

1. The licensee should be required to set in motion an effort to schedule the opposing viewpoint prior to the presentation of the original editorial discussion, rather than awaiting complaint or relying upon a blanket offer to anyone wishing to take issue. Every effort should be made for balanced programming in order that the public could be informed at the time of the editorializing that the opposing view will be heard at a given time.

2. The Federal Communications Commission should determine whether the licensee can require a commercial advertiser, who buys time for the advertising and promotion of his product but utilizes a portion of that time to editorialize on one side of a controversial issue, to make available equitable time for the opposing viewpoint to be heard on the commercial advertiser's program. The commercial advertiser has, by use of his time to discuss one side of a controversial issue, placed the licensee in the position of having to make available noncommercial public service time to meet the licensee's obligation under the fairness doctrine. Should not the commercial advertiser, who uses part of his time for editorializing, be required in fairness to make available equitable opportunity on his commercial time for the opposing viewpoint to be heard?

VII

Licensee refusal to sell commercial time for the presentation of news, discussion, or entertainment programs sponsored by organizations such as political parties, labor unions, citizen committees, or business groups espousing a viewpoint with which the licensee is not in sympathy should be required to be reported immediately by the licensee to the Federal Communications Commission. Censorship by the licensee by refusal to sell time for the presentation of a news commentary program by a commentator who may espouse a viewpoint contrary to that held by the licensee, or refusal to sell time for a speech or discussion program to be made by a public figure who, in the licensee's opinion may be controversial, may be a denial to the public of its right to hear those contrary viewpoints which are so necessary for the formation of intelligent opinion and sound judgment. This is doubly true when the licensee accepts programs and sells time for commentators or for public figures whose views and biases are well known, but contrary to those to whom he refuses to sell time.

The licensee has no mission to function as a thought control policeman. Our freedom and democracy are developing institutions. The democratic dialog must be encouraged

at all costs. Democracy is a way of doing business, and our freedom is protected by developing institutions which follow the guidelines of due process of the law.

It is in the deepening of our understanding and the constant reexamination of the ends to be achieved by our society that our strength lies. In public apathy lies the danger of failure of political morality.

So long as the American people are eager to explore ideas, to want to hear and discuss and think and read and seek information, we have a reservoir of strength which can see us through any crisis. In order to act responsibly, the individual has to be informed. The individual has a right to be informed. It is the right to hear open discussion of all viewpoints which concerns us here. Only through such discussion will we achieve the continuing education of us all which is so necessary if we are to survive.

Licensees who practice a continuing pattern of refusal to sell commercial time for such programs are not fulfilling their license obligation to act in the public interest.

The Federal Communications Commission should view a continuing accumulation of refusal notices to sell such time by a licensee as a failure on the part of the licensee to act in the public interest.

VIII

It is the subcommittee's opinion that consideration of a permanent statute to qualify section 315 of the Communications Act along the lines of the presidential and vice presidential candidate exemption of 1960 is premature at this time, but recommends a review of this matter early in the next (the 88th) Congress.

Various suggestions have been put forth that section 315 should be permanently modified so that not only the presidential and vice presidential candidates would be excluded from the coverage of the statute, but that candidates for the U.S. Senate, the U.S. House of Representatives, State Governors, and perhaps other candidates, be likewise exempted.

In a majority of the U.S. congressional and senatorial campaigns and State gubernatorial campaigns, there will be only two legally qualified candidates in the general elections of 1962. In these cases, licensees could, under the provisions of section 315, make time available for a series of debates or joint appearances or other presentations of the opposing candidates. We would be better advised to wait until the elections of 1962 have been held and to consider the actions of the licensees in making time available in those cases where only two candidates are involved before considering permanent legislation of this type.

The drive for suspension of section 315 permanently has some curious overtones. There seems to be a feeling on the part of some proponents of this type of legislation that those who are eminently qualified in the field of entertainment are better able to judge the format and content of political programs designed to enlighten the public than the candidates themselves. Those who test the public response and rate programs accordingly for entertainment value or the sale of commercial products may not be the best judge to analyze the citizen's quest for information or his taste for political controversy. Programs of a political nature in our society are a paramount public service responsibility of licensees. And the interposition of the licensee between the candidate and the public does not mean that the licensee is to act as a filter, substituting his judgment for that of the candidate as to what the American people want to know.

The substitution of licensee judgment for that of the candidates themselves, as to how best to present the candidates and the issues, the format and content of political programming, is freedom abused.

A very substantial part of the public's acceptance of a candidate rests on the public's concept of the candidate's judgment; and the candidate's judgment is oftentimes best expressed in his exercise of that judgment as to what tactics and strategy would best serve his campaign. The exercise of editorial judgment by licensees can very easily be used by them in political programming to direct a political campaign the way they think the campaign ought to go.

Despite claims to the contrary, the exemption from section 315 of the presidential campaign in 1960 did not give us a comprehensive picture of what would happen if the exemption were made permanent. The 1960 exemption became effective on August 26, 1960, after both national conventions of the two major political parties. Performance of the networks and licensees in the period prior to the conventions under such an exemption has not been tested.

The "Survey of Political Broadcasting, September 1-November 8, 1960," prepared by the FCC in response to Senate Joint Resolution 207, 86th Congress, raises as many questions as it answers. The situation in a presidential election year is different from that in an off year like 1962. In order to see the whole aspect of political broadcasting, a survey for 1962 is necessary.

The trend in radio broadcasting to the so-called news and music formula, which seems to exclude 15- and 30-minute news and discussion programs with the only political availabilities being spot announcements, needs thorough analysis.

The Congress, therefore, before considering permanent revision of section 315, should have available to it first a summary, not only of network and individual licensee performance in the presidential campaign of 1960, but a survey in depth of performance by networks and licensees in the elections of 1962.

And we would be well advised to consider then whether or not a case has been made for any exceptions to the coverage of section 315, and whether or not such exceptions are in fact class legislation and at variance with the fundamental objectives which the Congress seeks to protect.

IX

The Federal Communications Commission should reform its internal procedures for the handling and processing of "equal-time" and editorial "fairness" complaints. The time lag at the Commission must be cut to the minimum. Here are issues in which time is most certainly of the essence.

The physical handling of such complaints—in the mailroom—at the first point received by the Commission must be so organized and staffed so that the action to ascertain all necessary facts on a given complaint begins within 24 hours of receipt of same by the Commission.

Licensees likewise should be advised by the Commission that receipt by the licensee of a query from the FCC for information in regard to complaints in this field are to be answered forthwith without delay within the time stated. In case of arbitrary delay and refusal to answer within a stated time, the Commission should call an immediate hearing.

The Federal Communications Commission should consider the establishment of a hearing system under competent examiners for the immediate taking of testimony in the field when necessary to perpetuate a record concerning complaints under the "fairness doctrine" and equal time.

The Federal Communications Commission should consider its experience in this field and advise the Congress exactly what is needed in the way of legislative authority and personnel in order to preserve for the public the freedom to hear and to see on the public airwaves, free from governmental dictation on the one hand, but free as well from private licensee dictation, on the other.

Let there be free and open discussion; let the public hear both sides of the controversial and critical issues of our time, and this dialog will better maintain Americanism and the way of life it represents than anything else we can do. We must practice at home the freedom we preach abroad. We can convince only by example; let us make of our example the most of which we are capable.

RALPH W. YARBOROUGH,
GALE MCGEE,
HUGH SCOTT.

DR. VANDIVER, NOTED TEXAS HISTORIAN, EDUCATOR, CHARTS BATTLE FOR MEN'S MINDS IN THE CIVIL WAR

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, a noted historian of my State recently delivered to the Public Relations Society of America the initial lecture of that organization's Foundation for Public Relations Research and Education. Entitled "The First Public War," the treatise explores the utilization of means of formation of public opinion during the American Civil War.

Few contemporary observers are more eminently qualified to appraise any facet of that remarkable period of our history than the lecturer, Dr. Frank E. Vandiver, whose scholarship and whose family's friendship I value highly. Currently professor of history at Rice University in Houston, Dr. Vandiver is widely recognized for his studies of the Civil War. He is a native of Austin, and is a graduate of the University of Texas; and he is president of the Texas Institute of Letters, which in 1957 honored him with its Carr P. Collins Award. Dr. Vandiver is author of "Mighty Stonewall," "Fields of Glory," "Plowshares Into Swords: Josiah Gorgas and the Confederate Ordinance."

Dr. Vandiver is such a remarkable scholar that he was awarded a Ph. D. degree from the University of Texas without having obtained a bachelor's degree. He did the work for a bachelor's degree before he was 16. He was such a brilliant scholar that he had earned his Ph. D. at an age when most men are seeking their bachelor's degree.

The address is a most informative account of the efforts of the rival Presidents to mobilize public opinion in the segments of the Nation of which they had control through their armies; and he points out that Abraham Lincoln won the battle of public opinion before he won on the battlefield. The address was delivered before the conference of the Public Relations Society of America, at the Shamrock-Hilton Hotel, in Houston, Tex., on November 13, 1961.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the address by Dr. Vandiver, entitled "The First Public War, 1861-65."

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

THE FIRST PUBLIC WAR—1861-65

(By Frank E. Vandiver)

Strange that after a hundred years Americans still try to discover just what the Civil War means to them. If there is lingering confusion today, there was a good deal more in 1861—but much less by 1865. To the war

generation, as perhaps to all war generations, conflict gave confidence; bloodshed brought a kind of rectitude. Sturdy blue men could die willingly and well on fields from Virginia to Texas because they had something worth the dying. And across the bayonets from them, gaunt gray men laid down their lives with like gallantry for a cause which lent them grandeur. How was it that two causes so ennobling appeared to call Americans to the worst of brothers' wars? How was it that willing thousands raged, fought and fell for North and South and knew they must go on to the end?

This morale, this élan, this patriotism if you will, came from a certain understanding of American ideals, an understanding provided by propaganda, by crude attempts in the field of public relations.

Virtue is the basic ingredient of patriotism—every belligerent nation claims virtue is on its side, that its cause is just, its aims unsullied, its honor sacred. So it was with North and South. Both felt sure of virtue, sure of sanctity, sure of God's favor. Especially they felt their triumph certain because each fought for revered American principles, fought to keep the image of America bright for the world. And curiously enough they both were partly right in this conviction.

As things worked out, the Civil War cut between two views of America, both of which had always been part of the dream of the New World, and both of which promised more than the Old World had yet achieved. History would later blame the war on slavery, on differences between the workaday Yankee and cavalier southerner, on diverging economic systems, on the success of the industrial revolution, on the ineluctable triumph of a modern state over a decadent slavocracy. These were all part of the greater difference, a difference in mind dating from the American Revolution.

In time the views, differing governmentally, of Hamilton and Jefferson jelled into two political party ideals, became the fundamentals of policy for the later Whig and Democratic Parties. But they were also the articulation—with modifications—of the libertarian and equalitarian concepts of the United States. The North would stay steadfast to freedom and equality, while liberty would constantly charm the South.

Southern political leaders—John C. Calhoun and his followers—caught the libertarian urge of the dual ideal. The great promise of America to them was political freedom, political independence. And this was no small promise; it was, after all, the aim most cherished and most boasted during the Revolution, it had hallowed history and the virtue of success. For this ideal the Founding Fathers had pledged their lives and fortunes and had forged their sacred honor. The social ideals of the Declaration of Independence had been insinuated into the Revolution by Jefferson in a document many knew to be essentially rhetorical. In the southern mind the real meaning of liberty was self-determination.

But self-determination did not mean self-destruction. Democratic impulses were fine when kept in hand—the Virginia lady who said that she did not mind being democratic with people as long as they were not democratic with her clearly summed the views of Calhoun and his cohorts.

These southern leaders saw clearly enough that the surgent spirit of equality in the North threatened the safety of a class-based society, threatened the comfort of cotton oligarchs, the foundation of their economic order and the continuance of their system. Above Mason and Dixon's line independence had been coupled with freedom; liberty had social as well as political significance. It was true. It had been true from the time of the Declaration. In Jefferson's sage eyes, liberty could not endure without freedom for

the individual. Political independence had appeal, yes, but no thrilling summons to patriots unless it meant also that all men were equal in opportunity and free to improve their chance. He never swerved from this image of America, made it a part of the northern mind and a lingering hope of the world.

Few southerners doubted that if northern nationalism triumphed, slavery more and more would feel the pressure of abolition and the cotton States would come increasingly under the domination of eastern men of money. And if this truly came to pass, Jeffersonian visions were bound to win out everywhere. Political freedom would go under in the overwash of mass democracy and valor, and mass machinery.

In the face of these possibilities, Calhoun and fellow southern leaders began constructing elaborate defenses for the self-determination of the South. They clung to political freedom as the essence of the American dream. In their view, political freedom conferred the best type of liberty—because with the blessings of liberty went the requirements of responsibility. The ruling class understood responsibility and politics, and acknowledged an obligation to exercise leadership, to give time to Government.

It should be remembered that for some time southern politicians did not think of openly defending the "peculiar institution." Many of them, and this is certainly true up to 1830, suspected that slavery might be immoral and many were willing that it should erode. But they did think the South had a calling—a calling to preserve for posterity venerable American traditions of localism, independence, liberty and property.

True, they came finally to an active defense of slavery, to a full-blown rejection of much they once held inviolate. But when this happened, it happened because of external pressures and the imminent prospect of oblivion. And it happened swiftly.

The South was Jefferson's section, but it turned against him and his ideas with a vengeance after 1831—the year of Nat Turner's insurrection. Following that year abolitionist propaganda shoved the southerner into a new philosophy; all men are not created equal; the black man is inferior. With this new conviction in mind if not in heart, the southerner found the North more alien than ever. Southerners now felt compelled to preserve their special way of life, as well as their old concept of American independence. Newspapers spewed forth the latest catchism day after day; ministers found Biblical support for slavery, medical men found biological proofs of Negro inferiority. Everyone rallied round a system increasingly insulated from outside ideas. Mails were censored; abolitionist books burned. Freedom of thought gave way to compulsion to conform.

Conformity added to southern strength at least on the surface. The whole section entered into a frenzied demonstration of singlemindedness. All southerners became myrmidons of State rights and of southern nationalism.

The Confederate States of America, proudly proclaimed at Montgomery, Ala., in February 1862, seemed the personification of old ideas of State rights. The very name implied the nature of the Government—a confederation, with the States remaining sovereign. At Montgomery, however, in the deliberations over the Confederate constitution, a strong strain of federalism cropped out among the delegates, and the document which emerged bore striking resemblance to the Constitution of the United States. Many members of the provisional congress spoke in federalist phrases about law and order and fear of mass revolution. But the words were for a time lost in the fervor of southern patriotism. A president was elected to lead the

new nation, and hopes were high for liberty and southern independence.

Jefferson Davis of Mississippi, the Confederacy's Chief Executive, had the requisite experience and public prestige for the job, but never had he camped with fire-eating secessionists—he was a moderate, and so his administration. Although he had fought in the U.S. Senate for States rights, he soon saw the need for a strong government and became a Confederate nationalist. As such, he strove for aims remarkably like those beguiling the President of the United States.

In working to perfect a cause, make a government and win a war, Davis and Abraham Lincoln were the central figures of the years 1861-65. Each gave voice to one of the dual ideas of democracy, each typified his Nation to a large degree and each had an image of his country's destiny and fought to forge that destiny with every tool available. Forming government is, after all, largely an executive function. And it was especially so in 1861, for never before had Americans faced efforts so prodigious, war so total. No previous experience offered guidance, not even the career of postrevolutionary France with its *levee en masse*. For the French had faced outsiders, could count on solid patriotism. But Lincoln and Davis faced civil war, consequently the possibility of defection and blurred patterns of loyalty. Davis faced, too, the special problem of building a nation while constructing a war effort.

It is not surprising then, that the Civil War became largely a war of opinion, a war to win people's approval, a truly public war. Victory might well go to the people who responded first and with the fullest national effort.

Even a cursory glance at statistics showed that the South stood little chance in a test of resources. But Americans had faced worse odds and won, so statistics failed to cool southern blood. Jefferson Davis, more of a realist than most of his confreres, feared the outcome of a war of attrition and worked to win public support early. Quick mobilization, an undivided dedication to independence and an olive branch extended in a strong hand might win northern consent to secession.

Be it said for the embattled rebel President that he knew how to begin. From the outset the need to put the South in proper public posture was clear to him. In his inaugural address—given on the picturesque portico of Alabama's white-columned capitol—he sketched an image of his cause. "We have changed the constituent parts," he said, "but not the system of government." The Confederacy stood as the bulwark of constitutional government in America; it had been formed to preserve the political compact and to resist the dictatorship of the masses. In essence it represented a return to first American principles. Davis repeated the timeless call for sacrifice to sustain the new nation: "Doubly justified by the absence of wrong on our part, and by wanton aggression on the part of others, there can be no cause to doubt that the courage and patriotism of the people of the Confederate States will be found equal to any measure * * * which their honor and security may require * * *. We have entered upon the career of independence, and it must be inflexibly pursued * * *. Reverently let us invoke the God of our fathers to guide and protect us in our efforts to perpetuate the principles which by His blessing they were able to vindicate, establish, and transmit to their posterity." Lest the more optimistic southerners feel too sure of peaceful separation, Davis urged the likelihood of a terrible war.

In the years following, the Confederate President worked to sustain morale by using accepted methods of public appeal. Often he spoke to Congress, outlining policy and

fostering cooperation. Increasingly it grew difficult for him to persuade and cajole as the cause faded on the battlefield; increasingly he preached and demanded. Consequently contemporaries, hence historians, regarded him as unable to lead and branded him a latent dictator. Close scrutiny of many of his speeches to Congress, his public proclamations, his direct appeals to the Confederate people, shows this stereotype to be just that. True, he lacked the warmth and humanness of Lincoln, had no talent for enshrining his cause in ringing words, but he did have a certain charm and deathless devotion to his country. Always during the war he spoke of independence, heralded the horrors of defeat and finally advocated emancipation to ensure liberty. He tried to win the southern press to his administration and at first succeeded. But the Richmond papers, powerful because they were close to the mighty, soon showed the contempt of familiarity and several became vitriolic voices of opposition.

Many other papers in the Confederacy followed suit, especially when the President sponsored such un-Confederate measures as conscription, tax in kind, impressment of private property, mild regulation of private industry and public transportation, and the use of slaves as soldiers. When the press turned against the Government Davis fell back on more speeches himself and on requests to Governors for appeals to their own citizens. He sought, too, approval from the pulpit—long a standard method of reaching large segments of the populace. Southern clergymen, most of them, proved staunch rebels; paeans of patriotism rose each Sunday, and countless sermons to civilians and soldiers praised the country, the cause, the Government and called down the wrath of the Old Testament's Jehovah on barbarous, un-Christian Yankees.

Southern Governors were not nearly as helpful as southern ministers. After all, one of the things many southerners felt they fought to sustain was State rights; none thought so more fervently than Gov. Joseph E. Brown of Georgia—a larger Confederate millstone. Often at odds with Davis, often in direct conflict with Confederate war policies, State-Righter Brown did much to wreck the southern effort. But even Brown could be fired to nationalism by an occasional Presidential plea. Following the disasters of 1863's summer, Davis urged the Governors to even more herculean efforts. John Milton of Florida, John Shorter of Alabama and one or two other State executives reacted with typical dedication, and this time Brown reached into his large store of rhetoric to assist the Government. He issued a proclamation "to the people of Georgia" which illustrates accepted propaganda practice—leaves virtually nothing unsaid, touches every sentiment sacred to southerners. "Georgians, you who remain in this State owe further volunteering to the gallant men who have left their homes and gone to distant fields to meet the foe. You owe it to the orphans of the immortal dead who have lost their lives in your defense. You owe it to the noblewomen of Georgia, who, with hearts full of patriotism, have, by their untiring energy, clothed the naked and contributed millions of dollars to the support of our cause, and who, like guardian angels, have ministered to the comfort and soothed the agony of the sick and wounded. * * * You owe it to your own wives and children, to the families of our soldiers now in service * * * and to unborn posterity." Exhortations of this kind usually had some measurable effect.

That Davis asked for them, though, shows how chancy was the business of molding public opinion. The President tried direct methods himself, and three times made a "swing around the circle," toured the Confederacy, speaking to as many rebels as could

be gathered to hear him. He did this to bolster morale, to nerve people for bad news, or to call for more money and men. When he spoke informally he generally scored. Only when he read from a prepared text did he sound like a pallid Calhoun arguing an abstruse point of order. In person he had force, breathed some of his verve into his words, and carried listeners with him. But he could reach just so many.

Some local efforts by loyal rebels occasionally helped to prop up morale. Many southern school textbooks offered sound lessons in Confederate superiority. Arithmetic problems, for example, were often put in propaganda terms: "If 1 Confederate soldier can whip 7 Yankees, how many soldiers can whip 49 Yankees?" A few private societies appeared, dedicated to caring for soldiers' families and to encouraging the home front. But for the most part Davis had to rely on haphazard methods of morale building—the church, whimsical Governors, disorganized civilian activities. Even the Press Association of the Confederate States, which disseminated news via telegraph, did not cooperate with the Government—was not asked to do so, in fact.

Still, the picture is not all bad. Davis did have one propaganda success. With the wisdom born of war, he and his shrewd Secretary of State, Judah P. Benjamin, saw the desperate need of providing favorable views of the Confederacy to Europe. They sent an experienced journalist, Henry Hotze, to England, financed him in establishing the London Index, and aided in making this paper a highly respected source of pro-Confederate news.

At home, though in the absence of continuing encouragement and persuasion, Confederate morale sank in direct ratio to military defeat. Things at length so deteriorated that numerous peace societies sprung up and did their deadly business without serious opposition. About the only voices raised against this sort of sedition were Davis' and those of a few Members of Congress. But Congress had always been too far away and Davis had lost his luster in the backwash of disaster. Still, he kept on trying. And he showed best when everything crumbled around him. At the very end, after Lee had given up the Richmond-Petersburgh siege lines and his army trudged wearily to Appomattox and to history, Davis—president on the run—made his most eloquent appeal to his people. He told of Richmond's fall, of Lee's retreat, of Yankees ringing round, but spoke, too, of the future. "Animated by the confidence in your spirit and fortitude, which never yet has failed me, I announce to you, fellow countrymen, that it is my purpose to maintain your cause with my whole heart and soul. * * * If by stress of numbers we should ever be compelled to a temporary withdrawal from Virginia or * * * any other border State, again and again will we return, until the baffled and exhausted enemy shall abandon in despair his endless and impossible task of making slaves of a people resolved to be free. Let us not then despond, my countrymen, but, relying on the never failing mercies and protecting care of our God, let us meet the foe with fresh defiance, with unconquered and unconquerable hearts."

Liberty and independence lingered as the Confederacy's dream. For this dream, southerners were willing to change everything about the South, to submit to regimentation, to cooperate with Confederate nationalists, and finally to alter their social structure and abandon slavery. But this willingness was individual, without direction and often unspoken. The reasons for final Confederate collapse were many, but surely among the most important was the absence of a clear understanding of war aims and the absence of an articulate national purpose.

Lincoln faced similar problems in public relations himself. When the Southern States began to leave the Union the North reacted variously. Many in New England and the Midwest voiced relief that the South at last had gone its way. Others felt secession to be illegal but felt coercion to be equally beyond the law. Some called for preservation of the Union at any cost. How could these discordant elements be welded into a national opinion? It could be done, it turned out, by reminding northerners of a common dream—the dream of equality and freedom. Abraham Lincoln recalled it, refurbished it, made it the buckler of the Union.

Means and measures available to Lincoln were not very different from those used in the South: speeches, textbooks, newspapers—even Greeley's antiabolitionist New York Tribune. Lincoln had to rely on the same media for public information as did Davis, but he had a few significant advantages.

The northern people had long been addicted to private associations as a means of getting things done; the craze for joining hit the North much more forcefully than the South. And as a consequence, such voluntary organizations as the Union League and the Loyal Publication Society became important adjuncts of the northern war effort. Private funds and private zeal made the league one of the most successful morale builders for the Union Army. Volunteers went with the troops, ministered to their comforts, offered small luxuries midst the crudities of camp. And always these zealots provided rations of propaganda in the form of articles, books, poems, and speeches. The Loyal Publication Society, founded in New York City, was especially energetic in distributing patriotic reading matter. It raised over \$30,000 during the war, published 90 pamphlets, and distributed 900,000 documents. Associations of this sort were not officially recognized nor under Government direction, but they had wide membership and did much more useful service than disorganized southern citizens.

Like Davis, Lincoln also appreciated the importance of winning Europe's favor. Early in the war he dispatched a propaganda commission to France and England charged with presenting the North in favorable guise. The main task of this commission turned out to be constant efforts at counteracting Hotze's Index.

But Lincoln's greatest asset was himself. True, some northern Governors emulated southern ones in issuing proclamations and in summoning heroics by the pen, but their activities were insignificant in comparison to the President's.

Lincoln had a terrific advantage over Davis in public relations because he had long been a stump-speaking officeseeker, had for years wheedled country voters and coaxed canny politicians, while Davis' honors came by appointment or unopposed election. Experience taught the North's leader how to talk to people, how to engage their help, win their confidence, use their talents, accept their opposition. In the early stages of his administration, Lincoln felt his way into the northern mind. When the North was uncertain and confused about secession, about Fort Sumter and about the cause, Lincoln waited, selected the moment, and moved in to explain what the war was about, to mold the will of the Union. He began the process with the first inaugural, March 4, 1861. "I hold, that in contemplation of universal law, and of the Constitution, the Union of these States is perpetual * * *. It follows from these views that no State, upon its own mere motion, can lawfully get out of the Union * * * and that acts of violence, within any State or States, against the authority of the United States, are insurrectionary or revolutionary, according to circumstances." After thus explaining his political philosophy, he

moved to the issue of the moment, the one that then and later seemed the cause of all the trouble: "One section of our country believes slavery is right, and ought to be extended, while the other believes it is wrong, and ought not to be extended. This is the only substantial dispute." The last part of the inaugural address is often quoted as an example of Lincolnian prose at its best; and is also superb propaganda. "In your hands, my dissatisfied fellow countrymen, and not in mine, is the momentous issue of civil war. The Government will not assail you. You can have no conflict, without being yourselves the aggressors. You have no oath registered in Heaven to destroy the Government, while I shall have the most solemn one to 'preserve, protect, and defend' it."

In this one speech Lincoln took a stand for perpetual Union, focused on slavery as the evil in dispute, and fixed war guilt squarely on southern shoulders—no small achievement for a Presidential neophyte.

In this address, as in most of his early utterances, the President harped on maintaining the Union. All else, even abolition, could be deferred or abandoned—indeed, he once wrote Horace Greeley that "I would save the Union. I would save it the shortest way under the Constitution. If I could save the Union without freeing any slave I would do it; and if I could save it by freeing some and leaving others alone I would also do that." But unlike most of his northern contemporaries, and unlike Davis and southern leaders, Lincoln kept an open mind on objectives to be gained by the war; he regarded objectives as weapons, as catalysts for public morale. If one failed him, another would be found. When, for instance, after the long string of Confederate successes in the summer of 1862, he found the "Union forever" a tiring theme, he issued his Emancipation Proclamation. This proved a master stroke. It freed no slaves at once, but it killed the dream, hence crushed the power of the rabid abolitionist element in the Republican Party. And it made human freedom part and parcel of the crusade to preserve a government "whose leading object is," said Lincoln, "to elevate the condition of men—to lift artificial weights from all shoulders—to clear the paths of laudable pursuit for all—to afford all an unfettered start, and a fair chance, in the race of life." So now he gave voice to the old American promise of freedom and equality and human betterment—the goal of Jefferson, the Transcendentalists, and of the waves of immigrants who came to the North. Once articulated, the theme would not die. It sustained the Union through long, dark days and it touched the hearts of oppressed thousands in England and Europe. Freedom and liberty and man's dignity has lasting compulsion. The southern aim of independence seemed shoddy by comparison.

Public addresses, proclamations and messages to Congress could accomplish just so much. Politician Lincoln had learned back in Illinois that suasion could often be exercised by mail, and so from the White House issued hundreds of letters. Some went to urge friends to sustain a point, others to enemies to soothe a ruffled feeling, some to party leaders to cajole a reluctant vote. In these ventures in personal propaganda, Lincoln showed his great human appeal. To a lady he thought had lost five sons in the war he opened a boundless heart; to a New York Democratic leader who loved the Union but thought Lincoln trampled on the Constitution in order to save it, the President showed himself a hard, logical politician, one whose honesty and realism could not be questioned.

At his best when delineating the deeper meaning of the war, Lincoln relied often on impromptu talks to sharpen his own conception of the cause. The Gettysburg Address was not impromptu, but it gave

Lincoln's final perception of the war as a crucible of freedom. In this, his shortest speech, his eloquence reached the ages. The United States, he recalled, had been "conceived in liberty, and dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal." He chided listeners with the admonition that "the world will little note, nor long remember what we say here, but it can never forget what they did here. It is rather for us to be here dedicated to the great task remaining before us—that from these honored dead we take increased devotion—that we here highly resolve that these dead shall not have died in vain—that this Nation, under God, shall have a new birth of freedom—and that government of the people, by the people, for the people, shall not perish from the earth."

And since the forming of a government, the molding of a cause, is an executive function, it must be concluded that Lincoln ranks as a consummate executive. More than that he ranks as a practical politician, a prescient political theorist. These qualities elevated him above his time, made him one of the people and yet the people's conscience. They made him, too, perhaps the most effective fashioner of public opinion in American history. It was Lincoln, rhetorician, master of public relations, and poet of democracy who conjured the menace of the future for an uncertain North in 1862: "Fellow citizens, we cannot escape history. We * * * will be remembered in spite of ourselves. No personal significance, or insignificance, can spare one or another of us. The fiery trial through which we pass will light us down, in honor or dishonor, to the latest generation. * * * We shall nobly save, or meanly lose, the last best hope of earth."

Fate gave the North a leader whose language would echo down to history with timeless luster, a leader whose vision of freedom and whose conception of the Union transcended the moment to capture the future; it gave the Confederacy a leader whose wisdom none could doubt but whose appeal was muffled in legalistic phrase. It may well be that in selecting voices so aptly tuned to each cause, fate foredoomed one and evoked the other.

ADJOURNMENT OF HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES TO APRIL 30

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 465), that when the House adjourns on Thursday, April 19, 1962, it stand adjourned until 12 o'clock meridian, Monday, April 30, 1962.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, it is my understanding that this measure has been cleared with the minority, and that the Senate should now be prepared to act.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the concurrent resolution.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

PROPOSED INVESTIGATION OF ADMINISTRATION OF ACREAGE ALLOTMENT AND GRAIN STORAGE PROGRAMS

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, on Tuesday, April 17, 1962, I submitted a resolution, the purpose of which was to have made a full and complete study and investigation relating to the administration by the Department of Agriculture and any of its agencies of (1) acreage allotment programs for

cotton and other agricultural commodities and (2) storage programs for grains and other agricultural commodities, with a view to determining in the case of each such program the manner in which officers and employees of the Department of Agriculture have discharged their duties and obligations in dealing with persons affected by, or receiving benefits under, such programs.

The request for this investigation was particularly pointed at the financial transactions which had taken place between the Department of Agriculture and Mr. Billie Sol Estes, of Texas, and the allegation that numerous high officials in the Department of Agriculture had been the beneficiaries of his benevolences.

Mr. Estes is alleged to have improperly, if not illegally, obtained substantial allotments for cotton acreage, in addition to having a multi-million-dollar grain-storage operation with the Commodity Credit Corporation.

In this connection, I shall ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, three very significant articles, the first of which appeared in the Washington Daily News of April 16, 1962, in which is outlined the manner in which two employees lined up farmers with displaced cotton acreage allotments, in violation of the law. These employees were suspended for 2 weeks, and then were put back on the payroll.

The next two articles, the first of which appeared in the Kansas City Star of April 15, and the second of which appeared in the Chicago Daily Tribune of April 17, call attention to the manner in which attempts are being made to turn the Department of Agriculture into a vast political propaganda bureau, and also calls attention to the manner in which certain high-placed officials were allegedly involved in the manipulations of Mr. Billie Sol Estes.

I ask unanimous consent that these three articles be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

[From the Washington Daily News of Apr. 16, 1962]

TWO AGRICULTURAL AIDS SUSPENDED IN DEALS

The Agriculture Department confirmed today that two of its employees in Oklahoma were suspended and reprimanded last year for accepting commissions in connection with the transfer of cotton acreage allotments.

The two were identified to United Press International as Russell Dill, office manager of the Custer County Agriculture Stabilization and Conservation Service at Clinton, Okla., and Harvey E. White, performance supervisor.

Mr. Dill received a total of \$4,108.75 and Mr. White, \$3,665.

Informants said that Fred Chandler, Sr., Fort Stockton, Tex., paid each of the officials \$1,765 for lining up farmers with displaced cotton acreage allotments. The sale of such allotments is prohibited by law.

An Agriculture Department spokesman said the two employees were suspended 2 weeks without pay. They were put back on the payroll after they returned the commissions.

[From the Kansas City Star, Apr. 15, 1962]
A POLITICAL STAR DIMS—EMERY E. JACOBS HAS RANGED THE CAPITOL HILL PATHS FOR THE AGRICULTURE DEPARTMENT BUT A REPORT FROM TEXAS CHANGES THINGS—LINK TO ESTES—THE EMBATTLED TYCOON HAS BEEN HOST AT TWO DEMOCRATIC PARTIES

(By Jack Williams)

WASHINGTON, April 14.—Agriculture, with more than 100,000 on its payroll and spending upward of \$6 billion a year, carries the biggest troupe of trained politicians of any Federal department.

One of its stars has been Emery E. Jacobs, 55, Vice President of the Commodity Credit Corporation and Deputy Administrator for State and County Operations of the Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service.

"WILL REFUTE THEM"

Jacobs, 245-pound redhaired Oklahoman, has resigned in the midst of charges he was accepting gifts, such as \$245 suits from Billie Sol Estes, 37-year-old Texas agriculture tycoon.

Jacobs says he resigned so that he could go to Texas and refute the charges. He has announced no time for his departure for the Lone Star State.

Jacobs is a big, friendly man. His friends call him "Red." He has had the range of the political front here from the White House rose garden to table reservations at the \$100-a-plate Democratic dinners of the New Frontiersmen.

Washington, ever alert for a fresh scandal, is wondering just how much the Agriculture Department is involved in the affairs of the fabulous Billie Sol Estes of Pecos, Tex. The FBI is investigating. A Federal grand jury has indicted Estes on 57 allegations of fraud.

The quietest places in the Capital today were the massive Agriculture Department Buildings near the Potomac. Questions were not being answered.

FBI IS BUSY

After Secretary Freeman accepted the resignation of Jacobs, it was reported at the Department the FBI was investigating charges that Department employees had accepted gifts from Estes.

Two other employees are understood to be under investigation after their names came up in questioning at an inquiry into the affairs of Estes by Will Wilson, attorney general of Texas.

They are Dr. James T. Ralph, former Assistant Secretary of Agriculture now in training to become Agricultural Attaché for the Department in the Philippines, and William E. Morris of the Farm Credit Administration. They have not offered resignations or been suspended pending the investigation.

Jacobs, whose salary in the ASCS was \$16,530 a year, is reported to have acted as master of ceremonies at the State ASCS "convention" here about 10 days ago.

There are three ASCS members from each State and all were said to have attended the session here. Critics charged the meeting cost the taxpayers \$75,000 and was to put pressure on Congress to bring out the Kennedy farm bill now bogged down.

Jacobs is said to have escorted the group to the White House rose garden for a chat with the President and to lend prestige to their presence here as the farm bill was tied up in the House committee. The politically appointed top State ASCS men then called on Members of Congress from their States.

It was revelation of the amazing financial operations of Estes that brought the Agriculture Department and Jacobs into the picture. Secretary Freeman had named Estes to the Cotton Advisory Committee.

Estes bought two tables for President Kennedy's birthday dinner here May 27, 1961. The 20 seats cost \$2,000. One of Estes' guests

was Senator RALPH YARBOROUGH, Democrat, of Texas.

Morris, whose name is involved in the testimony at the Texas inquiry, also was listed as a guest at the Estes table.

Again, January 20, at the big inaugural anniversary dinner here, Estes and his wife were hosts at two tables. YARBOROUGH was present again. Estes is reported to have been a contributor to Democratic campaigns in Texas and the \$100-a-plate expenditures could be counted toward the State campaign contribution total to the national committee.

Jacobs turned in his resignation 24 hours after the Texas court of inquiry heard testimony he was with Estes when Jacobs went shopping for \$245 suits at the Neiman-Marcus store in Dallas.

The investigation also is going into the allotment of cotton acreage to Estes for acreage which had been transferred from and which had been taken over for reservoirs and airfields.

[From the Chicago Daily Tribune, Apr. 17, 1962]

FIRE AGRICULTURE AID IN PROBE OF ESTES LAND DEALS—INVESTIGATE LINKS WITH TEXAS TYCOON

(By Russell Freeburg)

WASHINGTON, April 16.—The Department of Agriculture today fired an employee linked with Billie Sol Estes, Texas farm magnate. The dismissal came just 3 days after a Department official resigned in the face of a probe of his dealings with Estes.

Estes, his cotton and fertilizer empire gone, is under indictment for fraud. His tangled financial dealings are being investigated by a grand jury in Texas.

The case broke wide open late last week when Emery Jacobs, the \$16,530 a year deputy administrator of the Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service, quit following testimony that he had received gifts from Estes.

DISMISS CREDIT OFFICIAL

William A. Morris, 46, \$14,380 assistant to the director for Farm Credit, was fired today. Thomas R. Hughes, executive assistant to Secretary of Agriculture Orville Freeman, said Morris was dismissed for failure to discuss the case with Department investigators.

Meanwhile, two Republican Congressmen introduced resolutions in the House calling for probes of the ASC. An investigation was considered by the House Agriculture Committee, but Representative HAROLD COOLEY, Democrat, of North Carolina, committee chairman, said tonight that his group will not act at this time.

Introducing the resolutions were Representative ROBERT DOLE, Republican, of Kansas, and Representative FLORENCE DWYER, Republican, of New Jersey. DOLE said the Jacobs incident was the latest in a series which has embroiled the ASC in political controversy during the Kennedy administration.

SELLS MINE STOCK

Morris is a former administrative assistant to Representative H. CARL ANDERSEN, Republican, of Minnesota, who also has been linked to Estes in Texas testimony. ANDERSEN said today his dealings with Estes were strictly business. He said he, along with Morris, was an overnight guest in Estes' home during a trip concerned with the sale of stock in a family coal mine. Estes, ANDERSEN said, invested some money in the mine.

The case of the allotments on 3,123 acres of Texas cotton land was reported by Agriculture Department officials to have involved more than 100 farmers in Georgia, Alabama, Oklahoma, and Texas. They made contracts to transfer their allotments to lands they were buying from Estes in Texas.

Estes would receive Government price supports for the cotton grown on the acreage.

Agriculture spokesmen said the 3,123 acres would yield at least two bales each. With Government price supports at about \$175 a bale, the total would be more than \$1 million.

The contracts provided that Estes lease back the land from the farmers for as high as \$50 an acre in some cases. Lease payments, however, were small compared with the money from price supports. Besides, the lands would revert to Estes if the farmers missed purchase payments.

EDITORIALS ON MASS TRANSPORTATION

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, a number of New Jersey newspapers have commented on the President's recent transportation message, especially on his recommendations for legislation on urban transportation.

Several editorials have pointed to the apparent paradox between the President's recommendations for less regulation and subsidization of intercity transportation and his proposal for a \$500 million, 3-year capital grant program to improve urban mass transportation.

I think it important to recognize that the problems of intercity transportation and urban transportation are entirely different.

In almost every metropolitan and urban area, large and small, private bus, rail, and transit carriers are caught in a squeeze of increasing capital and operating costs and a corresponding decline in revenue, through loss of offpeak and weekend riders.

The result has been round after round of fare increases, deferred maintenance, and discontinuance and retrenchment of service—which only serve to accelerate the downward spiral.

Thus, while transit continues to serve an essential rush hour and standby need for those unable to use automobiles, and while the urban areas need increased levels of rush hour transit service, in order to help cope with the growing problems of traffic congestion, the private carriers are finding it increasingly difficult, if not impossible, to provide it.

The only solution is the injection of public funds, in order to help bridge the gap between the financial abilities of the private carriers and the increasing needs of the urban areas. And as President Kennedy's message recognizes, the Federal Government has an inescapable responsibility to bear some measure of the financial burden, together with State and local governments and private enterprise.

While some may question Federal aid in this area, I would say that without it, the demise of private enterprise in urban transportation will become all but inevitable.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD several thoughtful editorials that discuss the President's recommendations.

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

[From the Newark (N.J.) Sunday Star-Ledger, Apr. 8, 1962]

SIGNIFICANT STEP

One of the more striking documents of the New Frontier is President Kennedy's just-issued message on transportation.

It contains so many criticisms of Federal regulation and governmental control that it might easily be mistaken for a discarded Republican campaign proposal.

The President lists two objectives of major concern to Jerseyans:

A national transportation system to provide the most efficient and inexpensive connections between the 40 supercities that are growing up in the United States.

Vast improvements in mass transportation within the big cities.

To achieve the first objective, the President urges sweeping removals of governmental controls that have been accumulating over the past 75 years. And he wants fewer Government subsidies. He recommends an emphasis on free competition to improve services and reduce costs.

When he gets to the big cities, the President finds governmental activity less objectionable. He proposes a half-billion dollar public program to improve urban transportation. But even here, he sets limits on the types of uses to which public funds would be put.

His program, if adopted, would commit the Nation to reliance on private enterprise to meet our transportation needs. In an era of bigger and bigger Government, that would be a significant commitment.

The question now is whether the proposals will be acted upon. The need for transportation reforms has been pointed out many times before. Hopefully, the President's word will carry enough weight to stir some action in Washington.

[From the Asbury Park (N.J.) Evening Press, Apr. 7, 1962]

KENNEDY'S TRANSIT PROGRAM

The best feature of President Kennedy's transportation program is the fact that he has recognized the problem and tackled it. Obviously there will be considerable debate over the merits of the specific recommendations the President has made to Congress, but his proposal will serve to center attention on the gravity of the transportation crisis and speed efforts toward solving it.

There is a paradox in Mr. Kennedy's suggestion that there be less Federal subsidization of transportation and his recommendation for massive Federal aid. But the Chief Executive draws a distinction between long haul transportation by railroads, airlines, trucks, and buses and the development of mass transportation in and around cities. He feels that intercity routes should be relieved of strangling regulations and subjected to greater competition that would improve service and produce innovations aimed at more efficient transportation. While curtailing subsidization of long-haul routes he would increase aid in urban centers.

Concern in this area lies chiefly with the President's program for developing adequate mass transportation in metropolitan areas. This newspaper has long contended that too much emphasis has been placed upon promoting automobile travel in the urban regions while mass transit has been allowed to disintegrate to the point of collapse. Thirty years ago this trend promised to provide adequate urban transportation but its failure is now obvious. Crowded highways are carrying more cars into the cities than their streets and parking areas can accommodate. Most metropolitan areas, indeed, are being strangled by a glut of automobile and truck traffic. Meanwhile the railroads, recognized as the most efficient means of carrying hundreds of thousands in and out of the cities, have deteriorated to the point where they are not equal to the job.

Mr. Kennedy would rectify this by providing \$500 million over 3 years to State and local governments for development of improved mass transportation. Emergency aid would also be supplied to existing facilities faced with collapse and a \$10 million fund

would be devoted to research looking toward improved techniques. Much of this program would be focused on New Jersey, where the inadequacy of mass transit to the New York and Philadelphia metropolitan regions threatens tragic economic and social dislocations.

The President's program is the result of considerable study and it obviously contains many meritorious proposals. It is equally obvious that further study as it is being considered by Congress will produce objections and recommendations for drastic alterations. But that does not detract from the great service Mr. Kennedy has performed in emphasizing the gravity of the problem and starting the wheels in motion toward a solution. At last there is hope that this country's mass transportation system will be rescued from a collapse that threatens to disrupt our entire economy.

[From the Elizabeth (N.J.) Daily Journal, Apr. 6, 1962]

KENNEDY'S MASTER TRANSIT PROPOSAL

Traffic-strangled cities, which certainly include the New Jersey-New York metropolitan area, are slightly nearer to positive Federal attention to their difficulties, but even the form and substance of assistance still are remote.

The 10th message to the Congress from President Kennedy has committed the administration to sympathetic measures and the Senate has legislation sponsored by New Jersey's Senators CASE and WILLIAMS supplementing the White House proposal, although offered in independent gestures.

The President presented a summary of obvious needs and advocated a \$500 million appropriation. Senator CASE almost simultaneously pressed his bill to advance coordination of mass transportation and highway systems. An earlier measure in which Senator WILLIAMS participated also contemplates Federal assistance and would make funds available.

The Presidential program looks to continued use of privately owned and operated facilities, to the overhaul of the complex and disputatious rates and variances now permitted, and particularly to measures to reverse the trend of mass movement of people from rapid transit to automobiles.

These are the necessities of the situation. The first step toward effectuating them will provoke controversy and progress will be born in strife. Within the transport industry bickering over advantages in the current rate structure is constant and bitter. The railroads, the truckers, the water carriers, the airlines fight among themselves and denounce the publicly built highway and the private vehicle.

Mr. Kennedy is to be commended for his daring. He was cognizant of the condition—everybody on Capitol Hill knows it—when elected to the White House. This message was promised long ago, but was delayed, presumably for study of what it should contain. Now it has been delivered and it is good. Activation will be more difficult than design.

As for the more specific proposals of the New Jersey Senators: They can be contributory, they may be molded into starting points for the whole program.

That would be appropriate for certainly no region stands in greater need in transit and transport—especially transit—than the section of the Garden State in which they live. The urgency of the situation will tolerate no useless delays.

[From the Plainfield (N.J.) Courier-News, Apr. 7, 1962]

TRANSPORTATION

Both of New Jersey's Senators are in the thick of the action in Washington this week called for by President Kennedy in his trans-

portation message to Congress. It is appropriate that New Jersey should take the lead in this discussion.

The President asked for a program that would emphasize more competition, and less regulation of fares and rates on railroads, airlines, trucks, and barges. At the same time, the President recommended massive Federal aid for developing mass transportation systems in and around cities.

Senator HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, Democrat, of Westfield, sponsored the transportation legislation introduced immediately following the President's message. Senator CLIFFORD P. CASE, Republican, from Rahway, introduced a bill to promote coordination of mass transit and highway systems in urban areas, but using a different technique and giving the Federal Housing Administrator a much greater part in the program.

We encourage the leadership of New Jersey Senators and Congressmen in the search for a solution to the transportation problem.

The solution sought for should stimulate free, competitive enterprise and steer away from the course of prolonged Federal subsidy or Government ownership.

TRENDS AND OUTLOOK IN URBAN TRANSPORTATION

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, I would like to call the attention of the Members of the Senate to an informative and valuable speech on the subject of urban transportation, delivered earlier this year by Mr. Delmer Ison, executive director of the Washington Metropolitan Transit Commission.

Mr. Ison has very clearly outlined in his speech the causes and the nature of the problems facing mass transportation in meeting urban transportation needs, particularly with respect to bus service.

He makes the important point that:

While transit has lost approximately half of its customers over the last decade, the demand for service facilities has not diminished. In order to handle the rush hour traffic, which has either increased or remained constant, the transit operators are required to maintain in service at least as many vehicles as were required 10 years ago to transport twice as many passengers * * *. It is a matter of plain economics that an operator cannot be expected to maintain a large fleet of modern buses to operate only 2 to 4 hours daily.

Yet Mr. Ison goes on to point out what is becoming increasingly clear to more and more people, that this limited rush-hour service is essential because the costs of trying to meet it exclusively with highways and automobiles are tremendously expensive and tremendously damaging to the structure of the city.

He concludes that governments definitely should assist in financing urban transit, and this is the reason for the administration's bill, S. 3126, to aid in this effort. Mr. Ison goes on to say that the public assistance should not be used to subsidize operating expenses. With this I completely agree, and the legislation I mentioned in fact prohibits such use.

Mr. Ison also goes on to discuss the role of private enterprise in the field of transit, and points out that there need not be any necessary conflict between the use of public funds and private operation of transit services. In fact, I would go so far as to say that if public funds

are not soon provided to fill the gap between the financial abilities of the private carrier and the increasingly pressing mass transportation needs of our urban areas, the demise of private enterprise in this field is all but inevitable.

In his message to Congress, recommending a program of financial assistance to improve mass transportation, President Kennedy stated:

Although grants and loans would be available only to public agencies, those agencies could lease facilities and equipment or make other arrangements for private operation of assisted mass transportation systems. The program is not intended to foster public as distinguished from private mass transit operations. Each community should develop the method or methods of operation best suited to its particular requirements.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that excerpts from Mr. Ison's speech to the Second Annual Institute of Motor Transportation Management last February be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

MR. DELMER ISON'S SPEECH BEFORE THE SECOND ANNUAL INSTITUTE OF MOTOR TRANSPORTATION MANAGEMENT

In commencing my presentation today, the views expressed are my own and do not necessarily reflect the views of my commission, although I am not aware of any disagreement in views.

In order to fully appreciate the present trends in urban transportation, it is necessary to go back as far as World War II. The World War II era, which was a flourishing era revenue-wise for the carriers, now appears to have also been a breeding ground for the present trends in urban transportation. The events and circumstances of those days, insofar as travel was concerned, pointed to public transportation. The rationing of gasoline and rubber precluded any extensive use of the private automobile. The absence of heavy automobile traffic on the streets was a direct benefit for public transit. The fact that people either worked long hours or by shifts of up to three shifts made it possible for the operator to get almost maximum use out of its entire fleet during the entire day and even at night. There were no real rush hour periods in the present day sense. The results culminated into a heyday for the transit operator and for the only time in history transit operators enjoyed a substantial monopoly on urban transportation. Even though fares were very low, urban transportation enjoyed its greatest financial success. In fact, many of the regulatory bodies viewed the profits as being unreasonably high.

Ironically, despite the high earnings during the war, the carriers were literally unable to plow these earnings back into service facilities. The production demands of the military simply did not allow fulfillment of the need for rolling stock of transit operators. Although urban transportation was amazingly efficient, under all the circumstances during the war, yet because of the inability of the carriers to replace revenue equipment they were unable to give the standard of service demanded by the American public.

The war had no more than ended until the very events and circumstances which brought about the financial success for urban transit began to unravel. The wartime restrictions disappeared. Times continued to be good and in addition to two chickens in every pot there were two cars in many garages. The American public became

very independent. Means of transportation became a status in life. Industry not only went back to one shift but the working day was shortened considerably.

Television, primarily because of its newness, kept people at home at night, away from the movies. The events which had been knitted together by circumstances to cause a tremendous boon in urban transit during the war years had suddenly unraveled as if by a sudden jerk of a string.

The decline in riding staggered the imagination of everyone. While revenues declined, operating expenses increased. Despite the noble efforts of the carriers to replace wornout equipment following the war, looking back now it appears that they were thwarted at every turn. With expenses on the rise and revenues going down, it became necessary to seek fare relief.

Generally, the regulatory bodies were in no hurry to grant relief. Many felt that the downward trend in riding would reverse itself.

Others were smarting under the feeling that the transit operators had received excessive profits during the war years and they were in no hurry to act.

Never before in the history of regulation did the term "regulatory lag" take on so much added significance. Generally, the regulatory bodies had the right to suspend the proposed fares for a period of 5 to 7 months and generally the entire period was allowed to run before any new fares became effective. In many instances, additional relief was needed before the original relief sought was granted.

This situation was not conducive to the type of cooperation needed between the regulatory bodies and the carriers.

The result was that confidence in urban transit received a shocking blow. Even the most optimistic transit operator was discouraged.

Higher fares became another deterrent to transit riding.

Public ownership appeared to many to be the answer. A trend got underway in that direction. Public transit authorities started appearing on the scene. Urban transportation in most of our large cities is being performed more and more by transit authorities. The governments not only built the transit systems but are actually operating them. Local governments in a number of other cities have taken over private transit systems.

How has urban transit fared under public ownership? Reasonable men have honest differences of opinion on this question. Certainly, a public authority can perform safe and adequate urban transportation, given the money to do it with. Whether or not a public authority can perform transportation economically is another question. For instance, the annual governmental subsidy of the New York transit authority exceeds \$100 million.

A frank discussion of the views in support of either side of these questions necessarily involves disagreement with the views in support of the other side. My personal view is that private enterprise should be permitted to operate urban transit, under regulatory control, as long as it can prove itself capable of performing the type of service needed in the particular community. The first important step needed to enable free enterprise to continue operating transit is the removal of the tax burden. Generally, transit authorities are exempt from taxes. In 1960, State and local taxes of the Nation's 1,200 plus private transit operators amounted to approximately 35 percent of their net revenues. But public ownership does not in fact remove the burden of taxation. It merely shifts it.

I do not suggest that governments should not assist in financing urban transit. They definitely should.

What it comes to is that whether operation is private or public, mass transportation in our big cities is the business of the entire community. Mass transportation facilities are part of the transportation of the area just as streets and highways are. There is nothing illogical or even arguable about the proposition that just as streets and expressways are publicly owned and the users then have to provide the vehicles and pay the fuel and repair bills, so in the same way, the capital cost of mass transportation should be a matter for the community and the fares should then cover all the operating costs, including the costs of the operating equipment. On that basis, and it is the only sensible basis, mass transportation cannot only compete with the private automobile, but for the daily mass rush hour movement of people can work wonders for our cities.

As far as outright public financial support, I would draw the line at capital investments. When you place the Government in a position of performing nongovernmental, day-by-day operating functions, is when you lose control over the economics of the operation. I have heard it put this way: The Government cannot put out on bids the various operating expenses of a transit operation as it can projects involving capital outlays. Let's face it, when the profitmaking incentives and initiatives are destroyed, inefficiencies are considerably more difficult to control.

What are the major causes of our urban transportation problems? I could go back and discuss the blunders committed by the cities in planning for future transit needs, but what good would it do? The problems are here. They are real. They can be solved.

In my opinion, there is only one real problem—it is one absolute and inescapable certainty of the modern great city in respect to movement of people. And that is the morning and evening rush hours. This, of course, is due to another inescapable fact—that the modern city is wholly organized on the basis of everyone going to work and returning home at approximately the same hours of every working day. It is also obvious that this rush hour situation has intensified greatly since World War II. As hours of work have shortened, the rush hour periods have become more acute.

Speaking of the rush hour problem, I would like to quote Robert L. Sommerville, president, Atlanta Transit System, during a discussion of the transit problems in Atlanta:

"The metropolitan area of Atlanta has just topped the million mark and is growing fast. Of that metropolitan area my company serves a population of 626,000 with 550 transit vehicles, just over 300 trackless trolleys and the balance diesel buses, all the buses being less than 7 years old. We have 1,100 employees, carry upward of 50 million revenue passengers a year and travel 16 million miles a year to do it. Of all the people who come into central Atlanta every working day, we carry half. And here is one significant thing. We have lost passengers like every other transit system. We carry only half of the total who traveled by transit a decade ago and yet we actually carry about the same number of people in the rush hour that were carried in the rush hour 10 years ago. Again mark that rush hour. It is not so much the key to the future as the immovable fact to which cities have to adjust.

"Now although we have lost passengers, as I say, we have faced the facts of the changing city and put on 54 new or extended lines in the last 6 years. Our route miles have gone up from 453 in the middle of 1954 to 696 at the end of 1960. Practically all this new service is rush hour work. That is when the people want to go so that is when we have to take them."

The experience of the Atlanta Transit System keynotes the problem being experienced by the transit industry generally stemming directly from the rush hour travel. While transit has lost approximately half of its customers over the last decade, the demand for service facilities has not diminished. In order to handle the rush hour traffic, which has either increased or remained constant, the transit operators are required to maintain in service at least as many vehicles as were required 10 years ago to transport twice as many passengers, even though many of these vehicles are used in service only anywhere from 2 to 4 hours a day. It is a matter of plain economics that an operator cannot be expected to maintain a large fleet of modern buses to operate only 2 to 4 hours daily. Consequently, many of the buses used in rush hour service are old and outmoded, resulting in many passengers getting a poor impression of transit service in general. Addressing myself for a moment to the situation here in Washington, on the average it requires three buses to perform rush hour service as compared to one bus to perform the base hour service. Consequently, for about 20 hours a day, a large fleet of buses is sitting idle on the lots of the transit operators. Base service requires only one-fourth of the bus fleet of the suburban operators. If the operators in the Washington area were required to maintain a completely modern fleet of buses to perform the rush hour service, unquestionably the fares would have to be considerably higher than they are at the present time. A new modern air-conditioned bus costs something in the neighborhood of \$33,000, and based on an annual amortization charge of approximately \$2,500 per bus, a fleet of 100 such buses would require an annual amortization expenditure of \$250,000 to be paid by the traveling public. Thus, it behooves everyone, in a position to act, to resort to every means in order to alleviate the rush hour traffic problems.

Again addressing myself to the Washington area, the Bureau of the Budget has done what I consider an excellent job in the staggering of working hours for Federal employees. The starting hours of Federal Government agencies are spread over 2 hours in the morning and dismissal times over 2 hours in the afternoon. While the policy of staggered hours is probably further advanced in Washington than in most other American cities, there are still marked peaks of transit riding in the morning and in the evening. The Bureau of the Budget, in cooperation with several other agencies, is taking a new look at the situation to see if further improvement can be made. The improvement lies not in spreading starting and quitting times beyond the 2-hour range presently in effect, but in achieving a more uniform distribution in the numbers of Federal employees reporting and quitting at the various times within that period. The spreading of peak transit riding more evenly over 2 full hours in the morning and evening could lessen the present disparity between rush hour and base day equipment requirements and as a result reduce the cost of transit operations to the transit operators in the Washington Metropolitan District.

In looking to the future, I would like to address myself to what is being done in the National Capital region, which, I think, may very well serve as a national guide for urban transportation in general. As our cities have expanded and overflowed across political boundaries, in many instances many States have become involved in a common urban transportation problem. This problem prompted the President of the United States to comment in the following language:

"The city and its suburbs are interdependent parts of a single community, bound together by the web of transportation and other public facilities and by common eco-

nomical interests. Bold programs in individual jurisdictions are no longer enough. Increasingly, community development must be a cooperative venture toward the common goals of the metropolitan region as a whole."

Perhaps, no other problem confronting our urban areas is more pressing than the mass transit problem.

It has been suggested that the creation of a special agency with powers to regulate and control all facets of mass transit is the answer to the transportation problems in the metropolitan areas. Given the power to regulate and control all facets of mass transportation without regard to jurisdictional or political lines, such agency can more properly coordinate and regulate all transportation activities. A unique and, I hope, refreshing example of this modern development is the effort now being made in finding a solution to our transit problem in our Nation's Capital.

In order to fully appreciate the background of the diverse difficulties attendant mass transit in the Washington metropolitan area from a regulatory point of view, four distinct regulatory bodies were jurisdictionally involved, namely: the Public Utilities Commission of the District of Columbia, the Virginia State Corporation Commission, the Public Service Commission of Maryland and the Interstate Commerce Commission.

Movement of transit from either Maryland or Virginia into the District or from the District into a neighboring State or from one State into the other State, and movements, intrastate or intradistrict, all required regulation, either separately, concurrently, or successively, by one or more of these four regulatory bodies. That this was costly, cumbersome, time consuming, and indeed aggravating to all concerned, is stating it mildly.

Accordingly, Congress empowered a transportation study of the National Capital region which was participated in by representatives of the District of Columbia, Maryland, Virginia, and the Federal Government. The result of this study was a recommendation that the following three steps should be taken:

First, an interstate compact between Maryland, Virginia, and the District, approved by Congress, to establish an interstate agency to regulate transit on a regionwide basis.

Second, the creation of a Federal agency to complement the efforts of the regulatory agency. The agency should be empowered to acquire rights-of-way and construct express transit facilities (such acquisition and construction in Maryland and Virginia to be subject to approval of those States).

Third, a second interstate compact to be negotiated and adopted, creating a new interstate agency to succeed the Federal agency. This agency should have power to construct and own transit facilities, to operate them or provide for their operation.

Steps 1 and 2 have already been taken—step 1 by means of the interstate compact approved by Congress creating the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Commission, and step 2 by act of Congress in 1960 creating the National Capital Transportation Agency.

First, I shall discuss the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Commission which became effective and assumed jurisdiction on March 22, 1961. The area over which the Commission has jurisdiction consists of the entire District of Columbia, the counties of Prince Georges and Montgomery in Maryland, the counties of Fairfax and Arlington and the cities of Falls Church, Alexandria, and Fairfax in Virginia. These areas make up what is known as the Washington metropolitan area transit district under the jurisdiction of the commission.

Although the creation of the new commission involved the removal of jurisdiction

from the regulatory bodies of Maryland, Virginia, the District of Columbia, and the Interstate Commerce Commission, Congress and the State Legislatures of Maryland and Virginia put aside all provincial and political considerations with the single purpose of improving transit in the Washington metropolitan district. It should be pointed out, however, that under the Constitution of the Commonwealth of Virginia, Virginia was not able to delegate to the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Commission authority over intrastate matters in Virginia.

The commission is composed of three members, one from each of the participating governments. The appointments from Maryland and Virginia are made by the Governors, and by the Board of Commissioners of the District for the District, and, in each instance, under the compact, the appointee must be selected from the regulatory commissions of the respective jurisdictions.

In order that the views of local political subdivisions and planning commissions might be expressed to the commission, there was also created by the compact a Traffic and Highway Board, which is composed of the heads of the traffic and highway departments of each of the States and of the counties and cities encompassed within the metropolitan district. In addition, the various planning commissions within the Washington metropolitan district are also represented on the board. The primary purpose of this advisory board is to make recommendations to the commission with respect to traffic engineering, the selection and use of streets for transit routing and the requirements for transit service throughout the metropolitan district.

What are the advantages of vesting in a single commission the regulatory authority exercised by separate State and Federal commissions? Clearly, the regulatory processes are simplified considerably. The carrier is able to avoid the cumbersome task of seeking relief from a multiple of jurisdictions, which necessitated separate proceedings entailing uncertain and often make-believe allocation of revenues and expenses. The commission is able to grant the relief on an areawide basis and to assure the public of transportation service at nondiscriminatory fares without regard to State boundaries. While these advantages are sufficiently important to warrant the creation of the commission, they are not what I consider to be the most important advantages. Perhaps the primary advantage is the ability of the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Commission to coordinate all mass transportation facilities in the metropolitan area to the end that the maximum use is obtained from all existing facilities. This, in turn, will assure the public the maximum efficiency in service at the lowest possible cost.

Another important advantage enjoyed by the commission, which distinguishes it from the ordinary type of regulatory commission, is the power to order things done as opposed to the mere power to approve things the carriers desire to do. Another important activity of the commission is the coordinating of transit planning with the various local highway and traffic departments to the end that in building highways, adequate transit facilities such as bus stop facilities and bus bays are included in the highway plans. Contrary to the opinions of some, the commission has found the highway and traffic departments, both on the State and local levels, to be very conscious of the need to include in highway planning adequate transit facilities. This commission has been afforded the opportunity to discuss the need for these facilities with the various highway and traffic departments, and we feel encouraged as to what the future holds in this area.

It has been estimated that by 1980 the population of the Washington metropolitan

district will increase from the present 2 million to 3 million people. To provide a rapid transportation system for this increased population, Congress, as I stated earlier, took step 2 in creating the National Capital Transportation Agency. This Agency is a Federal agency headed by a Federal administrator appointed by the President. The basic purpose of the Agency is to prepare a transit development program, which program must be submitted to the President for transmittal to the Congress not later than November 1, 1962. The program must contain recommendations for a rapid transportation system including organization and financial arrangements for transportation in the National Capital region. In preparing its recommendations, the Agency must consult with the governments and other agencies of the National Capital region. The program must be approved by the Congress, and by the Governors of the States of Maryland and Virginia before it can be placed into effect in those States.

The bold program underway in our Nation's Capital to solve our urban transit problems could serve as a national guide. The creation of a single commission (Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Commission) through interstate compact, to coordinate all transportation facilities involving several carriers, is an important breakthrough in urban transit regulation, especially where metropolitan areas have spilled across political boundary lines. The power of such an agency to establish joint fares and through routes largely defeats the argument that a coordinated transportation system cannot be provided on an area-wide basis by several carriers.

The congressional legislation creating the National Capital Transportation Agency providing for the development of a future transit program for our Nation's Capital specifically requires that the program must provide for its operation by private enterprise wherever possible. Thus, the traditional myth that public moneys cannot be used to assist private enterprise in solving our urban transportation problems has been erased. And it would appear that unless mere lipservice is paid the clear intent of Congress in making money available for transit improvements, that the trend toward publicly operated transit will be reversed.

In concluding my remarks, I would like to summarize briefly the trends and outlook in urban passenger transportation, the subject of my discussion. First, true to the basic traditions upon which this country has been able to prove its greatness, urban transportation was performed by free enterprise.

Following World War II, a series of events and circumstances collaborated in a strange way to deal the free enterprise era in urban transportation a severe blow. Many of these events and circumstances can be attributed directly to either action or inaction of governmental authorities. Taxes, many of which were imposed during the war, were allowed to continue without proper justification in light of all the circumstances. Public authority indifference to financial needs of urban transit operators seriously weakened the confidence of private investors and the ability of private industry to render a high standard of service. In the absence of a fair chance to survive, public authorities commenced taking over. While some governmental authorities were willing to relieve the tax burden somewhat, hardly any were willing to make an outright financial donation to private industry. The feeling was that publicly financed projects had to be owned and operated lock, stock and barrel by governmental authorities. The result was that a trend set in, calling for both public ownership and publicly operated urban transit. This is where we are today.

COMMUNIST MILITARY AID TO CUBA

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, the State Department has been the subject of criticism by persons both within and without this Government. I wish to call attention to an incident that happened to me personally. On February 6, following a statement circulated in a newspaper, I sent a letter to the distinguished Secretary of State requesting that the State Department make available to the American public the information with reference to the arms buildup in Cuba and the possibility of Soviet jet bombers and ballistic missile bases being made available to them. I also asked the distinguished Secretary to establish a policy for the State Department to keep the American public continually advised and informed as to this situation.

On March 2 I received a call from a Mr. Barrett, of the State Department, advising me that within a matter of 2 weeks I would have the information and answer to my request.

On March 7 a release was circulated among Members of Congress from the Department of State with reference to many of their activities, a portion of which was devoted to congressional correspondence, in which they stated that there was a stepped-up drive to insure replies of a prompt, responsive, and accurate nature.

As of that date I still had no reply to my letter of February 6.

On March 27 the Department of State issued to the press an extensive release with reference to the military arms buildup in Cuba.

On April 13 I finally received a letter from the State Department in answer to my original inquiry of February 6. Attached to it was a copy of the Department's press release of March 27.

My purpose in bringing this matter to the attention of this body this morning is to prevent this from happening to others of my colleagues, and in the hope that the State Department will adopt in fact a policy of keeping the American public informed.

In closing this statement, it is my hope that the information contained in the March 27 release is a complete and full statement of the situation as it exists.

I ask unanimous consent that a copy of my letter to the Secretary of State and the letter I received, together with the Department's release, be printed in the RECORD.

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

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, D.C., April 13, 1962.
The Honorable MAURICE J. MURPHY, JR.,
U.S. Senate.

DEAR SENATOR MURPHY: I refer to your letter of February 6, 1962, about the arms buildup in Cuba and to your telephone conversation with Mr. Barrett of the Department's Office of Cuban Affairs.

Communist military aid has turned the Cuban military establishment into one of the most formidable in Latin America. We are informed by the appropriate Government agencies, however, that there is no evidence the Soviet Union has supplied Cuba with missiles or that missile bases are

under construction in Cuba, and no Soviet bombers are known to have been delivered to Cuba.

An armed attack by Cuba against the United States or a Latin American nation would bring into operation the provisions of the Rio Treaty of Reciprocal Assistance. Further, the U.S. military machine has the capacity to meet any such aggression.

I am pleased to provide the enclosed copy of the recent Department press release on the subject of Sino-Soviet bloc military aid to Cuba.

If I can be of further assistance, please do not hesitate to call on me.

Sincerely yours,

FREDERICK G. DUTTON,
Assistant Secretary.

SINO-SOVIET BLOC MILITARY AID TO CUBA

The following summary on Sino-Soviet bloc military aid to Cuba is issued in response to numerous requests for up-to-date information on this subject.

For about a year and a half the Sino-Soviet bloc has supplied Cuba with large-scale military assistance. Bloc military deliveries—primarily from the U.S.S.R. and Czechoslovakia—have included a wide assortment of land armaments ranging from small arms through heavy tanks. Bloc aircraft supplied to Cuba include MIG jet fighters, helicopters, transports, and trainers. Extensive military training has been provided both in the bloc and in Cuba. Communist military aid has turned the Cuban military establishment into one of the most formidable in Latin America, and it has introduced a military capability hitherto not present in any of the Latin American countries of the Caribbean area. However, there is no evidence that the Soviet Union has supplied Cuba with missiles, or that missile bases are under construction in Cuba.

The Soviet Union at first moved cautiously in responding to Cuban requests for military assistance. Once underway, however, the Cuban buildup proceeded swiftly. Bloc support has aided the Castro regime in consolidating its control over the Cuban people. For the past several months the bloc's military aid program in Cuba has been concerned primarily with training, assimilating new equipment, and remodeling the Cuban military establishment along bloc organizational lines.

BACKGROUND

Preliminary attempts to procure Soviet bloc arms were initiated by the Cuban Government as early as 1959, but no firm military aid pacts were concluded until the summer of 1960. During 1959 and early 1960, Cuban purchasing missions traveled frequently to the bloc to investigate new sources of supply. Discussions reportedly covered a whole range of equipment from small arms to modern jet aircraft. Mikoyan's visit to Cuba in February 1960 signaled the beginning of a massive bloc trade and aid program which gained momentum throughout 1960 as United States-Cuban relations deteriorated.

Military negotiations with the U.S.S.R. and Czechoslovakia in 1960 were followed up by a well-publicized trip to Prague and Moscow by Raul Castro, which probably was the occasion for the conclusion of secret arms deals. By August, Czech small arms were being issued by some Cuban militia units, and in the autumn the first major shipments of Communist arms began arriving in Cuba.

SCOPE OF BLOC MILITARY AID

From the autumn of 1960 until the late summer of 1961, bloc arms deliveries were made regularly to Cuban ports. No financial information on the bloc's arms deals with Cuba has been disclosed, but it is estimated that on the order of \$100 million worth of equipment and technical services has been provided. Moreover, several hundred Cuban military personnel have received training, including pilot training, in the bloc.

On January 5, 1962, during a military parade celebrating the third anniversary of takeover by the present regime, Cuba unveiled an array of military hardware indicative of deliveries up to that time. Units equipped with medium and heavy tanks, assault guns, truck-mounted rocket launchers, artillery, antiaircraft weapons, and mortars, as well as rifles and machineguns, were featured prominently. A fly-by of MIG jet fighters, including some high-performance MIG-19's, was one of the highlights of the air display.

In the latter part of 1961 the focus of the bloc's military aid to Cuba was on assimilation of new equipment, intensive training, and completion of the reorganization of Cuba's military establishment. Recently, however, military shipments to Cuba have resumed and for the first time have included small naval vessels.

The capabilities of the Cuban ground forces have increased steadily since the introduction of bloc equipment and training in the autumn of 1960. The ground forces are estimated to number some 300,000. All units are equipped with bloc small arms and many have heavier equipment as well. Bloc aid is strongly reflected in Cuba's ground forces organization which resembles that of the East European satellites. Soviet bloc arms aid has given the Cuban ground forces an armored, artillery, antiaircraft, and anti-tank capability largely lacking in the past and unknown to other Latin American countries of the Caribbean area. Thousands of modern bloc small arms have been delivered. Soviet bloc instructors have been used extensively for training purposes and they serve as full-time advisers to some individual units.

Following the takeover by the present regime, the capabilities of the Cuban air force declined sharply as a result of purges and defections of key personnel. One of the major goals of the new regime, however, was to acquire combat jet aircraft, and most of the Cuban military trainees who went to the bloc in the summer of 1960 were air cadets. Their training has been one of the most important tasks of the bloc's military air program. Cuban pilots have now returned to Cuba where they are continuing instruction on MIG jet fighters which arrived last summer. The bloc has also supplied helicopters, piston-engine trainers, and small, single engine transports. About a dozen IL-14 twin-engine transports were delivered this autumn for the Cuban civil airline. No Soviet bombers are known to have been delivered to Cuba.

During the first year and a half of the bloc's military aid program, the Cuban navy did not receive any significant assistance. Since the first of the year, however, a number of Soviet patrol vessels and motor torpedo boats have been supplied.

BLOC ARMS AND MILITARY EQUIPMENT SUPPLIED TO CUBA

Type of equipment:	Estimated quantity
MIG jet fighters.....	50-75
Medium and heavy tanks.....	150-250
Assault guns.....	50-100
Field artillery.....	500-1,000
Antiaircraft artillery.....	500-1,000
Mortars.....	500
Small arms.....	200,000
Patrol vessels.....	Some
Motor torpedo boats.....	Some

FEBRUARY 6, 1962.

The Honorable DEAN RUSK,
Secretary of State,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I understand that certain information relative to the arms buildup in Cuba has recently been declassified by the State and Defense Departments. This information indicates that Castro has

built up the "most formidable military establishment" ever seen in Latin America.

It is also my understanding that Castro is now in the process of establishing ballistic missile bases and may soon have late model Soviet-built jet bombers. This type of weapon is not needed by the Castro regime to continue its stranglehold on the Cuban people. To me this would indicate that Castro could engage in aggressive warfare, either against this Nation or others in this hemisphere.

I urgently request that the American people be given full and complete information relative to the military buildup in Cuba. I also urge that a policy be established immediately within the State and Defense Departments making new information on this situation public as soon as it becomes available.

Since the Communist world obviously knows what is going on in Cuba, it would seem to me to be an unreasonable and meaningless procedure to keep this information from the American people.

With best wishes,

Sincerely yours,

MAURICE J. MURPHY, JR.

MARCH 7, 1962.

DEAR SENATOR: I want you to know of several new services which are being undertaken in the State Department's Congressional Relations office and which I hope you may find useful.

1. Newsletter possibilities: A twice-monthly compilation of short items on a variety of foreign policy developments will be available for those Members of Congress who prepare newsletters to send to their constituents. These reports will be objective and nonpartisan, and will not duplicate regular news sources. If you would like to receive these materials, please have your office call Miss Meredith Burch in my office (code 182, ext. 5395).

2. Briefings for special visitors: Special foreign policy briefings will be initiated this month for visitors in Washington on request of individual Congressmen. These briefings will be held each Monday, Wednesday, and Friday, at 9:30 a.m. They will follow the small early morning tours for congressional guests at the White House, and are being provided for the same general group of visitors. Large groups cannot be handled because of the limited facilities available here. If you want special guests included in these sessions from time to time, please have your office call and give their names to Meredith Burch at least 24 hours in advance (code 182, ext. 2663).

3. Radio and television taping: Arrangements are being made for some of the principal State Department officials to be available from time to time for brief television or radio interviews with individual Members of Congress. These sessions will be scheduled so as to complete a maximum number of interviews within a time period making effective use of Department officials. Because of the large number of Congressmen who might avail themselves of this service, we will appreciate your making only limited use of it. If you are interested in scheduling Department officials for radio or TV taping in the House or Senate studios, please have your office call Mrs. Mary Russell (code 182, ext. 3277).

When you are on a regular television or radio public affairs programs such as "Meet the Press" or one of the others, we will be glad to try to provide up-to-date background materials on current foreign policy matters for you. For this, your office should call Meredith Burch (Code 182, Ext. 5395).

4. Notice of State Department officers in your area: Officials of the Department accept speaking engagements from time to time in various parts of the country, and we are undertaking to inform the relevant Mem-

bers of Congress when that occurs. Your office may then want to consider contacting the particular official as to the possibility of other nonpolitical use of his time to provide public information on foreign policy problems if his travel schedule will permit that.

Congressional correspondence is now the object of a stepped-up drive to assure that the Department's replies are prompt, responsive and accurate. If you have criticism of such correspondence, please let me know or have your office contact the new reviewing officer for congressional correspondence, Miss Jean Gildea (Code 182, Ext. 6654).

Telephone inquiries from congressional offices concerning matters that cannot await a letter are now being specially handled by Mrs. Edith Waskewich (Code 182, Ext. 4747).

The steps listed above are being taken to encourage better service for Members of Congress and to facilitate better public understanding of U.S. foreign policy objectives. None will require additional personnel. If ever you have suggestions on how we can be of greater assistance to you, I hope you will be sure to let me know.

Sincerely,

FREDERICK G. DUTTON.

LABOR AND THE ANTITRUST LAWS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, this year college debate teams throughout the Nation are considering the question, "Should labor organizations be under the jurisdiction of antitrust legislation?"

There recently came to my attention an excellent statement on this topic by A. J. Hayes, president of the International Association of Machinists of the AFL-CIO.

This will be of interest not only to debate teams, but to all who are interested in the question of labor unions and the role they play in a free and dynamic society. I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Hayes' article be inserted at this point in the RECORD.

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

LABOR AND ANTITRUST LAWS

(By A. J. Hayes)

(This year most debate teams are arguing a question that concerns, not only union members, but the welfare and prosperity of our entire Nation. Essentially, the argument is whether labor unions should be encouraged under the law as a kind of organization that is necessary to the American system—or whether they should be outlawed as "restraints of trade." Recently, I was invited by the Midwest Debate Bureau of Normal, Ill., to answer three questions that students are asking on this subject. This brief contains my answers to those questions. We are reprinting them here with the hope that they will help debaters and also help to inform others who are interested in avoiding a serious miscarriage of justice.)

Should labor organizations be under jurisdiction of antitrust legislation?

At the outset let it be clearly stated, and fully understood, that labor organizations and business organizations are two entirely different institutions. They are in no way comparable since the purpose of business is to make a profit, while the purpose of unions is to protect workers. Thus, legislation applicable to one is not necessarily applicable to the other.

In the case of antitrust legislation, the purpose is to protect the public against artificial price distortions by those possessing a high degree of economic power over the economy. Since workers and their families

comprise the overwhelming majority of the public, the application of such laws to worker organizations would in effect penalize—and reduce—the efforts of the majority to protect themselves against economic exploitation.

Those who support the application of antitrust legislation to labor organizations pretend to see an equation between the commodities that business sells—and the labor a worker sells. However, easily identifiable differences between the two make such an equation patently false.

First, commodities can generally be withheld from the market, without loss of value, when the price is not satisfactory. Labor by comparison, is highly "perishable." Any attempt to withhold it from the market when the price (that is, the wage) is too low results in an immediate and permanent loss to the worker.

Second, commodities can easily be transferred from an unfavorable to a favorable market. Labor, on the other hand, is relatively immobile, being rooted in a particular locality not only by such ties as family, friendship, church affiliation and familiarity of surroundings, but by lack of knowledge of employment opportunities elsewhere.

Third, buyers of commodities are vastly more varied and numerous than are employers of labor. In fact, in recent years a trend of corporate mergers and absorptions has concentrated greater and greater control of production and jobs into fewer and fewer hands. At the present time, for example, more than one-half of America's productive capacity—and more than two-thirds of its industrial profits—are accounted for by only 150 of its largest corporations.

Fourth, owners of commodities, corporate and otherwise, normally have financial resources in cash, credit, property and inventory that workers do not possess.

Because of these significant differences, there can be no valid comparison between labor organizations and business organizations. As Congressman EMANUEL CELLER has so cogently summed it up, unions cannot be compared to business monopolies because they "do not have the control over the labor of their members that is enjoyed by owners over the goods they sell. No more than their individual members can unions store or ship that labor. Nor are they in a position to make unrestricted delivery of it. This imperfect control, compared to the control exercised by sellers over their goods, sharply limits the power of unions. They are not truly sellers but brokers of labor, a perishable, variable, and relatively immobile product."

Thus, the test that must be applied to any legislation aimed at reducing the role and effectiveness of unions in our economic system is: would it enhance or reduce the public welfare?

In part, the answer can be found by referring to earlier years in this century when unions were weak and workers competed without union protections in the job market. The results hardly contributed to the national good since they included sweatshops, speedups, the exploitation of women, child labor, the 12-hour day, company towns, an appalling industrial accident rate, and a generally depressed standard of living for the working people of America.

However, these were the only results that could logically be expected, since pure competition between workers will normally be expressed in terms of who can or will set the lowest value on labor.

There is little reason to suppose that in the absence of a strong labor movement conditions such as these would not be repeated today.

And if they were repeated, would the public interest be served?

Are low wages and their corollary, low purchasing power in the work force, beneficial

in a society where capacity to produce already threatens to outrun effective ability to consume?

Can low wages and depressed conditions in the work force provide a base of prosperity for merchants, doctors, teachers, farmers, or for industry itself?

Can America meet the challenge of rapid economic expansion in the Soviet Union with a depressed, "low wage" economy?

The answers are evident. Even the Taft-Hartley Act recognizes that without effective unions there can be no effective bargaining between employers and workers. And, without effective bargaining, wages and working conditions must inevitably sink to the level set by the most ruthless employer, and the hungriest worker.

Since the purpose of antitrust legislation is to prevent undesirable monopolies it must be noted that this purpose would be directly contravened by application of antitrust principles to unions. For it is only through unions that workers have achieved a measure of control over the conditions under which they labor. And if unions were destroyed, through misapplication of the antitrust principle, this control would revert to the employer. In effect this would reestablish, under the exclusive control of self-interested employers, complete monopoly of jobs and job conditions.

It is probable that the severance of long-established bargaining relationships would initially lead to chaos in labor-management relationships. A corporation with 10 separate plants would not bargain with one union for one agreement covering all, but with 10 fragments for 10 different agreements.

However, the unexpressed purpose of those who seek to treat unions as a "conspiracy in restraint of trade" is to achieve industrial peace by transferring to employers absolute power in the work place. And undoubtedly, this kind of peace they would eventually achieve. For it is obvious that large corporations would have little difficulty disposing of the labor movement once it was fragmented into tens of thousands of isolated parts.

And once management possessed complete and absolute power it could safely ignore any demand by workers for a greater share of their own rising productivity. And, of course, as production continued to outstrip consumption the eventual result would be economic stagnation.

In a society as highly industrialized and interdependent as ours the Federal Government could not sit idly and watch the economy die. Drastic countermeasures, involving far greater regulation of business and industry, would be necessary. In the end, free collective bargaining between workers and employers would be supplanted by complete Government regulation of the employer-employee relationship.

This necessary enlargement of the Government's role would automatically diminish the prerogatives of management. For, as employers in other countries have found, once government takes the first step toward regulation and control of wages, hours and working conditions, the next step—to government regulation of prices, production, markets and profits—is both short and inevitable.

Finally, it must be noted that the question implies that unions now enjoy a blanket exemption from the anti-trust laws. However, such an implication has no basis in fact. The purpose of the anti-trust laws is to prohibit a "conspiracy in restraint of trade." And though the Clayton Act specifically declares that unions per se are not such a conspiracy, this does not mean that unions are exempt from prosecution when they engage in activities (in concert with employers) that do, in fact, constitute a restraint of trade.

IS ORGANIZED LABOR TOO POWERFUL IN THE UNITED STATES?

Any attempt to compare the so-called power of organized labor with the all-pervading influence of big business in our society becomes ludicrous upon rational examination of the evidence.

Although organized labor directly represents some 18 million workers and seeks to advance the economic, social, and political welfare of all workingmen's families, its effectiveness is seriously impaired by the control that businessmen exert over the Nation's press, television, radio, magazines, advertising and other media of public information and understanding. One result of this control is, of course, that political candidates friendly to labor are invariably handicapped by a hostile and unfair press.

A further result is that the wishes and views of big business outweigh those of labor at all levels of government, from local school boards to the Senate of the United States. Accordingly, it is not labor, but the business community that selects the Nation's textbooks as well as the Nation's laws. This was dramatically illustrated in the 1961 session of Congress.

Although labor fought, and fought hard for such desperately needed national programs as Federal aid to education, medical care for the aged, minimum standards that would protect migrant farm workers against merciless exploitation, and the plugging of special tax exemptions for the very rich, these measures were buried under the disapproval of such affluent and politically influential groups as the National Association of Manufacturers, the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, the American Medical Association, the American Farm Bureau, and the oil and gas industry.

Similarly, in most State legislatures, years of effort by organized labor have failed to achieve basic and long-overdue reforms in antiquated workmen's compensation, unemployment insurance, and factory inspection laws.

In looking at the myth of "labor's power" it is also necessary to consider that not a single union in the country has assets that compare with those of the large corporations that dominate the American economy.

The resources of the United Auto Workers, for example, are microscopic as compared to those of any single producer in the auto industry. The total assets of the United Steel Workers, after a quarter of a century of operation, are only a fraction of 1 year's net profits of any of the major steel producers. The reserves of the Machinists Union, including the value of its headquarter's building, amount to less than \$25 a member. And so it is in industry after industry.

As a result of industry's financial and political advantage—and despite the distortions of the press—industrial democracy is far from being realized in the United States today. In the 1960's, as in the 1930's, organizers are still being beaten by company inspired police or company hired thugs.

Workers who desire to exercise rights supposedly guaranteed them by well defined Federal legislation are still subject to economic, and sometimes physical, reprisals. And, as the workers in Henderson, N.C., and Winchester, Va., know well and bitterly, even a long-established union tradition can be crushed by the economic power of an implacable employer, especially if that power is supported by court injunctions, imported strikebreakers, biased newspaper reporting, brutal police tactics, and the presence of the State militia.

Actually, the campaign to fragment the labor movement under the pretense of anti-trust comes at a time when union strength is declining due to such factors as automation, chronic unemployment, unfair labor legislation, and a consistently biased press. Under such conditions, and with only one

worker in four organized, labor's ability to maintain decent working standards is already less than the level needed to insure a healthy balanced economy.

Finally, it should be noted that if organized labor were as powerful as its enemies claim, this power would be reflected in a simple analysis of income distribution in the United States.

It would be expected, for example, that the people most likely to be represented by unions—i.e., the lower income families—would be increasing their share of the total national income at the expense of those in the upper income brackets. However, such is not the case.

In 1944, for example, 60 percent of the Nation's families—i.e., the lowest three-fifths—received only 32 percent of all family incomes in the United States. The upper two-fifths of the income groups received the other 68 percent, with almost two-thirds of this going to the families in the top fifth. Today, 17 years later, these ratios are almost exactly the same. The families included in the lower three-fifths of all income groups receive only one-tenth of 1 percent more of the national total than they did in 1944. Thus, it is evident that while the rich have stayed rich, the relative position of workers has not changed.

The illusion of labor's overwhelming and irresistible strength which prevails in spite of the above may be due in part to the fact that when organized workers are forced or driven to strike, editorial writers customarily view with alarm this evidence of "great power" by unions to stop industrial production. Yet few of these same editors have ever challenged or questioned the far greater power of industrial managers to stop production and to close factories, sometimes temporarily, sometimes permanently, without regard for the welfare of either the work force or the community.

As Prof. James Kuhn of Columbia University has noted, "The unions' ability to stop production when others wish it to continue is not unique. Only the public resentment of union stoppages is unique. Managers stop production and reduce output for months on end despite the readiness, willingness and desire of workers to work. Few question the throttling down of factory production, though unemployment probably is a lingering, wasting cancer more destructive than the clean, swift wound of strikes."

DO UNIONS TAKE UNFAIR ADVANTAGE OF EMPLOYERS IN COLLECTIVE BARGAINING NEGOTIATIONS?

Since organized labor is a human institution made up of human beings it is not possible to say that every union has always bargained with complete responsibility. However, it must be recognized that in any bargaining situation the employer holds certain economic trumps that make it far easier (and more typical) for him to exploit workers than for unions to take unfair advantage of him.

Not only does management enjoy superior financial resources and political power, but it is management that owns the jobs. Though workers have organized for the purpose of gaining an equity in their jobs based on years of service, it is management in the final analysis that controls the availability and number of jobs. This, in itself, is a powerful bargaining weapon.

Moreover, a union's demands must always be tempered by the realization that management must remain competitive and profitable. In other words, a union cannot bargain in a way that will destroy an employer's incentive to remain in business. For to do so would be self-destructive.

If the employer goes out of business or moves the plant because of unrealistic union demands, it is union members who lose jobs. This not only places a self-regulating brake

on union demands, but motivates unions to make special efforts to help employers who are in a bad competitive position.

In practice, as well as in theory, unions are acutely aware that the prosperity of workers depends on that of employers. A real problem for America rises from the fact that so many corporate managements do not understand that the principle works both ways. Though workers obviously cannot enjoy prosperity and good wages if management is unprofitable, management, by the same token, cannot enjoy the benefits of an expanding economy if workers are poorly paid.

All of these factors, taken together, place a definite limit of reasonableness on unions' activities. And, as can be easily demonstrated, this limit has been observed by the overwhelming majority of the Nation's unions over the course of many years.

First, if unions had been taking unfair advantage of employers in collective bargaining, the evidence would be easily observable in the declining profits of industry. However, the evidence actually points the other way. Not only have corporate profits after taxes, plus depreciation set-asides, doubled since 1953, but the mass-production industries in which unions have been strongest (steel, automobile, rubber, aircraft, and electrical equipment) have all made substantial progress in the 25 years since these industries were organized.

Second, while industrial productivity has increased 20.9 percent since 1953, unit labor costs (including all fringe benefits) of production workers have increased only one-tenth of 1 percent. By comparison, unit salary costs (again including fringe benefits) of white-collar workers (including executives at the management level) have increased 33 percent.

In this connection it is appropriate to point out the relationship between labor's long-term drive for better wages and management's continuing search for greater productivity.

It is no accident that the American worker is also the most productive worker in the world. Before workers formed unions it is true that wages were low, but individual productivity was also low. In effect, labor was cheap but production was expensive. But when unions drove the price of American labor above the subsistence level, management was compelled to find ways to use this more expensive labor more economically.

Thus, unions acted as a catalytic agent for technological progress. Instead of seeking profits through exploitation of cheap labor, management began to develop labor-saving machines and adopt better and faster methods of production. This interaction, between increased wages and intensified technology has given America the industrial leadership of the world.

Today, the United States, with 6 percent of the earth's labor force, produces more than 50 percent of the world's goods.

Finally, this whole question must be analyzed in context with the long-range struggle between capitalism and communism in the world. Assuming that mankind escapes nuclear destruction, America must nevertheless realize that it is engaged in long-term competition to prove that democratic free enterprise provides the world with the best formula for meeting its human and economic needs.

In other words America must provide the world with a real alternative to communism. And since a free labor movement is an integral part of the system of democratic free enterprise (as witnessed by the fact that democracy has never survived the destruction of the labor movement in any country.) America without its labor movement would provide the world with no real alternative at all.

It is indeed ironic that while America seeks to show Asians, Africans and others how to build a strong labor movement as a base for democratic free enterprise, its own labor movement at home is constantly threatened and harassed by the threat of legislation, the effects of which are little understood by either those who support it or those who would suffer because of it.

YOUTH CAMPS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I was extremely pleased to read in the New York Herald Tribune of April 13, 1962, the report on the Gallup poll which indicates that 8 out of 10 people queried feel it would be a good idea to set up youth camps, such as are provided in measures now reported out of both the Senate and House Committees on Labor and Public Welfare.

Mr. President, it was my privilege to be the principal sponsor of similar legislation in the 86th Congress, which passed the Senate and was bogged down in the House due to the opposition of the Eisenhower administration. I was also privileged to be the principal sponsor of legislation which has been reported favorably by the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare to establish a Youth Conservation Corps for young men between the ages of 16 and 22 for work on needed conservation projects and public lands.

The Gallup poll shows an overwhelming number of people in favor of the Youth Conservation Corps in all regions of the Nation and in all age groups. Even 70 percent of the rank and file Republicans approve this proposal, which has been supported by a Democratic administration.

No other proposal which the Senator from Minnesota has advanced in legislative form except the Peace Corps has evoked such a tremendously favorable response. I call to the attention of my colleagues the manner in which the American people have responded to this proposal to provide useful work and training for young men who are finding each year a more difficult labor market.

The American people in their innate good sense recognize the Youth Conservation Corps as a powerful preventive against juvenile delinquency and a magnificent method of developing character and skills among our young people.

The proposal for a Youth Conservation Corps is legislation which the American people want and which they want in overwhelming degree. I am confident that the Congress will act to authorize and establish such Youth Conservation Corps before adjournment this summer.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article by George Gallup appearing in the New York Herald Tribune of April 13, 1962, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

A GALLUP POLL—8 IN 10 FAVOR REVIVAL OF CCC YOUTH CAMPS
(By George Gallup)

PRINCETON, N.J.—As a way of dealing with the growing problem of out-of-school, out-

of-work young men, the American public is highly in favor of reviving the concept of the CCC camps of the 1930's.

Supported by 8 out of 10 persons, such a proposal would set up youth conservation camps for men between the ages of 16 and 22 who want to learn a trade and earn a little money by working outdoors.

Such a concept is embodied in the youth training bills now before Congress, with differing Senate and House versions. The Senate bill calls for a maximum of 150,000 youths in the program by the year 1965; the House version would limit the number to 12,000 at any time over a 3-year period.

To see how the public feels about the general principle of modern-day CCC camps, Gallup poll reporters put this question to a cross section of adults:

"It is proposed that the Federal Government set up youth camps—such as the CCC camps of the 1930's—for young men 16 to 22 years who want to learn a trade and earn a little money by outdoor work. Do you think this is a good idea or a poor idea?"
The vote nationwide:

	Percent
Good idea.....	79
Poor idea.....	16
No opinion.....	5

Analysis shows that the youth camps win overwhelming support in all regions of the Nation—East, Midwest, South, and Far West.

Big majorities of older voters—who recall the CCC camps of the 1930's—as well as younger voters endorse the idea of youth camps.

Although the proposal has bipartisan support at the grassroots level, a modern-day CCC has more appeal to Democrats and Independents (83 and 80 percent approval respectively) than it does to rank-and-file Republicans (70 percent approval).

Although the public supports the basic principle of youth conservation camps, the question of whether youths who are out of school and out of work should be required to go to these camps provokes some controversy.

Authorities estimate that as many as 1 million young men each year find themselves out of school, out of work, and not accepted by the military service. Many youth experts contend that this situation—in addition to providing a "breeding ground" for juvenile delinquency—constitutes a great waste of the Nation's manpower.

Overall—when asked about requiring such young men to go to youth camps—more persons approve of the mandatory approach than disapprove of it.

Among Republicans interviewed, however, the prevailing sentiment is against requiring young men to go to the camps. Democrats and Independents support such an approach.

Younger voters tend to vote against such a method of handling the youth camps; a majority of older voters are in favor of it. During the 1930's, upward of 2 million men were at one time members of the Civilian Conservation Corps or its predecessor, the Emergency Conservation Work agency.

Gallup poll files show that no New Deal measure was so consistently popular with the public as the CCC camps.

In July, 1936—after the camps had been in operation for 3 years—83 percent of persons in a national survey were in favor of continuing the CCC.

In April, 1938, another Gallup poll recorded nearly 8 out of 10 in favor of establishing the camps on a permanent basis.

PROPOSED FEDERAL CROP QUALITY LABORATORY AT UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA, IN ST. PAUL

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I propose that there be established under the auspices of the U.S. Department of

Agriculture a Federal crop quality laboratory at the University of Minnesota campus in St. Paul.

The dividends to this Nation from such a laboratory might be incalculable.

They would far outweigh the direct costs which might accrue—an estimated \$2.6 million.

The purpose of the laboratory would be to provide for the first time an organized basis for genetic modification of existing crop lines for largely new purposes.

Instead of dealing, as we do at present, with existing crop lines, trying to adapt them to new food, feed, fiber, and vegetable oil purposes, this proposed laboratory would do basic research on devising new strains for new purposes.

The case for such a laboratory was presented by Mr. Donald G. Fletcher, executive secretary of the Crop Quality Council, Inc., before the Agriculture Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations headed by the distinguished senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL].

As Mr. Fletcher pointed out, no facility exists today whereby the science of genetics and plant breeding is given the resources in men, money, facility, and equipment to experiment in basic research toward crop innovations.

Throughout the Nation at State experimentation stations and elsewhere, important work is at present being done with existing crop lines for the purpose of fulfilling presently felt needs, including adaptation for industrial—such as plastic—purposes.

But if we are to achieve genuine breakthroughs, we must give to the plant geneticists, the plant physiologists and to other members of multidisciplinary teams the resources to conduct basic research, free from the day-to-day requirements of applied research and development.

It is my hope, and that of my distinguished colleague from Minnesota [Mr. McCARTHY], that the Senate Committee on Appropriations will include in the 1963 USDA, appropriations bill an amendment for such a laboratory. It is our further hope that the invaluable resources of the University of Minnesota will be utilized for this purpose by authorizing the construction of such a laboratory in St. Paul directly adjacent to the new \$1 million Crop Research Laboratory. This latter new building has been constructed entirely through appropriations by the State of Minnesota and is a part of the Institute of Agriculture. There, skilled teams from the Divisions of Agronomy, plant pathology, biochemistry and soil work on problems of crop research.

This \$1 million center is, in turn, part of a master plan for a \$6 million State-financed enterprise which will embrace one of the most modern and comprehensive agricultural research establishments in the Nation.

In recent years, a number of important Federal laboratories have been established by the U.S. Department of Agriculture. For example, in the last 2 years, laboratories have been established in North and South Dakota, respectively.

We are familiar, too, with the previous record of the world-famous efforts of the Peoria, Ill., Utilization Laboratory.

The time has come for an enterprise of the type which I have described to be established—and Minnesota would be an ideal choice for its site.

I may say, too, that one of the first purposes of such a laboratory would be to compile information on plant genetic work anywhere else in the United States and abroad which could provide helpful "leads" for the laboratory's work. In turn, the laboratory would disseminate its findings to geneticists elsewhere as promptly as they are developed.

In other words, Mr. President, we seek to utilize plant physiologists and geneticists in this field to develop strains of seeds which will modify the crops which are produced from our land, so that those crops can be used for chemical and industrial purposes, not merely for food purposes. In this way we shall be able to utilize the vast acreage of America which now stands idle, which will provide income for farm producers and at the same time provide new products for American industries.

I am confident this proposal may well open an entirely new era of chemistry and biochemistry, and a new era of industry, through the utilization of food and fiber products modified for industrial purposes and for industrial development.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MUSKIE in the chair) 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.)

EXECUTIVE REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

The following favorable report of a nomination was submitted:

By Mr. HILL, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

Dr. Emanuel R. Piore, of New York, to be a member of the National Science Board, National Science Foundation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of J. Herbert Hollomon, of New York, to be an Assistant Secretary of Commerce.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

U.S. COAST GUARD

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of persons in the U.S. Coast Guard.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the nominations of persons in the U.S. Coast Guard be agreed to en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations will be considered en bloc; and, without objection, they are confirmed.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of the nominations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

IMPORTATION OF EGGS FROM POLAND AND ITS THREAT TO THE POULTRY INDUSTRY

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, today I call attention to another ridiculous situation resulting from one of our foreign aid giveaway programs.

During the past 2 years our Government has shipped to Poland 826,300 metric tons of grain under Public Law 480. Under the terms of this sale the American taxpayers receive practically nothing for this grain, since whatever is charged is paid in the form of Polish currency, which in turn can only be used by the U.S. Government in that country. Dollar sales of grain to Poland in that same period were less than 5 percent of the total.

It is true that under the most of these sales agreements the grain being shipped supposedly was not to be used for the feeding of livestock, but, under a socialistic government which handles all importation of grain for livestock feed as well as that for human consumption, certainly the grain cannot be kept separate.

In any event what is in effect practically a gift of 826,000 metric tons of grain to Poland has the indirect effect of reducing the cost of all grain in that country, whether such grain is used for livestock feed or for human consumption.

The result has been that Polish poultry farmers for the past 2 years have been able to buy American grain or by-products from American grain, for the feeding of their livestock, at prices far cheaper than are available to poultry farmers here in America.

As evidence of the ultimate effect of such a contradictory policy, Poland is now beginning to ship eggs produced with this cheap American grain back into the United States, thereby further depriving the American farmers of their normal markets.

The Department of Agriculture has just confirmed that delivery of 40,000 cases of shell eggs has been arranged by a Canadian citizen, and that this Canadian importer is in turn selling some of these eggs in the United States.

This is but the beginning, and unless our State Department and Agriculture Department take prompt steps to correct this situation the increased influx of eggs imported from Poland can prove disastrous to our eastern markets.

Already the production of cheap eggs in Europe from poultry flocks that are fed with subsidized American grain has destroyed our export markets.

I have received assurances that both Departments are aware of the results of a continuation or acceleration of the importation of these eggs and have promised to give this problem their attention.

At this point I ask unanimous consent to have printed a letter dated April 17, 1962, just received from Mr. Charles S. Murphy, Under Secretary of Agriculture confirming these importations and the shipments of this subsidized grain.

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

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, D.C., April 17, 1962.

HON. JOHN J. WILLIAMS,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR WILLIAMS: This is in reply to the April 8 telephone request of Mr. Ralph Peters of your office, for information concerning the recent importation of Polish shell eggs into the United States.

This Department understands from trade reports that a Canadian citizen has purchased from Poland approximately 40,000 cases of shell eggs which are scheduled for delivery in parcels of some 3,400 to perhaps as high as 10,000 cases each, between the latter part of March and the middle of May. It is understood that the Canadian importer has been selling some of these eggs in the United States to egg breakers.

There are no restrictions against the sale of such eggs in the United States, provided the 3½ cents per dozen import duty is paid and that they meet the food and drug requirements with respect to the importation of shell eggs.

This Government has supplied Poland with wheat and barley for human consumption under the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act (P.L. 480) since 1957. In earlier years, relatively small quantities of corn and grain sorghums were included in the programs. However, in view of the increase in Polish exports of poultry and livestock products, the programing of feed grains was discontinued after the July 1960 agreement. The agreement of December 15, 1961 did not include any grain for feed, but did include a requirement that Poland purchase U.S. feed grains commercially for dollars as a condition for receiving wheat under the program, since the Polish Government was unwilling to agree to limit exports of poultry and livestock products. It is emphasized, however, that grain for poultry feed has not been sold to Poland recently under Government programs.

This department is following the importation of these eggs and is continuing to make inquiries so as to assure that the laws and regulations of the United States are not violated.

The following is submitted in response to Mr. Peters' specific question. Our rec-

ords of imports in the United States for the past 5 years (1957-61) show that no eggs have entered this country from Poland. Exports of grains to Poland during the same period were as follows:

Exports for dollars:	Metric tons
1957-----	None
1958-----	None
1959-----	3,300
1960-----	16,600
1961-----	16,500
Exports under title I, Public Law 480:	
1957-----	None
1958-----	155,200
1959-----	120,500
1960-----	439,900
1961-----	387,400

We hope the foregoing information is helpful to you and that you will request further information in the event same is needed.

Sincerely yours,
CHARLES S. MURPHY,
Under Secretary.

CALIFORNIA SETS PACE IN EDUCATION

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, we Californians are proud of our State's leadership in education.

Among the many achievements of the administration of Gov. Edmund G. (Pat) Brown are the steps taken to provide even finer educational opportunities for today's young people and for those who will follow them into the classroom in the years to come.

One aspect of California's preeminence in the field of education is discussed in an article by Mr. Ron Moskowitz, education editor of the San Francisco Examiner, in the newspaper's April 13 issue.

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

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

[From the San Francisco Examiner, Apr. 13, 1962]

WE'RE SETTING PACE—STATE LEADS IN COLLEGES

(By Ron Moskowitz)

Los Angeles County is a wondrous place. You drive for miles and miles through subdivision after subdivision until you feel almost like "Alice in Suburbialand."

And no matter from which direction you head out of Los Angeles' sprawling downtown area, if you drive long enough through this caricature of all suburbs, you will reach a State college. Usually a beautiful State college.

There are now 15 State colleges with 16 campuses. And two more are planned for the Los Angeles area, which already has the majority.

I sometimes wonder if the people of California realize the wonder of it all. State colleges close enough to the people so their sons and daughters can commute from their homes.

Beautiful new colleges that are attracting better and better faculties.

Last week the State board of education met on one of the newest of the campuses, at San Fernando Valley State College at Northridge. Ten years ago it was a bald spot in a desolate area. Today it is a growing campus—growing in prestige as well as size and enrollment. And growing in quality.

A similar miracle is taking place in its earlier stages just 50 minutes from San

Francisco. Today, near Cotati in Sonoma County, 275 students study in temporary quarters. Nearby is a 275-acre plot of land barren except for a few trees.

In about 20 years, that land will be topped with a carefully planned campus of Sonoma State College and enrollment will have grown to 12,000. The master plan was tentatively approved last week by the board.

Again, I wonder if Californians appreciate the fact that the site was purchased at a reasonable price before the people crowded into the area; that the master plan for the campus was carefully developed so buildings would be designed for the type of program to be offered there; that such far-ahead planning and vision is saving the State millions of tax dollars while providing Californians with better education than many States not afflicted with the growth problems we have here.

At a dinner party the other night, the inevitable "What brought you to California?" question made the rounds and a couple in their forties answered:

"We were living in the East, where the good colleges and universities are so crowded that even students of better than average ability are unable to enter.

"It was the chance for our two sons to go to good colleges that brought us to California. We don't have a lot of money."

I wonder how many people good education has brought to California. I wonder how many new industries have been attracted to the west coast because of good educational planning.

I wonder if those businesses and industries realize that tax dollars are well spent when they are invested in education.

California is setting the pace in the Nation in higher education. I hope Californians realize it.

CALIFORNIA AGRICULTURE AND THE TRADE EXPANSION ACT

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, farmers in California are deeply concerned about the possible effects of the Trade Expansion bill. They are now taking a long, hard look in an attempt to estimate what new tariff negotiations might mean to their livelihood.

They have some considerable reason for concern, because recently announced European Common Market external tariffs fixed rates on several products at levels higher than the average of duties of member countries. I have specific reference to prunes, fruit juices, and canned pineapple. These new higher-than-average tariffs are disappointing and have brought some disillusionment, not only to prune growers and the others directly affected, but to other producers who cannot be sure that they will not receive similar treatment in the future.

California leads the Nation in agricultural exports, with more than 200 specialty crops. Our farmers necessarily fear that these specialty crops—many of them grown primarily if not almost entirely in California—may be used as concessions in future negotiations aimed at gaining entry into Common Market markets for other U.S. products. Recognizing that California is something of a "political sitting duck" with only two U.S. Senators and only a limited number of agricultural Congressmen, California farmers are anxious about what the Trade Expansion Act might mean to them.

Nevertheless, they have not turned against the bill. Instead, they are suggesting ways in which the bill might be revised to take care of certain specific problems.

One of the best, moderate statements on the subject is that of the U.S. National Fruit Export Council, which I ask to have printed in the RECORD.

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

FRUIT INDUSTRY—EXPORT POLICY STATEMENT BY U.S. NATIONAL FRUIT EXPORT COUNCIL

The membership of the U.S. National Fruit Export Council represents the major U.S. fresh and processed fruit exporting industries. The council's objective is to facilitate exports. In recent years it has emphasized the need to obtain competitive access to export markets. The major problem confronting U.S. fruit exporters has been the existence of nontariff barriers (quotas, prohibitions, licensing, etc.), maintained by Western European countries. These countries provide the major offshore markets for our products; and the council has concentrated its efforts on this problem. Although some of these barriers have been removed, many important ones still remain. They are maintained to protect European markets for local or associated producers, even though they no longer are justified under the rules of the GATT, but, in fact, are contrary to the terms thereof.

The council testified at the hearings on the extension of the trade agreements legislation in 1955 and in 1958. It stressed the need to obtain removal of these foreign barriers to trade in horticultural products in order to make reciprocal trade truly a two-way street. We supported extension of the Trade Agreements Act, even though in the case of perishables, the act had not worked in the way it was intended, and U.S. fruit and fruit products were discriminated against.

One of the major purposes of the Trade Agreements Act of 1958 was to enable the negotiation of favorable tariffs with the European Economic Community. The recently announced EEC common external tariffs agreed upon at GATT negotiations and the provisional Common Market fruit and vegetable policy are a great disappointment to us. Tariffs on important segments of our trade (for example: dried prunes, fruit juices, and canned pineapple) were fixed at rates higher than the average of the duties of the member countries, this at a time when reductions were supposed to be negotiated under the authority of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1958. We are also concerned from study of the provisional Common Market fruit and vegetable policy, that the EEC countries intend to continue or indeed increase their nontariff barriers.

We need to know whether the common external tariffs negotiated with the EEC, are capable of being nullified by nontariff barriers. If they are, the United States should either obtain firm commitments that this will not be done or else withdraw concessions commensurate in value to the trade in these products.

European duties on horticultural items too often have been augmented by nontariff barriers in recent years, and the benefit of concessions lost thereby.

This leads to our principal recommendation, which is, that the Congress should incorporate in new trade agreements legislation, steps to maintain and improve access for U.S. horticultural products into the Common Market, and other foreign countries, and should instruct the President in

utilizing the steps incorporated in the authority of new trade agreements legislation. To do this, the President should take special precautions to insure that existing tariffs or subsequent tariff concessions for the entry of these products are not offset by quotas or other import restrictions.

The legislation should provide that whenever the EEC or any foreign country takes action to nullify or impair concession granted on these products, equivalent withdrawals will be made by the United States. Similar action should be taken against countries who refuse to remove existing unjustifiable barriers.

The legislation should also prohibit the President from making any future concessions available to any country that has unjustifiably nullified or impaired concessions previously granted to the United States without having made adequate compensation therefor; concessions negotiated in multilateral agreements must be withheld from any such countries.

This recommendation is made because experience has demonstrated that representations on the part of the United States have not succeeded in modifying or removing some of these nontariff barriers, despite GATT obligations for their removal. We are informed that continuing representations have taken place over the past several years in an endeavor to seek relaxation of quantitative or seasonal restrictions on imports of fresh apples and pears in most Western European countries, on winter grapefruit and processed orange and grapefruit products in the United Kingdom, and on imports of most horticultural products into France. Despite these, little significant progress has been made. Hence, representations alone apparently are not capable of securing removal or even reductions of these barriers.

Another recommendation which is related to the previous one, is that the United States modify its most-favored-nation policy for tariff concessions. We suggest that tariff concessions be available only to those countries who have tariff agreements with the United States or are members of the GATT. We cannot understand why countries who do not reciprocate with the United States should receive the benefit of our tariff concessions.

Mexico is a good case in point. Despite increased imports into the United States from Mexico, of horticultural products, practically all U.S. exports of horticultural items to Mexico are restricted. At times, these exports have been subjected to embargoes almost without notice. We believe that a country which continues to impose such restraints on trade should not be eligible for the benefits of all concessions made under our trade agreements program.

Also, we believe that the most favored nation policy should be modified so that concessions may be withdrawn from individual countries which maintain nontariff barriers.

Because representations alone have proved inadequate to secure access to foreign markets, we believe the Congress must insist that withdrawals of concessions be used as a means to accomplish this end.

We recognize the danger to trade involved in a mutual withdrawal of concessions. Also, we know that retaliatory measures involving other products will not alone guarantee us reasonable access to foreign outlets for our products. But lack of progress in the removal of these trade barriers has persuaded us that measures stronger than those heretofore used are required if we are to obtain continuing reasonable opportunities to export our products.

LOBBYING BY CIVIL SERVICE EMPLOYEES

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks an editorial entitled "Kennedy's Lobby Is Turned Back," published in the Chicago Daily Tribune of April 18, 1962. The editorial deals with the successful battle by the distinguished Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] to upset the Kennedy administration's plan to convert more than a million Federal Civil Service workers into a huge lobby on behalf of administration programs. I thoroughly agree with the views expressed in the editorial.

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

[From the Chicago Daily Tribune, Apr. 18, 1962]

KENNEDY'S LOBBY IS TURNED BACK

Senator JOHN J. WILLIAMS, of Delaware, has succeeded in another of his copyrighted one-man battles, this time by upsetting the Kennedy administration's plan to convert more than a million Federal civil service workers into a huge lobby to plug administration programs. The plan had the blessing of Chairman John W. Macy of the Federal Civil Service Commission and of the President's brother, Attorney General Robert F. Kennedy.

Mr. WILLIAMS seized his opportunity when the administration presented a half billion dollar appropriation bill. The Senator offered an amendment which put it up to the administration to back out of its scheme for organizing the Federal lobby or risk loss of funds it badly needed. The amendment specified that no part of the money should be used to propagandize the public.

Other Senators, though they realized that debasement of the civil service was indefensible, attempted to induce Senator WILLIAMS not to make an issue of the matter. But the Republican Senator refused to retreat. He recalled that Macy had distributed a circular acknowledging that the law forbade civil service employees from engaging in "propaganda or publicity" affecting legislation, but then went on to counsel Government workers to do this very thing. They were authorized "to explain the position of the administration in the proposed legislation."

When Attorney General Kennedy was asked to comment on the subject as a question of ethics, he wrote that it would be "a serious impropriety" and a "distinct breach of duty" for a civil servant to oppose any administration measure. But the Attorney General had no corresponding caveat regarding lobbying in favor of the New Frontier.

Mr. WILLIAMS did not need to labor the point that this was a scandalous attempt to convert the whole of the civil service into advocates who could only see one side of any question. President Kennedy himself endorsed the plan when he told 175 agricultural stabilization and conservation committeemen that, though their activities were supposed to be circumscribed by custom and law, they were still at liberty to function as lobbyists "acquainting" Members of Congress with the administration's views on farm policy.

Before Senator WILLIAMS could bring the controversy to a vote, he was called off the floor to take a telephone call announcing Macy's capitulation. Senator HAYDEN, Democratic chairman of the Appropriations Committee, also received a call and announced that Macy had withdrawn his ill-advised scheme.

Although Senator WILLIAMS' triumph was complete, this whole business leaves a bad taste. The administration brazenly sought to destroy the essential reason for civil service, which is that it should give the country politically disinterested public servants. The highest officers of the administration advised that the law be violated openly, and the President, his brother, and their civil service chairman emerged as principal offenders against the Hatch Act, which prescribes that no one receiving Federal funds shall engage in partisan politics.

It was a good day's work by the Delaware Senator—one among many for which his fellow citizens should be duly grateful.

KENTUCKY ARMY RESERVE, 100TH DIVISION

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON], I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement prepared by him regarding the mustering back into active duty of the 100th Division, Kentucky Army Reserve, as a part of the program to strengthen our defense capabilities to meet the challenge to world peace and our own national security.

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR MORTON

Late last summer the deteriorating Berlin situation and the Kremlin's belligerent attitude during this crisis gave the United States little choice but to strengthen our defense capabilities to meet this challenge to world peace and our own national security.

The military establishment turned to the citizen-soldiers of the Reserves, our peacetime minutemen, to provide the muscle for the buildup of the Armed Forces. The first division to be mustered back into active duty was the 100th Division, a Kentucky Army Reserve outfit whose primary mission is the training of troops.

The Pentagon picked the 100th Division because its record clearly demonstrated its superiority to do the job. The "Century men" entered active duty on September 25, 1961, and within a week were fully mobilized at Fort Chaffee, Ark. Three weeks later the division received its first trainees for 8 weeks of instruction in the basic art of infantry combat.

Since then, thousands of young soldiers have received their indoctrination in the basic skills of infantry warfare at the hands of real professionals. The division's performance at Fort Chaffee has more than justified the judgment of the Pentagon in recalling the "Century men" for their important and necessary national security assignment.

Recently, it was my great pleasure to visit Fort Chaffee, spend time with my fellow Kentuckians, inspect various facilities, and observe the division in action. Let me say that I was never prouder of Kentuckians. Their record at Fort Chaffee is exemplary of the finest of our citizen-soldier traditions. They have done the job called for and more. They have not only far surpassed the training demands originally projected, but their trainees have shown a remarkable degree of proficiency at the end of basic training.

I recall one incident where the division was assigned trainees of low aptitude and ability. By the end of 8 weeks, these soldiers had been so capably handled that their proficiency records were considerably higher than had originally been anticipated for the group.

The division, according to procedure, is supposed to have a week's respite between graduating one group and receiving another. It is standard practice now for companies to ship our trainees on Saturday morning and receive a new group Saturday night, picking up where they left off without a break. When asked if it can handle additional soldier-trainees, the division does not say, "We'll study our capabilities and let you know later." It says, "Sure, we can handle them," and then adjusts its manpower and facilities to handle the additional load without in any way impairing its training efficiency.

I was also intrigued by an administrative procedure followed by Maj. Gen. Dillman A. Rash, the division commander. General Rash meets weekly with the divisions top noncommissioned officers, who constitute a NCO advisory council, at which the noncoms are free to discuss division matters. These are not gripe sessions, but are valuable in transmitting the enlisted man's views to the division command, thus contributing to the division's operational efficiency. There's an old saying that "the chiefs run the Navy," and I guess the parallel is that "the sergeants run the Army." I would like to invite the attention of the Armed Services Committee to this technique, and say that when the generals are called to testify on Reserve matters it might be well to listen to the opinions of some of the Reserve sergeants who have been called up.

I was deeply impressed by the morale, spirit, determination and willingness of the officers and men of the Century Division. It is obvious that the same dedicated and patriotic determination with which the division captured the fortress city of Bitche in 1945, shattering two centuries of military history, still prevails at Fort Chaffee.

To say that the members of the division are completely happy is not true. It is impossible to uproot 3,000 men, most of them with families, from the peaceful pursuits of civilian life and transplant them as soldiers hundreds of miles away without creating hardship. Many of the Century men and their families have real serious and human problems.

They have suffered a reduction in income, or had to give up their homes, or surrender business opportunities, or interrupt their education. They were, of course, anxious to know when they would return to civilian occupations, taking up where they left off more than 6 months ago. The Pentagon's announcement of an August release was, I am sure, welcome news at Chaffee.

Despite the tremendous sacrifices each man has been making, it is to the division's everlasting credit that it has accepted the necessary responsibilities entrusted to it as reservists without creating incidents such as we have seen at other locations. These men are conscientious, dedicated and patriotic Americans who are performing a necessary task during a national emergency. They recognize the continuing seriousness of the crisis which led to their calling up, and they know that these Communist-mastered world tensions still exist.

Kentucky has always been noted for its breed of fighting men, and the Century men of today are worthy heirs of the traditions of Americanism handed down by their forebears. The Commonwealth and the Nation have every reason to feel secure in the faith placed in their care. Perhaps the division's dedication is best stated in its creed: "The American fighting man, endowed with a firm belief in his God and the country he represents, has not and will never be defeated."

THE EASTER SPIRIT

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, a week-end of great significance to all Christen-

dom approaches. Upon our adjournment today for the Eastertide, we will all have occasion to be reminded of the tragic day when Jesus Christ was crucified and the glorious day of His resurrection. The question, "Why did Christ die?" has been asked time and again down through the ages. The answers to this question will forever be important to all mankind.

I am indebted to the Reverend James McNamee, pastor of the Church of the Madalene in Tulsa, Okla., for a searching analysis into this all-important "why." His statement was published in the Tulsa World on Good Friday of last year. It is a dissertation fitting this season and all seasons and all years. I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the RECORD.

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

WHY DID CHRIST DIE?

(By Rev. James McNamee, pastor, Church of the Madalene, Tulsa, Okla.)

Many Christians and even theologians attempt to fit Christ's action into the pattern of the ancient sacrifices (animals were offered, Christ was offered), but that is seeing the shadow, not the reality. The ancient sacrifices were only faint shadows of what Christ was to do. We should not define Christ's action by the old and imperfect foreshadowings, but do the reverse: We should explain the old sacrifices in the light of Christ and His work.

Why did Christ die? One of the reasons offered for the crucifixion of Christ is that it "satisfied the anger of God" toward men. God, it is implied, was placated by one man's blood and was thereafter ready to forgive men their sins. To atone, which originally was two words, "at one," took on a new meaning.

This theory goes back about a thousand years, actually to the time of St. Anselm, of England. It did not seem too strange to a race of men who were sadly used to the irresponsible anger of kings and petty tyrants.

To people of today it is appalling that a good God would demand blood, especially the blood of His own Son. Actually God was never unwilling to save men. It was—and is—men who didn't want to be saved.

Is there any other way of looking at this event? Is there any way that does not reflect discredit on God? Certainly there is.

We may ask, "What did Christ come on earth for?" The answer is very clear. He came to set up a kingdom: the Kingdom of God, with the limitation that He must not destroy or corrupt men in the process. His only means therefore was by preaching the truth—the very "foolish" truth that the way to save mankind here and hereafter was by meekness, by mercy, by purity, by uniting peacefully for justice, and all this to be accepted freely by men. By these means alone the world should be changed for the better, not perverted.

These means did not seem too realistic in Christ's time, or, to be truthful, in our time. We are prone to imagine that there must be a quick, easy way to the Kingdom of God. But they are the only means to change the world without degrading man.

Easier methods were offered Christ. The first suggestion of the people of that time was that He should set up the Kingdom by force, put the world to rights first, and then wait for men to become good. This would have been slavery. The Kingdom could not depend on fraud or bribery either, as the devil suggested: by making stones into

bread. It had to come by full acceptance of men if it was to be a "Kingdom of justice, love and peace."

Christ did not court death. He was not ordered to die, and if men had accepted His method, He would not have died until the natural time arrived. He was told to set up the Kingdom of God by methods that would really save men. He died in the effort. The Father was not placated by Christ's blood. He does not rejoice at murder, but he was pleased that Christ obeyed Him and did not distort His Kingdom even if He was killed in the effort. "Christ for our sake became obedient unto the death of the cross, therefore hath God raised Him up." It would have done no good for God to have rescued Christ in the last minute. It would have stultified His whole life, made it into a pretense.

It is somewhat the same as a soldier who volunteers to cover the retreat of his comrades. He dies but he saves his fellow soldiers. Does his captain want him to die or rejoice at his death? That would be dreadful. The captain is glad that the man was a good soldier and saved his men, but he is sad at the death of a hero. The Father did not order Christ to die. That was the idea of wicked men. But the Father did command Christ to set up a kingdom, and by the right methods, even if He were to be killed in the attempt. Christ carried out the Father's will to the letter, dying in the effort. Christ is therefore "The faithful and true witness." He did not change the Father's will even when it seemed to human eyes that the Kingdom was all finished on the cross. But God raised Him up "And of His Kingdom there shall be no end."

SECOND NATIONAL CONFERENCE ON PEACEFUL USES OF SPACE

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], I ask unanimous consent that material relating to the Second National Conference on Peaceful Uses of Space, as prepared for that conference, together with the opening statement of the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

STATEMENT OF SENATOR MAGNUSON

This Nation, and the world, are on the brink of the most fantastic scientific revolution in history. In weather forecasting, in communications, in education, in new materials and techniques for industry, and in many other ways, we are all going to benefit from our space research program.

The United States, always at the front in scientific developments, will emerge as a stronger leader of the free world because of our present efforts. I sincerely believe that our children will consider commonplace many of the things that amaze and startle us today.

Our growth has been so rapid in the civilian space effort and the applications of this new science so swift that there is still little realization in this country of the impact which this new technology will have on our everyday life.

It is for this reason that I wish to call attention to the Conference on the Peaceful Uses of Space, which will be held at the Seattle World's Fair on May 8 through 10. This historic meeting, the second of its kind to be held in this country and the world, will contribute to the broadening of public understanding of the impact space science will have on our lives.

The leading authorities on space, in Government service and in private industry, will present a complete overview of what we are doing and where we are going in this exciting new frontier. It will not be a technical meeting of scientist talking to scientist, but instead a forum from which the entire world public can gain a better appreciation of what this country means when it talks about "peaceful uses" and space.

From my own committee work, I have some knowledge of the eventual global impact of our communications satellites. I predict that someday people throughout the world will have access to visual instruction on how to decrease mortality by the adoption of simple health measures and how to increase their food production. I know that the communications satellites, which are but one portion of our civilian space program, can be a most valuable instrument of good will and understanding.

As many Senators know, the genesis of this conference was in the imaginative thinking and foresight of the distinguished senior Senator from Oklahoma who heads our Aeronautical and Space Committee. The first conference was held last year in Tulsa. It was so successfully received that many of the leading citizens in my State decided that a second meeting should be organized this year and agreed to underwrite the expenses as did the people of Tulsa last year. With the cooperation of Mr. Webb, Administrator of NASA, the Seattle sponsoring committee has organized an outstanding program.

Vice President JOHNSON will participate, as will the 10 American space pioneers who have gone over 100,000 feet into space in balloons, X-15's and Mercury capsules. Distinguished national leaders will discuss the impact of space programs on society and a group of high school and college panelists will consider the effect those programs will have on the future of youth.

It is my sincere hope that many Senators will find it possible to be present at the Second National Conference on the Peaceful Uses of Space. Once Senators have had this experience, I believe they will agree that similar meetings should be organized in other parts of the country so that all Americans can have a better realization of the civilian benefits of space research.

Because of the great interest in this subject, I request permission to insert into the RECORD, at this time, a projection of some of the peaceful dividends which can be derived from our present and future space programs. It was prepared by Edward Gottlieb and Associates, Ltd., the international public relations organization which has been retained by our sponsoring committee in Seattle.

CIVILIAN DIVIDENDS FROM SPACE RESEARCH

"It is the policy of the United States that activities in space be devoted to peaceful purposes. All of us in the United States and in all nations can derive many benefits from the peaceful application of space technology. The impact of this new science will be felt in our daily lives. It can bring all people closer together through improved communications. It can help control the weather and the climate around us. We can safely predict that the impact of the space age will have a far-ranging effect within industry and in our labor force, on medical research, education and many other areas of national concern."—PRESIDENT JOHN F. KENNEDY.

Outer space is our newest frontier, says James E. Webb, Administrator of NASA, who points out that our Space Agency is dedicated to the acquisition of knowledge and its dissemination for peaceful and scientific purposes to benefit all mankind.

"Many of the instruments, equipment, power sources and techniques that we devise to make manned lunar expeditions possible," Mr. Webb reminds us, "will be adaptable to other uses. The result will be a great variety of new consumer goods and industrial processes that will raise our standard of living and return tremendous benefits to us in practically every profession and activity."

Just what is happening in our efforts to conquer space? How will this research benefit mankind in everyday life? What lies ahead in this exciting frontier? Many answers to these questions will be presented at the Second National Conference on Peaceful Uses of Space, to be held May 8-10 at the Seattle World's Fair. This "report to the Nation" will be the most ambitious program of the type ever undertaken by our National Space Agency. The conference will bring together the Nation's outstanding Government and industry space research scientists.

From Government, scientific and industrial sources the following peaceful uses of space research—already achieved or reasonably attainable in the foreseeable future—has been compiled:

FOR HEALTH AND HUMAN BETTERMENT

Research in aerospace medicine will further worldwide improvements in the diagnosis and treatment of diseases, and in the prolongation of life.

Consider, for instance, the miniature instruments (sensors) attached to our Astronauts to gage their physical responses in space-flight via telemetry. These devices measure heartbeats, brain waves, blood pressure, breathing rates, etc. In civilian life, the "electronic nurses" are already being applied to hospital patients so that they can be watched by remote control. The moment a patient's condition changes, it is instantly recorded and a warning flashed. Such telemetering systems are used in the Lafayette Clinic, Detroit, Mich., and for surgery patients on operating tables at the North Carolina School of Medicine, Chapel Hill. The sensors are components of the automated hospital of the future.

Pressured space suits (developed by B. F. Goodrich Co.) are making it possible for bedridden victims of strokes to walk and work. They may restore the necessary tone of the blood vessels so that blood pressure would be normal. The theory is based on the fact that space suits are designed to maintain normal circulation of blood that otherwise would be impeded by stresses in space flight, such as high altitude, sudden acceleration and deceleration. An Illinois farmer, afflicted with a rare disease that adversely affected his blood pressure and made him an invalid for years, donned space suit trousers and was able not only to walk but to do heavy farming chores. Cases of stroke victims who walked again have been reported in Los Angeles and Santa Monica, Calif.

This spring, an electronically rigged helmet was used during football practice at Northwestern University to obtain data about the degree and kind of head shock received by gridiron players. The apparatus, located in the crown of the helmet, resembles that used by our space experts in telemetering critical data back to earth from the astronauts. The research at Northwestern is to determine minimum standards of performance for football headgear.

Among drugs emanating from our space efforts is one, developed from a missile propellant, which is treating mental illness. Army research has been working toward a radiation-immunization drug which could be taken before exposure, with injections of bone marrow to cut down biological after-effects of radiation. The techniques are of special interest to astronauts who may have to subject themselves to varying intensities

of radiation in space. Civil defense authorities look forward to the possible protection of lives with such methods during nuclear warfare.

Another antiradiation device has been developed by the Chemalloy Electronics Corp., of Santee, Calif. This is a calorimeter which absorbs otherwise harmful radiations. Thus far, the calorimeters have been used in the space program chiefly to check out tracking radars, focus energy in space and to determine what signal levels exist to propagate through space.

Miniaturization is gradually revolutionizing medical science by giving the surgeon and the diagnostician remarkable new tools and tracking devices. It was U.S. space exploration and our defense program that gave miniaturization its biggest boost. For example, pinpoint size ball bearings, devised for satellite equipment, have made possible the new, almost painless, ultra-fast dental drills with a speed of 250,000 or more revolutions a minute.

Hearing in deaf persons has been restored electronically via an operation and surgical implant of a tiny electronic device. The technique stems from space research by the General Data Corp., of Garden Grove, Calif., which develops instruments for spacecraft. The company's scientists are also engaged in a medical-electronic study aimed at developing a sight aid for the blind.

Doctors now foresee a battery-powered television system, small enough to be swallowed, transmitting an on-the-spot pictorial report from a patient's stomach. Already in use are an ingestible capsule that takes samples of stomach fluids, capsule transducer-transmitters that broadcast intestinal data, and transmitters attached to teeth for studies of night grinding.

People with certain heart defects can now wear a rhythm-control device to keep their hearts functioning while they go on living normally. This heart stimulator, now miniaturized by space scientists, is powered by tiny mercury batteries and can be sewn into a heart patient's body. Thus, some individuals literally owe their lives to space age technology.

Other devices include a tiny instrument that can be inserted into the heart through a vein in the arm, so that valve sounds can be heard from their source. Miniature microphones, broadcasting to receivers the size of a cigarette pack, may soon be used by doctors and the patients themselves to monitor heart activity.

Mercury-powered batteries, similar to those being used in satellites, have been adapted for a number of medical devices, such as an artificial larynx which permits people to speak who otherwise couldn't.

What we learn about the effect of weightlessness in space on breathing, sleeping, eating and working—and how long isolation affects the mind—many pave the way to improved medical and psychiatric practices.

Perfecting for space vehicles, a new electrostatic camera which produces movies or still "instant pictures" without any processing may turn out to be of immense value in recording a patient's condition. When focused on a patient in a critical condition, such a camera could keep vital, instantly available photographic records for doctors.

According to the Aerojet-General Corp., of Azusa, Calif., X-ray equipment now used in examining Polaris solid propellant motors can produce X-ray pictures at only 1/30 of the radiation exposure possible with even the most advanced X-ray equipment.

Surgery with an intense pinpoint of light from a LASER has been accomplished successfully in eye operations. This light is a million times brighter than the sun. The LASER, originally developed by the Hughes Aircraft Co., is being used by Minneapolis-Honeywell for our satellites. The Kollsman Instrument Corp., Elmhurst, N.Y., indicates

that LASER may be used for coagulation in brain surgery as well as in eye tumor removal and retinal welding. (For more on LASER, see "Communications.")

Our astronauts' flights into space may affect the physical checkups your doctor will give you. Following John Glenn's debriefing, after his historic flight, Lt. Col. Stanley C. White of the Air Force Medical Corps, who monitored Glenn's physical condition during the orbit, suggested that routine electrocardiograms and regular physical checkups should start at the age of 30, rather than at 40. Medicine, Dr. White urged, should move toward a "dynamic type of physical" in which the patient is examined while duplicating his everyday tasks, instead of just sitting still while things are done to him. In other words, if you're a sedentary worker but sometimes run for a bus, you'll be tested while running on a treadmill, to get a true picture of your health.

NEW BENEFITS FOR THE CONSUMER

For the housewife, the homeowner, for all citizens, numerous practical byproducts are emerging from technological and scientific research dealing with space—and more are constantly on the way.

Our study of foods best suited for space flights is bound to lead to improved nutrition for the earthbound. The use and growth of synthetic fabrics or new foods could prove invaluable as the world's population explodes and the need for food and clothing mounts.

From its space experimentation with algae, the Boeing Co., of Seattle, has fully developed a process for making flour of high nutritive value from bleached seaweed. The flour, originally developed as a possible space food, has actually been used in making cookies, and it has been offered by Boeing as a low-cost, easily produced earth food.

Out of outer space-related research have come specific new tools for the food and agriculture industry. Infrared food blanching, for instance, is highly effective in preparing foods for canning and freezing.

The American Machine & Foundry Co., believes that better coffee is in the offing due to a new teflon-coated cloth filter, designed for use in space research where extreme cleanliness is required. The company reports that the flavor of percolated coffee is enhanced when this filter is substituted for ordinary paper or cloth filters.

Housewives will bless the virtually indestructible toasters and refrigerators that will eventually come out of the research on space materials. Already they are beginning to use new pots and pans made from pyroceram, a material originally devised for nose cones. These utensils can be taken out of a freezer and instantly put over the hottest flame without damage. Another boon is a glass that stays permanently sterile.

Improved protective clothing, plastic fabrics and specially ventilated garments developed for our spacemen will affect even the clothes we'll wear in the not-too-distant future.

For homeowners, there's a housepaint that never needs renewing. Do-it-yourself householders who like to repair gutters, flashings, utensils, bikes, screens, metal boats, radiators, electrical joints and other items will find multiple uses for the new fluxless aluminum soldering, an outgrowth of missile work. It's already being sold in hardware stores.

In heating our homes, new cheaper ways of utilizing fuel may come from the work of scientists in learning to control the temperatures in space capsules. Less energy would be needed for heating and cooling if the exterior of a home were controlled with shuttering devices developed for satellites. Nonchattering solenoid valves and other plumbing innovations developed for missiles and other space vehicles should provide im-

portant refinements for household air-conditioning systems.

Your home may be better safeguarded from fire as result of the ultraviolet phototubes developed for space probes by the industrial laboratories of I.T. & T. These tubes may turn up as effective flame detectors of the fire-alarm type.

The car you drive will reflect the progress of space science. Among the things to come are miniaturized electronic controls for automobiles, capable of maintaining highway speed, slowing the car to avoid obstacles and stopping it in dangerous situations. The powerplants of tomorrow's automobiles may be no bigger than a coffee can—burning new fuels with much greater efficiency. According to the Aerojet-General Corp., a new brushless generator now in use with various space programs may be used in the automobiles of tomorrow. From space telemetry will come a system for the automatic changing of road signs as the weather changes.

Tiny batteries designed for space equipment—the same mercury batteries that operate a timing mechanism developed for an Explorer satellite—have been adapted for a wristwatch you can buy now. On the market is a radio the size of a lump of sugar. Dick Tracy's famous two-way wrist radio is not as incredible as it once sounded. A transistor portable radio manufactured by Hoffman Electronics Corp. of Los Angeles gets its power from solar cells, originally perfected for spacecraft power. This portable can operate as long as the sun is shining. It can be used in a shelter with the "solar pack," placed on the roof, sending power down a cable which also doubles as an antenna.

New battery-powered flashlights can be recharged simply by plugging them into an electric current, using the same small nickel-cadmium batteries devised to store solar energy and keep the instruments of a satellite operating when it is hidden from the sun.

Even the water we drink from the faucet at home may be influenced by our space program. The threatening water shortage in some areas may be finally solved as a result of the search for ways to reuse water aboard spacecraft. AMF Co., for example, is adapting techniques of water desalination to water reclamation (by recycling) for use in space vehicles. Successful accomplishment of this space process may, in turn, bring about the solution that will permit desalination on an economical basis.

Many little-known products destined to touch our daily lives were born in this satellite age. One of the most accurate portable clocks in existence, developed by the Hewlett-Packard Co. of Palo Alto, Calif., grew out of precise navigational requirements of the missile space program—a significant improvement of time measurement. Another byproduct of our aerospace program is the creation, by Sundstrand Aviation of Denver, of a photochromic material which darkens rapidly when exposed to sunlight. With this material, some day we may have self-accommodating sunglasses and antiglare windows.

Scientific advances come in many shapes. The Aluminum Co. of America developed an ultrathin aluminum foil for Project Echo (aluminum coated spheres). The company feels that this material has potential in the field of freeze-dried products, and in the pharmaceutical industry.

An important side effect of our space work has been pointed out by J. R. Dempsey, senior vice president of General Dynamics Astronautics:

"The cleanliness requirements in an advanced missile plant today indicate the new level of product refinement expected in the space age. Practically all foreign matter

must be removed from the missile to assure a successful flight. As engineers and production workers trained in the astronautics and aeronautics industries filter into other fields, they will take along their high standards. The result will be more reliable, longer-lasting consumer and industrial products such as kitchen equipment, outboard motors, television sets and machine tools. Without knowing it, consumers will profit as an indirect result of the tax dollars they invested in precision training of space industry employees."

GLOBAL WEATHER OBSERVATION—AND ITS POTENTIAL

With our Tiros meteorological satellites, and the upcoming Nimbus and Aeros spacecraft, we are heading for an eventual worldwide system of invaluable long-range weather forecasting—with far greater accuracy and for much longer periods in advance. Someday you may know, with more than a pure guess, what the weather will be like weeks or even months ahead.

The initial values of our weather satellites have by now been definitely demonstrated. Benefits will continue to be reaped in areas which lack adequate conventional types of weather observations as well as in adjacent regions. These are not confined to distant oceans, the polar regions or sparsely populated countries. Today, weather data obtained from such ocean areas as the Atlantic southeast of the United States, and the Pacific west of Baja, Calif., are still hardly enough to permit us accurately to forecast storms affecting our mainland, especially our ships and aircraft. It is in these areas that satellite observations of the cloud cover and patterns have significantly helped our meteorologists to analyze existing weather conditions.

Through such improved observations, our storm-spotting Tiros satellites have already saved many lives and an estimated billion dollars a year in property losses, according to a report to Congress by Dr. Francis W. Reichelderfer, Chief of the U.S. Weather Bureau.

Improved long-range forecasting depends on much more than better observations over areas that had hitherto been neglected. We must also understand more clearly just how the atmosphere operates and get the data which can be applied to our knowledge. How the atmosphere behaves as a heat engine will hopefully be learned through satellite observations of reflected solar radiation and emitted long-wave or infrared radiation. We know that the sun's heat is the basic fuel that drives the atmosphere—and creates our weather. We're also aware that the long-wave radiation lost to space is roughly like the exhaust. But we've never been able to see in detail how these losses and inputs vary from time to time, from place to place. With what satellites tell us, we can now begin to do this job. By applying future similar observations quickly enough, we'll be able to make far better weather forecasts.

Right now, cautious weather experts can't say for certain just what will develop but the benefits of even partial success would be tremendous. You could be prepared, for instance, for either a tough or mild winter. Communities armed with long-range predictions of probable droughts or heavy rainfall could prepare for special control of their watersheds. People alerted through satellites and forecasts to the likelihood of hurricanes, floods, severe storms, and other catastrophes will have more time to plan and carry out evacuations, raise levees, strengthen shelters or get ready for disaster relief.

By taking advantage of long-range forecasts, farmers could plant and harvest during most advantageous periods, decide which particular crops to grow and how much land

to use. They'd get maximum yields and cut down their risks and losses from crop damage. Our meteorological satellites will be worth many millions of dollars to them, perhaps enough to pay for much of the cost of our space program.

All people will benefit. Knowing long in advance what the weather will be like, you could arrange your vacation, here or abroad, to benefit from favorable conditions. Such events as baseball games, county fairs, golf tournaments, and championship fights could be scheduled for good weather days. Weather-sensitive industries such as construction and travel resorts would find a foolproof, long-range weather service an invaluable asset.

What's the state of weather reports today and just what progress have our satellites been making?

At present, meteorological observations from the ground and balloons equipped with radios can provide us with only a 20-to-30-percent coverage of weather phenomena, mostly from the Northern Hemisphere and the underside of the atmosphere. Only one-fifth of the globe is covered by any regular observational and weather reporting systems.

Extensive areas are not yet covered and they constitute regions in which storms can be generated and grow without detection before they move over inhabited areas. These gaps may be filled in the next 5 years by an ingenious satellite system that could photograph the whole panorama of weather, from the march of cold fronts to the birth of storms.

As the House Committee on Science and Astronautics reported: "An improvement of only 10 percent in accuracy could result in savings totaling hundreds of millions of dollars annually."

Substantial progress has been made in NASA's development of meteorological satellites to provide worldwide observations of atmospheric elements—the data weathermen must understand—what's going on in the atmosphere—in order to make accurate predictions.

The first step toward an operational system was made with the launching on April 1, 1960, of the hatbox-shaped Tiros I. Equipped with two TV camera systems, its primary source of power was solar cells which covered the top and sides. In addition to pictures taken over and near the United States, through tape recorders other pictures were stored that were taken over areas distant from the United States and then "read out" as the satellite passed over the command and data acquisition stations at Fort Monmouth, N.J., and Kaena Point, Hawaii.

During its 78 days of useful life (until June 17, 1960), Tiros I made 1,302 orbits around the world. Orbiting at altitudes averaging 450 miles and transmitting 22,952 television pictures of the earth's cloud patterns, the 270-pound satellite proved eminently successful. Tiros I proved that it's feasible to use satellites for observing cloud patterns and related atmospheric conditions. It opened a new era in weather observation.

Within 60 hours after this first Tiros was in orbit, reports from it less than 6 hours old were being applied to day-to-day weather forecasting. In the Pacific, Tiros pictures helped trace the monsoons. Data on storms in the Indian Ocean were used by Australian meteorologists.

Tiros II, launched in November 1960, was an improvement on the first weather satellite in that its sensors were able to report important information about the atmosphere such as the reflection of solar heat back from the earth into space and the loss of long-wave or infrared radiation. Radiation balance has a significant effect on the earth's weather.

For a year in orbit, our second weather satellite continued to provide us with data. Its photographs of the icepack breakup in

the St. Lawrence confirmed the indications of Tiros I that weather satellites could be used to show ice boundaries and open seas. Tiros II also aided forecasters on weather conditions for the suborbital flight of Astronaut Alan B. Shepard, Jr.

Tiros III, popularly known as the "Hurricane Hunter," was placed in a near-circular orbit in July 1961, to coincide with the hurricane season. Eight days after it was launched, the satellite was helping to analyze and track Hurricane Anna in the Atlantic. Then, on September 10, Tiros III detected Hurricane Esther as it was forming in the mid-Atlantic—2 days before conventional methods, or weather reconnaissance aircraft. The result was additional warning time.

Esther was the first hurricane ever to be discovered solely by a satellite, although earlier Tiros III had spotted related types of storms in the eastern Pacific. Without the pictures it transmitted to earth, the Weather Bureau pointed out, it's possible the hurricane might have remained undetected for several days, until reported by a passing ship. With the space information, hurricane search planes were able to confirm the existence of the hurricane. The Tiros III feat was one of the best demonstrations until then of the potential of meteorological satellites for improving weather analysis and forecasting.

In the Atlantic, Tiros III photographed a total of five hurricanes and one tropical storm. In the eastern Pacific it saw two hurricanes and a tropical storm in areas where they greatly influenced fishing operations. Nine typhoons were followed in the central and western Pacific. Fifty advisories on these storms and other important weather developments were sent by telephone, telegraph, or radio to Japan, the Philippines, Mexico, Hong Kong, Formosa, and Guam, as well as to Honolulu, San Francisco, Miami, New Orleans, and San Juan.

Japanese weathermen made good use of Tiros III data. According to the chief of Japan's weather bureau, the information was valuable in plotting tropical storms. Weather satellites, he declared, would open a new era in forecasting typhoons, from which Japan has suffered so heavily in the past.

NASA also used Tiros III for weather support of Astronaut Virgil Grissom's Mercury suborbital flight. Twice a day, as the Tiros passed over the Caribbean, one of its two TV cameras was triggered to report weather conditions in the area of the flight.

Tiros IV was placed in orbit on February 8, 1962, traveling around the earth in 100 minutes. Within a few hours its observations were being incorporated into weather forecasts. It marked the fourth straight success for the Tiros program—the weather-seeing "eyes in the sky" designed to help us develop a global system of weather satellites within this decade.

As one of its first jobs, Tiros IV helped to forecast the weather around the world for the orbital flight of John Glenn, Jr.

Three more in the Tiros series will be launched, followed by the advanced Nimbus type. These will tell the forecaster how much energy is gained or lost in the atmosphere. The day-to-day variations in this amount will affect the weather and contribute to the existence of wind, cloud, and rain.

Planned for some time after the middle of this decade is the Aeros satellite family. "The meteorologist," says Dr. Morris Tepper, Director of NASA Meteorological System, "is interested in a capability of continuously observing the developments of a particular storm area. This is particularly true of short-lived and severe storms where the entire life history may be only a matter of a few hours. It is also important to be able to follow the development of nascent storms

before they explode into full maturity. The development of the Aeros family of satellites is for the purpose of satisfying this requirement."

The planned Aeros satellites will be launched into "stationary" orbit 22,300 miles above the equator. Thus, they will remain fixed overhead in a specific geographic area and will be able to watch weather happenings over nearly an entire hemisphere.

In the opinion of Dr. Harry Wexler, the U.S. Weather Bureau's director of meteorological research, a system of satellites of two types would be ideal for charting the world's weather. One system would circle the earth over the poles, the other would circle around the equator. Both types could send their observations into a central weather office. They could also pick up and transmit information from automatic weather stations located in uninhabited areas.

Since weather is an international problem, the values of our weather satellite system will not be limited to this country. At least 10 nations (Argentina, Australia, Belgium, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Italy, Japan, the Netherlands, Switzerland, and West Germany) have been participating in the Tiros program by making special ground measurements to correlate with satellite observations as it passes over their countries. More countries will be invited and are expected to join in such observations as well as the use of the satellite-gathered data. Here is one product of the space age that may serve to bring the international community into closer cooperation and harmony.

And still further in the future (no reliable scientist would yet care to speculate just when) may come the time when man may be able to exert at least limited control on weather conditions. To do this without the danger of producing unforeseen and possibly catastrophic side effects, we must learn tremendously more about our atmosphere and its processes than we now know. Our predictions must first be close to perfection—otherwise we run the danger that good weather in one area is obtained at the cost of a damaging storm somewhere else.

Toward this end, our weather satellites and the data they gather may be expected to play a vital role. But they alone will not be enough. All types of weather observations and many years of research and study lie between us and the day when the possibility of diverting a crippling snowstorm can seriously be considered.

THE NEW ERA OF COMMUNICATION

With the development of NASA's global communication satellite system (Echo, Courier, and the forthcoming Relay, Telstar, Syncom and Advent) within your lifetime you may be enjoying these peaceful uses of space:

Almost instant mail without mailmen. A single satellite with modern facsimile equipment could transmit letters to any place on earth in a few minutes.

You may be able to watch the 1964 Olympics in Japan—live, as it's happening—on your home TV set. Or tune in on an opera in Paris.

You may be reading an orbital newspaper originating in London, New York or Tokyo—simply by pressing a button.

A business conference with associates halfway around the globe could be held by turning a knob.

Dialing Hong Kong would be as simple as calling a local number and the cost would be reduced substantially.

We may have a universal language as communication satellites pull the world together. Or we can expect direct voice-to-voice automatic translations; a Russian may speak his native tongue and an English version will automatically be heard.

Children in our schools will be exposed to important worldwide events as they oc-

cur, through space-based TV and radio. (For millions of people in emerging countries who can't read, improved communication will foster better understanding of important issues.)

The picture-phone is already a reality. With a satellite phone, you may some day be able to see the art treasures in the Louvre or use the Vatican library without leaving your living room.

What's the score to date on our state of communications and the progress of satellite systems?

It's clear that our present capacities will not be enough to meet future demands for long-distance communication. Overseas calls are expected to jump from 4 million today to some 100 million by 1980. We'll need 10,000 circuits. At present, there are little more than 500 circuits (for 500 phone calls) for the busiest route, from the United States to Europe.

A single TV channel is equal in bandwidth to 1,000 phone channels. At present, television can't be transmitted directly more than two or three hundred miles. Without satellites, it's hard to see how transoceanic television would be economically feasible.

Communications satellites are coming to the rescue. There are two types. Echo, a passive reflector system, contains no electronics. The satellite reflects or bounces the signal back to ground-based receiver antennas. The second type (in this category are Relay, Telstar and Syncom) is an active satellite system. The satellite contains its own receiver, transmitter, antenna, and power supply. A signal received from the ground by the satellite is amplified and retransmitted back to the ground.

NASA's first communications satellite, Echo I, a 100-foot aluminum-coated plastic balloon, was launched August 12, 1960, and went into orbit at about 1,000 miles. It proved that it's feasible to use passive satellites as radio communication reflectors.

Echo I demonstrated conclusively that satellites, used as reflectors or communications relays, can extend line-of-sight transmissions to intercontinental ranges. Such a satellite can provide tremendous bandwidth capacity. It has been estimated that a single \$40 million active satellite in an equatorial orbit would take care of as much traffic as a half-billion-dollar cable system.

The capabilities of Echo as a "radio mirror" was proved during its first orbit when it transmitted a tape-recorded voice from California to New Jersey—despite a solar disturbance at the time which had blacked out high-frequency long-distance radio communications.

Since then, other communications experiments have included transmission of teletype signals, two-way phone talks using commercial equipment, transatlantic wireless codes, and wire-photos sent from Iowa to Texas. On August 22, 1960, space scientists bounced the first transatlantic voice message off Echo I and later transmitted a recording of "America the Beautiful" from Holmdel, N.J., to listeners in Jodrell Bank, England. The first letter to be processed through outer space—Speedmail—was bounced off Echo I from Stump Neck, Md., to Newark, N.J., on November 10, 1960. Echo I is still in orbit.

This year (1962), the United States is expected to launch at least six new communications satellites. Four are built with Government funds, two are privately financed by A.T. & T.

The NASA satellites, to test two-way telephone, telegraph and television communications, include:

A "passive" Echo II, larger than the first, in a polar orbit.

The active repeater Syncom. At a 22,300-mile altitude, the 55-pound synchronous satellite would have a speed identical to that of

the earth's rotation and thus would appear to be in a fixed position in space. Three of these so-called "24-hour" satellites, suitably placed (one above the Atlantic, a second over the Pacific and the third above the Indian Ocean) could provide world-around coverage. Each could, by line-of-sight transmission, transmit to one-third of the globe.

Relay and Telstar satellites, both of them "active" types, will be orbited at 3,000-mile altitudes. They are designed to demonstrate transoceanic television and multichannel voice and telegraph communication. Each will conduct scientific experiments to produce information about effects of the space environment on electronic components. It has been estimated that 20 to 30 Relay and Telstar satellites would be needed for global radio or television coverage. (Project Telstar is a cooperative enterprise of NASA and A.T. & T.)

The implications of all these efforts are far reaching. Consider what happens when emergencies saturate land lines and people can't "get through" for hours. With communications devices in the heavens, the lines would be virtually foolproof, except for a missile deliberately sent to destroy them. Conventional radio communications, on the other hand, are subject to complete breakdown from magnetic storms.

Before the 1960's are over, a worldwide network of inexpensive and speedy satellite-based links will probably be a reality. First will come telephone calls bounced back by an orbiting sphere, then high-fidelity radio and finally many channeled TV. General David Sarnoff, RCA board chairman, predicts:

"Ten years hence there will be TV stations in virtually every nation on earth. An audience of a billion people might then be watching the same program at the same time. The instrument which will give television's second epoch this distinctive global character is satellite relay television."

New component developments will stimulate and make possible new and exciting needs for communication. One of the most amazing is the LASER (light amplification by stimulated emission of radiation), termed one of the great scientific breakthroughs in recent years. A LASER, built by Minneapolis-Honeywell, throws a light a million times brighter than the sun. In satellite communications, a LASER (described as coherent light) could send signals thousands of miles. One beam from a LASER theoretically can carry as much information as 25,000 of our present television channels. (As noted earlier, a LASER has other important uses, as in eye surgery.)

Appraising the eventual global impact of our communication satellites, Senator WARREN MAGNUSON recently observed:

"Everywhere in the world people will welcome visual instruction on how to decrease mortality by the adoption of simple health measures. Everywhere they will welcome programs on how to increase their food production. Everywhere they will welcome news telecasts of events affecting them. The communications satellite can be the most valuable manmade instrument of good will and understanding in history."

AIR TRAVEL IN THE FUTURE

"In the not too distant future," predicts Gen. James H. Doolittle, "we may be able to fly, or project ourselves, from Los Angeles to New York in half an hour or from Los Angeles to Paris in one hour."

Aeronautics, obviously, has received a tremendous impetus from space era advances. Flight equipment, engines, automatic pilots, radar systems—all required to meet the high standards demanded by spacecraft—will show a vast improvement over prespace aircraft.

Now in the concept stage, new supersonic transports are based partly on the results

of our X-15 research planes and other advanced aerospacecraft. These planes, which will have adapted some of the operating elements of space vehicles, will fly 1,500 miles an hour, at an altitude of 50,000 feet or more.

"Aircraft manufacturers," says J. R. Dempsey of General Dynamics Astronautics, San Diego, Calif., "are already beginning to think of boosters and launch vehicles as the trucks of space. In the next few years, improved air traffic, navigation and control devices will also be developed and these will be based in large degree on navigation satellites and radio and inertial guidance systems originally built for missiles."

Another outgrowth of aerospace research is the Posifix rescue system developed by the Douglas Aircraft Co. of Santa Monica, Calif. This system uses radio signals to accurately fix the location of downed pilots up to a distance of 150 miles.

The Minneapolis-Honeywell Regulator Co. of Minneapolis, recently announced a new pushbutton autopilot for light business aircraft, based on principles derived from research into control of space vehicles. The system makes it possible for an inexperienced pilot to fly as smoothly and safely as a professional. The feature of the autopilot, shared in common with the hypersonic X-15 and the Air Force's Dyna-Soar manned space glider, is a computer which virtually "thinks for itself" or adapts automatically to compensate for varying flight conditions such as speed, altitude, weight and wind gusts.

Flying will be safer, too. According to the International Telephone & Telegraph Corp., navigation equipment and techniques are being applied to solve the increasingly severe problems of air traffic control.

NAVIGATION WILL BE REVOLUTIONIZED

The Transit program, an experiment carried out by the Navy, has proven the feasibility of precise navigation at sea via satellite, even when the stars are completely obscured by clouds. Envisioned are several satellites receiving, storing and relaying navigational orientation to ships anywhere in the world, in all kinds of weather.

Three successful launches were conducted in Project Transit. Such a satellite navigation system will be able to operate in fair weather or foul, day or night. It will not be necessary for a navigator to see with the naked eye a body of land on which he is sighting. Four satellites would permit determination of position at any place on earth, every hour and a half. Ships of all nations could take advantage of the system.

It has been predicted that 5 years from now, navigators on ships or planes will no longer need sextants or radio beam finders. To get a "fix" on their position, they will "tune in" on a satellite 400 miles overhead. The navigational information will be fed into a simple computer which will pinpoint their position within five-tenths of a mile.

BENEFITS TO INDUSTRY

At least 9,000 industrial and business organizations worked together to help launch our astronauts into space. The concerns range from giant corporations to tiny, family-held enterprises. Their special fields range from nuts and bolts to the most intricate and sophisticated electronic equipment known to man. Numerous by-products and applications of space research to peaceful uses are emerging virtually every day.

New materials—metals, alloys, fabrics and compounds—created by space activities are already being produced commercially. Many of the fabricated items will be valuable wherever long life, great strength or resistance to high temperatures and radiations are essential. For example, new types of glass have been adapted to filter intense light automatically. From our work in space vacuum and in extreme low temperatures,

new plastics will give industry highly durable, unbreakable products for a variety of purposes, such as plumbing and many personal and household products.

The Brookings Institution reports:

"The development of new materials, including among them many synthetics and composites of synthetics and metals, reflects a concentrated effort to meet the special and unique requirements of space flight. Fabrics to be used must be light in weight, high in strength, resistant to temperature extremes, noncorrosive and tolerant of multiple accelerations.

"Reinforced plastics are being considered for increasingly wide use in missiles and other space vehicles. Silicones, polyesters, epoxyresins, and phenolics reinforced with a variety of materials— asbestos, quartz fibers, graphite cloth, glass fiber, etc.—show mechanical strengths far exceeding most common construction materials. A filament-wound, glass-reinforced epoxy-resin has been developed with the ultimate strength of 130,000 pounds per square inch and density of 0.072 pound per cubic inch, giving it a very high strength-weight ratio. To perform equally well, steel would have to have strength in the neighborhood of 500,000 pounds per square inch.

"Various plastics and new metal alloys could replace traditional fabricating metals, if the costs of the new materials should prove to be competitive with the costs of steel, aluminum and the like. The long life of products utilizing these new materials would substantially lower replacement requirements."

With spacecraft pushing into strange new environments, materials research has been forced into new frontiers. "The metals industry," says J. R. Dempsey of General Dynamics/Astronautics, "is currently undergoing a quiet revolution equal perhaps to the development of aluminum." While at first material developed may prove too expensive for common use, Mr. Dempsey predicts that later "the materials of astronautics may be put to work in consumer products such as the automobile."

One example is PSC-Durock, a ceramic insulation material produced by Packard Bell Electronics of Los Angeles. Originally it was created to withstand the extreme heat generated by exotic rocket fuels. Now it is used as a high temperature and radiation-resistant coating on inreactor sensors employed in the search for an economical way to produce atomic energy for civilian use.

Daystrom, Inc., a subsidiary of Schlumberger, Ltd., developed a metal film precision resistor for use through a wide range of environmental conditions in space exploration. These same precision resistors are now used commercially in analog computers, improving their overall performance. This company feels that its aerospace products have potential in communications, weather reporting and forecasting, navigation, and food processing.

AMF has developed a new hydraulic fluid for use in rocket launching systems where mixtures of regular hydraulic fluid and liquid oxygen could cause an explosion. This new fluid will not burn, even in the presence of 100 percent oxygen atmosphere. It is believed that this new hydraulic fluid will find many uses in aviation and industry.

E. C. Burkhart, president of Genisco, Inc., Los Angeles, believes "the navigation of the space ocean to be as vital to the future of mankind as the exploration of the Vikings, Columbus, or Cortez was to our time. It is inevitable. It is necessary." His company's products, oriented to many phases of the space research effort, have civilian applications. Example: the analog-to-pulse-width digital converter is used in weather stations and accelerometers for inertial navigation.

Technical devices are being applied outside the space effort. The Thiokol Chemical

Corp., of Bristol, Pa., cites its solid propellant rocket motors which are being used for auxiliary power units. Because of their tremendous output, they can move heavy objects or supply a vast amount of electrical or mechanical energy for short periods of time. Another possible application is using small rocket motors for safety brakes to actuate hydraulic systems on runaway trucks or trains or to provide a retrobraking system.

Space vehicles must first be tested in giant vacuum chambers. Besides developing aerospace techniques and vacuum systems important to the systems testing of space vehicles, the Consolidated Vacuum Corp., Rochester, N.Y., has been applying its coating techniques, done under vacuum processes, for the production of costume jewelry, mirrors, glasses, and similar products. Consolidated's vacuum-coating techniques are also being utilized commercially for transistorized TV sets, radios, and other transistor products.

Some companies sit astraddle the space-civilian markets. For example, Texas Instruments, Dallas, produces a number of important devices for space research, including the very important semiconductors. Yet almost anything developed for this area can be adapted to the civilian market to give us smaller and better radios and industrial computers. Conversely, items developed for the civilian market can also be adapted for space research.

Collins Radio of Cedar Rapids is another in this group. This company has developed certain techniques and subcircuits in its aerospace activities that, with modifications, have been applied to the latest commercial FM transmitters, which give better FM system performance.

In mining of taconite (very hard rock) iron ores, jet drilling—"captive rockets" that melt the rock—is actually burning holes for blasting charges. Experts estimate that in less than 20 years we'll be getting about a third of our ores from taconite.

Telemetry, so important in our space vehicles, is being utilized to collect information from inaccessible or dangerous locations. For example, the Bechtel Construction Corp., building the traffic tunnel from San Francisco to Treasure Island, planted telemetry units deep in the slit along the route. Over a 2-year period, the units have monitored seismic and other earth movements to provide the engineers with information they must have. The Caterpillar Tractor Co., Peoria, Ill., installed a telemetering system that enables pistons in experimental engines to broadcast their operating temperatures.

The trend toward improved, high-speed, lightweight computers has been accelerated by space exploration. Naturally, spacecraft need electronic computers to determine the moment of launch, for fixing orbits, navigation and onboard processing of collected data. Because space vehicles are limited in size and weight, the giant electronic brain will soon be replaced by equipment only a small fraction of its present size and cost using solid state techniques.

The impact of this development will be tremendous on industry, business and the professions. One side effect will be the release of much manpower from time-consuming chores, making it available for basic, creative thought. Thus the high-speed lightweight computer is destined to become, more than ever, an integral part of our working lives.

The possibilities include an electronic computer so small that it will fit into a briefcase. Packard Bell's SE-1000 system, the first computer-controlled automatic checkout system built for space vehicle application, has already been adapted to schedule railroads, search for oil and regulate refinery processes.

Remington Rand reports: "The Nation's space program has resulted in the develop-

ment of the UNIVAC ADD series of spaceborne computers. These computers employ the latest in micro-miniaturization techniques, enabling for the first time a computer occupying less than one cubic foot to perform calculations that were at one time limited to computing systems many times larger."

Space-related programs at the Ford Motor Co.'s Aeronutronic Division, Newport Beach, Calif., have developed three amazing computer projects. One, BIAx, is an ultra-high-speed computer element so fast that it can perform 10 million computer operations in the time it takes to pronounce its name. In addition to satellite installations, the tiny elements can be used in computing equipment for language translations, library searching and decoding. Another computer, MIND, artificially duplicates parts of the human nervous system and carries out learning processes. A third type, bio-computer, is leading to a new generation of computers capable of adaptive, or learning processes. All three programs have important space-age application for development of machines with which scientists can investigate distant planets. They may also lead to a wide variety of machines to make auto driving easier and safer, household chores less burdensome and everyday living simpler.

AMAZING NEW SOURCES OF POWER

When we send a three-man expedition to the moon, the fuel cell—a young and promising form of power source—will go along. A fuel cell converts chemical energy directly into electricity; its fuel and oxidant are supplied from outside and, like a car, it will perform as long as the fuel and oxidant continue to be supplied. It has no machinery or working parts. In the spacecraft, in addition to powering radios and running computers, the fuel cell based upon a mixture of hydrogen and oxygen, the fuel cell will supply the astronauts with the purest kind of drinking water. This will be one of its first practical applications. But already the Navy plans to convert some of its diesel submarines to fuel-cell power. And the auto industry is talking of fuel-cell cars.

New sources of power, such as the fuel cell, have been in great demand for our space program, largely because all spacecraft require a compact electrical energy source operating reliably over long periods. The power source must be able to energize equipment and, in some cases, to propel the vehicle after launching.

Besides the fuel cell, much progress has been made with solar power, in which the sun's radiation is converted directly into electricity. Space-stimulated power systems research has also produced the thermionic converter. Nuclear devices have the advantage of needing neither storage units nor heat sources. Eventually this may reduce the cost of large nuclear power stations to service newly developed areas of the world where fuel resources are inadequate.

Still another potential source is plasma power, generated through the use of hot ionized gas. This gas acts as a conductor of electricity. It is simple, rugged and efficient. Already 10 municipal areas along the Mason-Dixon line are preparing to experiment with electric power derived from this source.

The compact new power sources will make possible self-powered home appliances and self-powered industrial equipment.

They will permit the designing of walls for homes and buildings with their own built-in, self-contained heating, cooling, lighting and electrical systems, feeding on fuel cells, small gas flames or free energy from the sun. By the end of this decade, this may turn into a business as huge as space communications.

DIVIDENDS FOR OUR ECONOMY

Directly or indirectly, the benefits from space research and development affect almost every part of the American economy.

"Perhaps the greatest economic treasure," says Dr. Hugh L. Dryden, Deputy Administrator of NASA, "is the advanced technology required for more and more difficult space missions. This new technology is advancing at a meteoric rate. Its benefits are spreading throughout our whole industrial and economic system."

The needs of the space program, Representative Edwin Mitchell points out, "Spread across the entire industrial spectrum—electronics, metals, fuels, ceramics, machinery, plastics, instruments, textiles, thermals, cryogenics, and a thousand other areas."

Western Electric, which coordinated all electronic tracking for the Mercury project, estimated that about 5,000 companies were involved in its portion of the project. The McDonnell Aircraft Co., which built the Mercury capsule, counted about 4,000 companies as participants in its manufacture, as subcontractors or as direct or indirect suppliers.

Clearly, our space program is providing the incentive to American industry to remain in the world's technological vanguard. As the Baldwin-Lima-Hamilton Corp., Waltham, Mass., puts it: "The Nation's space program has indeed compelled our Electronics and Instrumentation Division into technological research and development into new areas. It is continually forcing us to higher accuracy standards and the development of new products which would probably have been developed eventually, but were developed much sooner because of the stimulation received."

When growth industries, such as chemical, communications, electronics, and metallurgy, join the space effort, inevitably it means new jobs, new job categories. Andrew Haley, past president of the International Astronautical Federation, believes that within two decades the space and astronautics field will outdistance the giant automotive industry. As a great new industry spur in the Nation, astronautics and space could fill the gaps in employment ranks being left by automation.

New careers are opening up for our youth and our school curriculums will have to include opportunities in the space field. At Seattle, for instance, where the Second Conference on the Peaceful Uses of Space will be held, students and teachers will find a new world of knowledge in the remarkable exhibits set up by NASA and industries.

AND MORE TO COME

Not tomorrow, nor next year, will all the predictions of the space experts emerge as realities. But the magnitude of the space era potentials is evident.

"As our space explorers venture farther into the unknown," says James E. Webb, NASA Administrator, "we can expect countless other practical values as yet undreamed of. Whatever our investment in this great enterprise of the century, the feedback will be well worth the price."

Vice President LYNDON B. JOHNSON, Chairman of the National Space Council, recently underscored this point: "Our entire space program—even at the peak planned for next year—is costing annually less than the \$5 billion we spend on face powder, lipstick, and nail polish. And it is estimated conservatively that our space outlays will yield \$2 return for every \$1 invested; for every nickel we put into it, we get a dime back. The real and legitimate goal of science is the endowment of human life with new inventions and riches. That is the goal of our space effort today—to endow all of human life, in all lands, with new inventions and riches."

PRINCIPAL SOURCES OF MATERIAL

A special survey of major industrial firms engaged in space research and development. Report to the Congress from the President of the United States, January 1962.

Astronautics, October 1961.

"Proposed Studies on the Implications of Peaceful Space Activities for Human Affairs," prepared for NASA by the Brookings Institution.

Report of the Committee on Science and Astronautics, U.S. House of Representatives, 87th Congress, 1st session, March 24, 1961.

"The Practical Values of Space Exploration," report of the Committee on Science and Astronautics, U.S. House of Representatives, 86th Congress, 2d session (July 5, 1960), U.S. Government Printing Office.

"The Peacetime Uses of Outer Space," edited by Simon Ramo (McGraw-Hill, 1961).

"Speaking of Space," edited by Richard M. Skinner and William Leavitt (Little Brown & Co., 1962).

Proceedings of the First National Conference on Peaceful Uses of Space, Tulsa, Okla., May 26-27, 1961.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, is there further morning business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

JAMES M. NORMAN

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Chair lay before the Senate the unfinished business.

There being no objection, the Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 1361) for the relief of James M. Norman.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, so that our colleagues may be notified that we are coming rather close to the conclusion of this brief session, 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. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

IS IT TRUE THAT OUR PRESENT TREATMENT OF INCOME EARNED ABROAD BY AMERICAN-DIRECT INVESTMENTS HAS AN ADVERSE EFFECT ON OUR BALANCE OF PAYMENTS?

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, as I stated on the floor on April 17, 1962, I expect to present for the RECORD my comments on the question, Are direct investments in oversea subsidiaries beneficial to the U.S. economy?

I expect to present factual information in answer to the questions I then raised.

My remarks today and in the days that follow on this subject will be in relation to our tax laws and the proposals of the administration for changes in these laws. My remarks are not to be construed as pertaining to the administration's proposals for trade agreement legislation, tariff revision, or for a delegation of powers over tariff to the President.

Those matters will be considered later by the Senate Finance Committee and the Senate. Although I do not favor the administration's trade proposals I shall at this time speak about the tax proposals only.

I intend to discuss the question as to whether it is true that our present treatment of income earned abroad by American direct investments has an adverse effect on our balance of payments.

Every Senator is necessarily concerned with our continued overall deficit in the balance of payments and the continued reduction in our gold reserves. It is well recognized by the President of the United States that these pressures would not exist were it not for the necessity of maintaining troops abroad and supplying economic assistance to underdeveloped countries. The private sector of our economy not only is in balance but is producing substantial surpluses which have been used to defray the cost of necessary Government programs overseas. It is essential that any proposed changes in our tax laws do not result in a worsening of the overall balance of payments by reducing the surpluses presently generated in the private sector of our economy.

The junior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] was correct when he stated on February 19 that there are inadequacies in our overall statistics involving income from foreign investments as well as the net dollar outflow for new investment. Certainly every effort should be made to secure the most accurate data that we possibly can; nevertheless, the junior Senator from Tennessee in discussing the data for the year 1960 said:

Income from foreign investments amounted to \$3.2 billion, certainly an important item. Of this amount, direct investment income amounted to \$2.3 billion. We ought to be receiving a much greater return from foreign operations. This, it seems to me, is out of proportion * * *

In the first place receipts from direct investment in the amount of \$2.3 billion is not an inconsiderable amount. The statement that we should be receiving a much greater return from foreign operations fails to consider a number of important factors: The majority of foreign direct investments are relatively new. It is expected that any enterprise—domestic or foreign—will not yield a high return during the early years of its development. Furthermore, profits which may be realized are plowed back into the business so that it may grow to its maximum effectiveness. If there is a strong prospect of a higher return in future years, there is every reason for prudent management to reinvest earnings abroad so that the future profits which may be remitted as dividends may be larger and, of course, the U.S. Government will receive 52 percent of the results of such investments. The fact that our investment accounts overall do produce a return to the United States clearly shows that such foreign investment has been profitable and by permitting it to grow in a natural way will help to rectify

¹ CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Feb. 19, 1962, p. 2425.

the present deficit in our overall international accounts.

The remarks by the junior Senator from Tennessee apparently fail to give adequate consideration to the fact that if American investments were not made in areas with good market potentials, similar investments would be made by nationals of other countries. Should this occur, in the long run, there would be no net balance in our favor on investment accounts.

Mr. Donald C. Alexander, a partner in the Cincinnati law firm of Taft, Stettinius & Holister, discussed the balance of payments before the Committee on Ways and Means. He said:

Under present law the investment of U.S. corporations in foreign subsidiaries located and operated in the more developed countries creates a situation favorable to the generation of earnings. Although official figures show a substantial portion of such earnings is remitted each year as dividends, the remainder is reinvested to generate increased earnings in future years. This reinvestment may be in the same country or in a different one, perhaps one that is a so-called less developed country. It is obvious that, in the long run, the present tax treatment of these foreign subsidiaries will have a very favorable effect on our balance-of-payments position, and one that will outweigh any temporary advantage that could result from taxing the income of these foreign business operations, as earned, under the heavier burden of our tax structure. This is true even under the assumption that foreign business ventures would continue with investment practices followed under current law; however, it seems apparent that the administration proposals will have an adverse effect on further investment in existing overseas companies, and a particularly adverse effect on new investment in new foreign business ventures. Thus the difference will be greatly magnified.

It should not be forgotten that the moneys invested and reinvested in the stable developed countries are in general, within the economic power of businesses controlled in the United States. Thus, they represent assets of our country in the balance-of-payments picture and not liabilities.²

Another witness, Mr. Harold D. Arneson, president and general manager of Abbott Laboratories International Co., testified on this aspect of taxing foreign investments. He said:

The suggested taxation would place our company at a distinct disadvantage in competing for business in Western Europe as well as in the developing areas of the world. Our foreign competitors are increasing the use of base company operations. For instance, the OTC in England. They would be pleased to see U.S. private investments overseas shrink and withdraw from world markets. This is just what would happen if our Government is allowed to penalize American industry overseas by taxing unremitted earnings.³

Perhaps the best summary of the contribution of direct foreign investment by American firms to our economy may be found in the testimony of Mr. Ray R.

Eppert, president, Burroughs Corp. He said:

Underlying the tax proposals, it seems to us, is a basic misunderstanding of the purpose and function of direct American investment abroad. American direct investments are made to take advantage of potential demand, to satisfy potential markets that cannot be served through U.S. exports. Last, but not least, American business trades and invests abroad in order to remain competitive with foreign competitors and to maintain and expand exports as part of a balanced worldwide marketing effort.

There is no alternative to American business investing abroad if we are to hold and expand markets for American enterprise. This is vital to the maintenance and expansion of the number of jobs in the United States and the attainment of a maximum export trade surplus. Stated differently, this overseas activity contributes greatly and directly to our domestic economy.

The tax proposals would treat American direct investment abroad much more harshly than foreign investments are treated by other countries with which we compete. This would weaken American business abroad since foreign-earned income is generally not taxed by other countries until returned to the parent company and in some instances not at all, as, for example, Canada.

Increasing the cost of doing business abroad would also seriously injure America's economy. We know of no other case where a country proposed a program to make it more difficult for itself or its citizens to compete with foreigners for world markets.⁴

The junior Senator from Tennessee expressed concern in his statement of February 19 that not only were the returns from foreign investment inadequate but that capital outflows exceed the inflows of dividends and interest in the case of the developed countries of Western Europe and that we were receiving a considerable net income from underdeveloped countries. He believes that this is unfortunate inasmuch as the underdeveloped countries are the areas of the world that we are trying to assist.

Again a careful review of the entire testimony before the Committee on Ways and Means provides a further perspective to appraise American direct investment in developed countries with our foreign policy objectives to provide assistance to the underdeveloped nations. It is not generally realized that a large portion of the income presently received from underdeveloped countries is only made possible because of investments by U.S. concerns in developed areas.

Mr. E. G. Collado, director of the Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey, testified on this aspect of foreign investments. He said:

A further objective of the administration is to redirect private foreign investment from the industrially developed to the developing countries. In the administration view, U.S. investment in the advanced countries is no longer needed, whereas investment in the developing countries continues to serve the national interest.

There is no reason to believe that foreign investment denied outlet in Europe will seek outlet in the developing countries. The quantitative importance in foreign investment of so-called footloose industries, that is, industries willing to shift their base of

operations in response to marginal investment advantages, has often been exaggerated.

The location of the bulk of foreign investment is determined by basic consideration of markets, costs, and sources of supply and will not be affected by marginal incentives. These foreign investments will not be made at all if tax penalties make them economically unattractive.

Foreign investment is also closely tied into a network of world trade which cannot easily be sliced into segments of developing country trade and developed country trade.

This interdependence is seen clearly from the experience of the oil industry. Investments in the industrially developed countries provide the market for most of the crude produced in the developing countries. Let me illustrate. Over the past decade U.S. oil companies have spent in excess of a billion dollars to develop additional crude oil producing and transportation capacity in the Middle East. Without the markets in Western Europe assured by these investments in refining and distribution facilities, the American oil companies could not have justified such large investments in the Middle East.

A great deal of emphasis has been given in these hearings to a regional comparison of income received and new funds invested over the past few years. It has been claimed that, over the period 1957 to 1959, this comparison shows a deficit of \$200 million for the industrially advanced countries and a surplus of \$1.7 billion for the developing countries.

Such a comparison ignores the complementary nature of much of foreign investment. It also overlooks the fact that a substantial portion, perhaps as much as 40 to 50 percent, of the income attributed to U.S. operations in the developing countries is actually earned in Europe, Canada, and Japan largely through sales to affiliated enterprises in these countries.

The alleged regional imbalance of income received and new funds invested quite simply reflects a failure to take into account the interdependence of U.S. foreign investment and foreign operations in different parts of the world.⁵

Mr. Collado also provided a table which compared the percentage of earnings distributed by Western Europe subsidiaries of American corporations from 1957 to 1960 which shows that in 1957, 47 percent of earnings were distributed and that they reached a high of 61 percent in 1959. During this same period of years, U.S. corporations distributed between 50 and 60 percent of their earnings as dividends to domestic stockholders. Hence, there does not seem to be too great a disparity between the operations of foreign subsidiaries and the parent U.S. corporations.

Mr. President, another witness, Mr. Arneson of the Abbott Laboratories clearly demonstrated that in terms of his own company's investments in the developed countries that the principal source of funds to invest in underdeveloped countries was derived from the profits in the developed countries. In many descriptions of foreign taxation, the term "tax haven" has been used in a manner that suggests tax avoidance for such an operation. Mr. Arneson said:

Abbott carries on all of its trading activities outside the Western Hemisphere through the use of a base company. During the past 5 years 48 percent of Abbott's base company's earnings were derived from industrial

² President's 1961 Tax Recommendations, hearings before the Committee on Ways and Means, House of Representatives, 87th Cong., 1st sess., vol. 4, pp. 2868-2869.

³ Ibid., p. 2856.

⁴ Ibid., p. 2830-2831.

⁵ Ibid., pp. 2672-2673.

countries of the world, and 52 percent from the so-called developing countries. Upon analyzing the use of these earnings, we have found that 82 percent of the base company's funds that have been reinvested abroad, have gone into the developing countries, and only 18 percent back into the industrial countries.⁶

Mr. President, I purposely cited testimony relating to specific companies which avoids the qualifications and statistical problems involved by using Department of Commerce estimates of global activities. The House Ways and Means Committee testimony conclusively shows that American investments in developed countries are positive assets when we consider our balance-of-payments problem.

For example, table B76 in President Kennedy's Economic Report sets forth our international statistics for the years 1956 to September 1961. When these data are consolidated for the entire period, we find that total U.S. payments for all accounts were \$162,017 million. U.S. direct investments represented a net outflow of \$9,271 million. During this same period the income received from direct investments totaled \$12,998 million. Our total gold sales over the entire period were \$3,889 million. The net excess of receipts from direct investments over new investments totaled \$3,727 million. If private investments had not been made and these receipts had not been obtained, our international overall statistics would be far less favorable, and we might find that our gold supply was in serious jeopardy.

The junior Senator from Tennessee compares the dividends paid by domestic corporations in 1960 with new money going into them. He suggests that this ratio should be applicable to oversea subsidiaries. He said:

Taking our domestic operations as a guide, we find that dividends paid by domestic corporations in 1960 amounted to more than 160 percent of new money going into these corporations. With this as a guide, our foreign corporate subsidiaries ought to be sending home in dividends at least 60 percent more than new money we send abroad to pump into them. * * *

Applying this yardstick to all subsidiaries, it would appear that our foreign subsidiaries could together contribute a \$1 billion improvement each year in our balance of payments * * *.

As I have already indicated, many foreign investments are new, and they have yet to attain their maximum earning capacity. On the other hand, some firms have had an opportunity to reinvest a substantial capital over a period of many years so that dividends based on this well-developed structure would naturally represent a sum in excess of new direct investments.

The junior Senator from Tennessee completely disregards the fact that in corporations where U.S. nationals are not the sole stockholders, dividend policies cannot be adopted solely to return the maximum dollar exchange to the United States. Such a course would

inevitably result in resentment toward this country and would jeopardize our commercial relations with many nations.

Other developed countries are seeking to establish themselves throughout the world and are giving many preferences to their investors that have never been accorded U.S. firms venturing overseas. New restrictions on the accumulation of surpluses by foreign corporations would only tend to cause their abandonment by U.S. parent corporations. This would result in foreign firms facing no competition in this field.

It is doubtful that any Senator would advocate such a course. Again, Mr. Arneson places this problem in better perspective. He said:

I should like to comment also briefly on some principles of taxation which are being propounded by a few tax theorists and doctrinaires with little regard to our country's stake in international trade and the challenge of the industrial competition throughout the world. There must be fuller recognition by our Government that business has to be conducted in foreign areas on the basis of the customs and the laws of these areas, and that American industry overseas should not be hampered by laws, rules, and regulations, including tax laws, which were designed for the regulation of business in the United States. It is a grave misconception to believe that U.S. companies overseas are presently getting special tax incentives from our Government. Quite the contrary, in fact. For example, as long as an American industry abroad is not given full credit by our Government for income taxes that are waived by a foreign country, U.S. concerns will be gradually losing to competition of these foreign firms.

What should be considered, too, is that income taxes in most foreign countries are a smaller part of the total burden on business than in the United States. On the other hand, sales taxes, turnover taxes, 25 percent in France for example, transmission taxes, manufacturers' excise, capitalization taxes, property taxes, and a host of others are usually much higher in other Nations than in the United States.

The U.S. manufacturer overseas is penalized by our Government which allows credit for foreign income taxes only, not for the rest of these taxes. In other words, U.S. industry overseas pays all of the local non-income taxes which I have mentioned, plus a total of 52 percent on the resulting net income, while our foreign competitors often pay a much lower total amount of tax. This situation, I can assure you, is a most serious threat to the future of our own company and portends a significant retreat of American industry in general to the benefit of foreign competitors in the world markets.⁷

Mr. Robert R. Schorn, the tax counsel of American Radiator & Standard Sanitary Corp., showed that in the case of his company the American parent total investment in foreign subsidiaries is considerably less than its present net equity. In this instance it totals less than \$10 million and no subsequent investment was made after 1930. Through the reinvestment of earnings, at present, the net equity is \$58 million and more than \$30 million has been repatriated to the United States in the last 10 years on which U.S. taxes were paid. All this was made possible by permitting an orig-

inal investment of \$10 million to grow under favorable conditions so that as other newer foreign investments mature, the dividends repatriated to the United States will grow.

Arguments against the administration's proposals to tax earnings of foreign investments are quite well stated by Mr. Schorn. He said:

The proposals would not help to redress the balance of payments, but would actually adversely affect this balance to the extent that they would discourage American expansion abroad, which has the purpose and effect of bringing more dollars back to the United States than are invested in foreign countries. This point is more fully developed below.

There is no reason to assume that investment not made in or withdrawn from developed countries would be rechanneled to undeveloped countries, since this presupposes an interchangeability of markets, available resources, manpower, skills, etc., which in fact does not exist.

Since in many developed countries the combined effective corporate income and dividend withholding tax rates are not significantly different from the U.S. corporate income tax rate, the proposals would to this extent produce no important additional revenue; on the contrary, they would tend to decrease revenue, since the substantial expenses of compliance would be borne to the extent of 52 percent by the U.S. Treasury.

The accounting, legal, and other services required to satisfy the requirements of the proposals are very extensive and burdensome. Foreign corporations affected by the proposals would in effect have to maintain an additional set of books for U.S. tax purposes and would have to submit their proposed and executed transaction to scrutiny from a U.S. tax standpoint.

Complex problems of interpretation would arise in connection with the computation of a foreign corporation's earnings and profits by U.S. standards, as, for example, in the area of foreign exchange valuation.

The international implications, both economic and political, of the proposals, are unfortunate, both as to substance and as to timing.

The proposals tend to create the impression that the United States is financially weak, and this is calculated to impair our world prestige and to lessen the attractiveness of our leadership for neutral nations.

The fact that the United States will continue to give substantial economic assistance to many countries, including so-called developed countries, is unlikely to offset this damage to our worldwide image, although it will more than offset any revenue gain from the proposals. Indeed, the statement that the proposed list of developed countries is for use only for tax purposes and "is not intended to suggest whether or not U.S. economic assistance * * * may be justified" indicates both the insincerity of the approach and the awareness of the difficulties inherent in it. The proposals may thus fairly be characterized as having as their theme: aid, not trade.

Similarly, they constitute an act of economic isolationism, without even the short-run financial benefits which such a policy could normally be expected to offer.

The proposals for the immediate taxation to the U.S. parent of undistributed profits of a foreign corporation in which it may own a very small interest will undoubtedly be interpreted by the foreign economic community and governments as an unwarranted interference in their affairs, particularly since the proposals proceed by way of disregarding foreign corporate entities and are

⁶ Ibid., p. 2848.

⁷ CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Feb. 19, 1962, p. 2426.

⁸ President's 1961 Tax Recommendations, op. cit., pp. 2855-2856.

to be implemented by onerous administrative requirements sought to be imposed by U.S. law on the foreign corporation itself. Such a policy would also invite reprisals against U.S. enterprises wherever possible.

The proposal for the immediate taxation of undistributed profits of foreign subsidiaries, as well as those for the elimination of so-called tax haven companies and exclusion of foreign-earned salaries, add up to a resounding Yankee go home. They will effectively take the United States out of the running as a capital-exporting country (i.e., exporting capital through trade, as distinguished from aid), and will leave the field to other capital-exporting countries with more forward-looking policies.⁹

Our colleague, the senior Senator from Maryland, in an address delivered in Pittsburgh on March 21, 1959, predicted the difficulties we are now facing because of our unfavorable overall international gold balance. He showed that this situation resulted from the activities of our Federal Government and not from normal private economic activities by investors throughout the world. He said:

On Friday, March 13, President Eisenhower requested the Congress to approve \$4 billion in additional funds for the mutual security program. I believe that it is essential for us to assist our allies in strengthening their defenses to meet the onslaughts of atheistic communism; however, very few of our citizens comprehend the magnitude of the President's request.

Fortune magazine in its July 1958 issue ranked America's leading industrial corporations in terms of their sales. On the basis of this list, I find that the taxes paid in 1957 by 44 of our largest industrial corporations do not equal \$4 billion. In fact, they paid taxes to the Federal Government in the amount of \$3,811 million. These taxes in turn were predicated on sales of \$91 billion worth of products. The production of these goods required the use of assets costing \$73 billion. The production to furnish these taxes required the employment of more than 4 million employees. These taxes merely support the foreign aid program. Remember, this leaves nothing for our own defense expenditures, interest on the public debt, veterans, agriculture, reclamation, education, slum clearances, public housing, urban renewal, and the countless other programs suggested for our own economic development.

I might add that the 44 corporations I have listed obviously include many whose headquarters are centered in Pittsburgh, such as the United States Steel Corp., Westinghouse, the Aluminum Co. of America, the Jones & Laughlin Steel Co., and Gulf Oil, as well as other leading firms such as General Motors, Ford, Chrysler, General Electric, Du Pont, and the major oil companies.¹⁰

The senior Senator from Maryland also stated:

American citizens are not permitted to convert paper dollars into gold; however, foreigners have this opportunity. In recent years we have been providing them with dollar resources to enable them to draw on our gold balances. Unless we maintain competitive prices in world markets and bring about a balance in terms of our international payments our economy is headed for serious trouble.

In 1948 U.S. gold stocks reached a postwar high of \$24.6 billion. At the end of last year they stood at \$20.6 billion, a decline of

\$4 billion. The reduction in 1958 alone totaled \$2.3 billion. In fact, the monthly figures show a falling gold stock for every month since January 1958. While a \$20 billion gold stock provides an adequate base for our currency, it must be self-evident that a decline of about 10 percent a year can no longer continue without completely destroying our own economic system. This, perhaps, is the best way for us to fully appreciate the impact of unsound economic policies, since an excess of demands for dollar payments abroad over purchases from us will sooner or later be reflected in our monetary reserves.¹¹

The great virtue of a free enterprise economy as compared with other economic systems is that it provides flexibility so that management may adopt policies which maximize profit opportunities.

This often entails foreign investment, export sales, and perhaps licensing arrangements. It is naive to suggest that the management of any American firm is not aware of the necessity of providing adequate dividends to its stockholders. Since the vast majority of them are American citizens, this entails a flow of dollars to the United States which will, of course, be taxed by the Federal Government.

Testimony before the House Ways and Means Committee showed that a conscious effort is made on the part of most companies not only to reinvest their earnings abroad but also to repatriate the funds to the American stockholders in the form of dividends which of course are taxable.

Mr. Frank X. White, the president of Machine & Foundry International, a subsidiary of the American Machine Foundry Co., Mr. Collado of the Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey, and Mr. Harold D. Arneson of Abbott Laboratories, testified on this matter. Mr. White said:

Investment abroad is being conducted according to a long-range plan based upon capturing and keeping a reasonable share of overseas markets for our products. The plan calls for the return of dividends to the United States for distribution to stockholders in a reasonable period of time, and, at every annual meeting of the company, the management is reminded by the stockholders that, although they support the company's interest in international business, the wait for dividends cannot be and will not be indefinitely sustained.¹²

Mr. Collado said:

Thus, in 1960, we paid out \$485 million in dividends, of which two-thirds was attributable to foreign income. You may be sure that many millions of dollars in U.S. taxes are paid by Jersey shareholders on such income.¹³

Mr. Harold D. Arneson said:

I wish to emphasize that our foreign earnings have always been reinvested abroad for normal business reasons and not to thwart collection of U.S. income taxes. Our company, in common with a vast majority of companies, is publicly held. The stockholders would not permit the indefinite retention of foreign source earnings overseas.¹⁴

¹¹ CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 105, pt. 4, p. 4859.

¹² President's 1961 Tax Recommendations, op. cit., p. 2696.

¹³ Ibid., p. 2672.

¹⁴ Ibid., p. 2856.

There is obviously no conflict between the long-term interest of parent-company stockholders and the U.S. Treasury. They both seek the maximum return in the form of investment income for every dollar which is sent abroad to expand our market position in competition with the well-organized firms throughout the world that can offer not only capital but also management skills and techniques, patents, and scientific programs.

Those firms which through foreign investment are entrenched in local markets will enjoy the fruits of the expansion of the world's economy. Those who are timid and do not venture abroad or are prevented from doing so by restrictions imposed by their own governments will not be in a position to go forward. Of the leading countries of the world, the United States appears to be the only one that is even considering any deterrents to foreign investment.

In his testimony, Mr. Charles I. Derr, vice president of Machinery & Allied Products Institute, stated that:

A foreign subsidiary facilitates contacts with foreign customers, it establishes local identification for the U.S. company, and it permits the kind of market penetration that is not readily available to a domestic which does not have such identification. It leads to more extensive foreign distribution channels. Demand is created for U.S.-manufactured components. Much of the initial investment, incidentally, is offset almost immediately by a demand for and export of American capital goods. And again our records would seem to bear this out.

I sum this all up by saying that this very substantial impact on American exports serves not only to assist in the adjustment of the balance of payments, but contributes materially to employment in the United States.¹⁵

American business, at no cost to the taxpayer, can perform a task that can be achieved in no other manner in overseas operations. Mr. Derr also said:

It makes possible the application of U.S. technology, managerial skills, and resources to the development of industry throughout the world, and particularly in underdeveloped areas. Certainly it contributes to the promotion of friendly relations on a people-to-people basis through the employment of a good many Americans abroad. Third, it brings about a closer and a longer lasting relationship between American business and their foreign counterparts than is ordinarily possible in government.

Business leadership abroad is generally more stable than is government's, so that you have here a continuing relationship of very considerable value in our judgment. Finally, the presence of American business in underdeveloped areas has served largely to dispel the image of America as a race of dollar exploiters. I would suggest that in India, for example, in what might be called head-to-head competition with our Soviet rivals, American business has come off very well indeed. Much of this contribution would be lost and further growth would be retarded, in our judgment, if the administration's proposals were to be adopted.¹⁶

Our balance-of-payments problem cannot be solved by deterring overseas investment or by an export drive.

¹⁵ Ibid., p. 3079.

¹⁶ Ibid., p. 3076.

⁹ Ibid., pp. 2898-99.

¹⁰ CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 105, pt. 4, p. 4857.

The American dollar for many years has been one of the world's principal currencies. Without our seeking world responsibilities, they have been thrust upon us. The role of our private over-sea investments over the long term was set forth in the June 1961 Monthly Letter on Business and Economic Conditions, of the First National City Bank of New York. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that excerpts from this bulletin be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

In his tax package President Kennedy recommended overhauling the tax treatment of income earned by Americans abroad. Secretary Dillon presented the proposals before the House Ways and Means Committee and pressed for prompt enactment.

The principal and most controversial proposals would make a far-reaching change in the long-established tax treatment of profits earned abroad by American firms operating through foreign subsidiaries. At present, such earnings are taxed in the country where the subsidiary operates and then again in the United States when they are distributed to the parent company in the form of dividends. Earnings retained abroad are not subject to U.S. tax. It is now proposed that the United States should tax earnings retained abroad by foreign subsidiaries in economically advanced countries. Profits earned and reinvested in developing countries would continue to be eligible for what the administration proposals call the "privilege of tax deferral" (postponement). The tax burden on dividends from both areas would be increased by technical changes.

The idea is not only to enlarge U.S. tax revenues, but to make over-sea investment in advanced countries less attractive to American industry. Thus it introduces a new concept of public policy. Ever since the United States, which was benefited for many decades—and still is—by foreign investment in its own development, became in turn a capital generating and exporting country, it has been believed that U.S. investment abroad helped other countries by building up their production, stimulating their economic growth, and increasing their trade. Similarly, it helped the United States by expanding markets for U.S. products, building U.S. assets abroad and providing a flow of income back to the U.S. investor. Economic history is filled with lessons of these mutual benefits. The history of Great Britain, whose investments helped build other countries and whose over-sea assets in turn aided immeasurably in her fight for survival through two world wars, is a dramatic example.

The benefits of the flow of capital over international boundaries, which indeed is as natural as the flow of water from one level to another, have seldom been questioned in principle, though to be sure there has been much controversy on nationalistic or other narrower grounds. In these days of widespread Government grants and aids, there seems special reason not to discourage the investment of private capital, which brings a return flow of income in support of the balance of payments and tax revenues, and which ought to be encouraged and expanded to lighten the burden the Government programs lay on the taxpayer.

The new proposals therefore raise fundamental questions. One argument advanced for them is that they would reduce private capital outflows and bring about increased remittances to this country, thus helping to overcome the balance-of-payments deficit and win the battle to safeguard the dollar.

Another is that the change would make the tax system more equitable. The basic issues include not only these points, but how economic growth, production, trade, and capital formation everywhere would be affected.

Implicit in the use of the balance-of-payments argument is an assumption that private capital investment is at least a bad boy, if not the bad boy, in the U.S. balance-of-payments problem. This, however, is contradicted by readily available figures.

Despite the implications that American corporations have been hiding income in tax havens abroad, the fact is that data of the U.S. Department of Commerce show that American corporations do bring home, for inclusion in U.S. income tax returns, large and growing amounts of earnings. Remittances of income, year after year, are larger than the outflow of new funds going into plants abroad—so-called direct investment.¹⁷

Mr. President, it is unfortunate that the administration in attempting to justify its proposals to tax undistributed earnings of foreign corporations should base its position on the need to improve our balance of payments. This is predicated on data involving our international accounts with Western Europe particularly over the 4-year period 1957 through 1960. The fact of the matter is that in the first 3 of these 4 years, 1957 through 1959, there was a favorable balance. One widely publicized transaction involving the purchase of the foreign-owned stock of the Ford Motor Co. subsidiary in the United Kingdom resulted in an outflow of approximately \$376 million.

By carefully selecting the period for study it is possible to develop almost any argument with reference to our balance of payments. However, such a course is unfair to our national interest. The only meaningful data is to examine the results over a sufficiently long period of time to reveal probable future trends. While I agree with the junior Senator from Tennessee that the Department of Commerce data are not necessarily conclusive, I am confident that over a long period of time the discrepancies tend to cancel each other.

Mr. President, let us not lose sight of the fact that the best official data show that in every year since 1950 income returned to the United States from direct private investment overseas has exceeded net capital outflows.

During a 10-year period the aggregate repatriated income on investment accounts exceeded new investments by more than \$8.5 billion. Whether we examine the data submitted by specific companies concerning their own operations or whether we consider official overall data we find that foreign investment provides a net flow of dollars to the United States which is subject to taxation in this country. Private direct investments overseas have played a major role in making it possible for the U.S. Government to assume the heavy burdens of defense and foreign economic assistance.

Mr. President, I intend to discuss further aspects of the administration's proposals with reference to the taxation of foreign subsidiaries of U.S. corporations as the Senate Finance Committee continues with its current hearings.

¹⁷ Ibid., p. 3320.

PRICE INCREASES AND INFLATION

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, recently there has been much discussion in this body and throughout the country about price increases and the imperative need of holding the line against inflationary trends. I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Alerting Mr. Kennedy to a Price Rise," published recently in the Chicago Daily Tribune.

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

ALERTING MR. KENNEDY TO A PRICE RISE

A rise of at least a half cent a quart in the price of milk by July 1 is being forecast because of impending higher labor costs for dairies. Fred Nonnamaker, executive secretary of the Associated Milk Dealers, Inc., estimates that on May 1 plant workers will receive an increase in pay and fringe benefits totaling 43.67 cents an hour, which will boost their average pay to \$137.30 a week (not including fringe benefits).

Milk wagon drivers are scheduled to get a total increase of 13.45 cents an hour in pay and fringe benefits, and their average pay will go up to \$135.92 a week for home delivery, and \$221.68 for store delivery.

These increases are the second and last under a 2-year contract, negotiated last July in settlement of a strike. Mr. Nonnamaker says the higher costs cannot be absorbed by the dealers because their net profit is generally between a fifth and a third of a cent a quart.

In fact, he said, a milk price increase on May 1 probably was averted by a scheduled decline, equivalent to a half cent a quart, in the price paid to farmers. The farm price of milk is scheduled to go up again on July 1. These adjustments, based on seasonal factors, will take place under an agreement between farmers and dealers.

If the price hike occurs, it will be interesting to observe the reaction in Washington. Will President Kennedy, who became so agitated over the proposed price increase in steel, now speak out with similar vigor in behalf of consumers of milk?

Mr. Kennedy's excuse for condemning the steel companies and threatening them with punitive action, which caused them to call off the announced steel price increase, was that benefits granted labor in the recent negotiations did not justify a price rise. In the case of Chicago area dairies, the dairy workers' and milk wagon drivers' unions appear to have received more substantial benefits.

If he is consistent, Mr. Kennedy will be as forthright in condemning actions of unions that raise the cost of food as he was in condemning the steel companies.

AUTHORIZATION TO SIGN ENROLLED BILLS

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that during the period of time between now and Monday, April 23, the President pro tempore or the Vice President be authorized to sign enrolled bills.

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

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, so that Senators may be informed when the Senate completes its work today, it is

planned to adjourn to Monday next at noon. I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock noon on Monday next.

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

TREATY ON GENERAL AND COMPLETE DISARMAMENT

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I wish to address myself to the subject of the basic provisions of the Treaty on General and Complete Disarmament as presented in Geneva, Switzerland, yesterday by the representatives of the U.S. Government at that disarmament conference.

As a longstanding advocate of disarmament under proper safeguards, I was greatly encouraged by the presentation in Geneva yesterday of a new U.S. proposal for a treaty on general and complete disarmament in a peaceful world. Any openminded person who reads this down-to-earth document cannot fail to see that the United States has taken a giant step toward ending the arms race. Never before has a major power made such concrete suggestions, based on such manifest self-interest, for the reduction and elimination of the sources of its power—namely, its military forces, armaments, and weapons delivery systems—with such absolute assurance that as it disarms, its most likely adversaries will have to follow suit.

In other words, they will have to do as is required of us.

President Kennedy is perfectly justified, in describing this draft treaty as "the most comprehensive and detailed proposal in the field of general disarmament ever put forward by any government."

Some people may call this proposed treaty utopian, but only if they also consider "utopian" the goal of a world of law and order free from the menace of accidental or aggressive war and free from the intolerable burden of armaments.

The latest U.S. plan breathes the spirit of its principal author, President Kennedy. Last September in the United Nations General Assembly, President Kennedy challenged the world to end the arms race and to join what he so aptly termed the "peace race." At that time—in the midst of mounting anxiety over a United States-Soviet clash in Berlin—the President said:

Men no longer debate whether armaments are a symptom or a cause of tension. The mere existence of modern weapons—10 million times more powerful than anything the world has ever seen and only minutes away from any target on earth—is a source of horror and discord and distrust. Men no longer maintain that disarmament must await the settlement of all disputes, for disarmament must be a part of any permanent settlement. And men may no longer pretend that the quest for disarmament is a sign of weakness, for in a spiraling arms race a nation's security may well be shrinking even as its arms increase.

These words are even more valid today than they were on September 25, 1961. The balance of terror has not shifted.

Arms and the destructive power of armaments have increased, not diminished. Horror and discord and distrust are still prominent features on the international landscape. The best that can be said today is that for the first time in many, many months there seems to be an international atmosphere conducive to the discussion, if not to the solution, of our problems.

It is therefore singularly appropriate that the President has chosen this moment to again put forward a detailed comprehensive program of disarmament that moves the United States into first place in the peace race. No longer can the Soviet Union claim to have the only disarmament proposal before the Geneva Conference in so-called "treaty" form. We have firmly seized the initiative for peace. We have kept our pledge to the United Nations and to all of humanity that peace with honor and absolute security has the highest priority in American policy. Once again the President has proven that we shall never be afraid to negotiate, but we do not and never shall negotiate from fear.

In the most literal sense of the word, we are negotiating from strength. Our disarmament proposals are presented at a time when the United States has unequaled strength, and when our rivals have shown that they respect our strength in areas of direct confrontation. In short, these are the proposals of a strong nation that seeks to use its military, economic, and political might to lead the world in the paths of peace.

Finally, we have shown that we understand mankind's yearning for a disarmament agreement that rests on something stronger than the thin reed of trust among the great powers. If two men stand with pistols drawn at 10 paces, neither is going to drop his weapon without absolute assurance that the other will do the same. The best way to prevent a suicidal duel through accident or miscalculation is to have an impartial third party to guarantee that neither of the two antagonists will take advantage of the other's momentary weakness. This is why our plan gives such a prominent role to a United Nations peace force capable of safeguarding world peace during and after the process of general disarmament. Stage III of the U.S. proposal stipulates that the United Nations peace force, to be established in stage II, will be progressively strengthened until it has "sufficient armed forces and armaments so that no state could challenge it."

The provision in the draft treaty relating to the United Nations peace force follows many suggestions made by others over the past years. This proposal, however, needs the most careful analysis. We shall want to consider the voting pattern in the U.N., the financing of such a peace force; what would be the command of the peace force; and we will have to ask and find out if such a force is subject to the Security Council or the General Assembly. These questions and many more concerning our relationship to the United Nations need to be clarified and answered. It is the provision that will be the subject of much debate and

dissent. Frankly, I want to know more about it.

Mr. President, the new plan demonstrates the soundness of our judgment last year in establishing the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency. My colleagues in the Senate will recall that on the occasion of the discussion of that legislation I reminded them that we needed to study arms control and disarmament as carefully as we study problems of national security in terms of the defense of this Nation, the military operations that may be required for the defense of this Nation.

I have pointed out repeatedly that in recent years we have neither had an arms policy nor a disarmament policy; we have had a budget policy. A budget policy is hardly adequate for the kind of world in which we live where there is the constant danger of Communist aggression and totalitarian force. Today we have an arms policy and a national security policy, and today we have also a disarmament policy. They are the two sides of the same coin of national security.

The new U.S. plan, Mr. President, shows that our disarmament officials have studied the problems of disarmament and arms control far more thoroughly than have their counterparts in the Soviet Union. Our people have not been content to deal in semantics. For instance, although the draft treaty offers the familiar outline of a three-stage disarmament process, it assigns precise time limits for the completion of the first two stages; it offers a scientifically cheatproof method of verifying disarmament and measuring total military capacity; it grapples with the problem of militarily significant states which may be reluctant to disarm; it provides for the exact categories and types of arms to be progressively reduced; finally, as I have said, it sets up an international police force to fill the vacuum left by the elimination of national forces in the final stage.

The chief Soviet delegate to the Geneva Disarmament Conference apparently finds nothing new in the American proposals and calls them unacceptable.

I cannot dispute that statement, even though Soviet officials privately have expressed interest in our proposals. However, I can say that the U.S. plan contains several features never before seen in any serious disarmament plan.

The most striking new feature of the U.S. disarmament plan, Mr. President, is the verification function of the International Disarmament Organization, which is to be established early in stage I of disarmament. Not only would the IDO be supposed to verify both the reduction and destruction of armaments, but it would employ a unique method of checking up on remaining force levels and arms inventories as disarmament proceeds. This is the so-called spot-check method. Now, this unique feature needs very careful examination. It may not be adequate inspection; nevertheless, it represents a constructive proposal.

It is well known, Mr. President, that the Soviet Union, both in disarmament and nuclear test ban negotiations, has

balked at the idea of opening up its territory to on-site inspections by foreign nationals. This attitude has its roots in the traditional secretiveness and xenophobia of the Russians. Ostensibly they argue that there can be inspection only of the weapons marked for destruction, not of the weapons that remain in their arsenal or the bases where they may be deployed. Anything else, they claim, would be a device for espionage. We should expect this response, for the Soviet Union treats every foreigner that crosses its borders as a potential or actual spy. Why, therefore, should it treat the members of an international control commission any differently—although no rational person would conceive of an international disarmament inspector engaging in espionage for military purposes.

In other words, the Soviet Union has built its own monster, a monster of secrecy and fear. They have to live with that monster. It is suspicious of everyone else. Our task is to break down that suspicion. Our task is to penetrate the crust of secrecy by insisting upon disarmament with international inspection and a control system which is designed for one purpose; namely, to supervise disarmament agreements.

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

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I wish to commend the Senator from Minnesota in presenting this very able speech this afternoon. It is particularly apropos that the speech, presenting the American point of view, should be made by the Senator from Minnesota on this last session of the Senate before Eastertide. I believe at this time it is important that the American people reflect once more and rededicate themselves once more to the spiritual values on which the disarmament program of the United States is based.

I intend to discuss the subject of disarmament briefly later this afternoon. However, I wish to commend the Senator from Minnesota for making his speech. I am glad he is leading off in the discussion. The people of this country should know, if they do not know already—and I am sure millions of them do—that no one in the Senate has contributed more in the past several years to the subject of disarmament than has the distinguished Senator from Minnesota. He and I serve together on the Committee on Foreign Relations. I can rise at any time as his witness to testify to what the Senator from Minnesota has done. I commend him again, as I have in committee, for his great statesmanship on this subject.

It is so difficult to get the people to understand, not only here but also elsewhere, that we will either solve the disarmament problem or we will lose the heritage of our people through increased international tension or war. We do not have much time. I do not know what we can do to get the people, not only in our country, but also around the world, to recognize that this is probably the greatest issue confronting this generation.

It is so easy, as one listens to the flag wavers, to forget that the best way

one can serve that flag is to lead mankind to the acceptance of the American program for disarmament.

As I have said, I shall discuss the subject later, but the Senator is so right in pointing out that we cannot have disarmament unless we have both inspection and control and, as I shall show later, enforcibility also.

Enforcibility cannot be carried out by the President. Enforcibility will have to be carried out through the application of the rule of law by way of the procedures of the United Nations, as the President of the United States has had the courage to tell the American people and the world. He had the courage to say that last September in the magnificent speech he made at the United Nations, and he had the courage to repeat it again yesterday, as he again discussed this subject.

I consider it not only a privilege, but a trust, on my part as a member of the Committee on Foreign Relations, to join the Senator from Minnesota this afternoon, in these relatively few hours before Eastertide, to see what we can do to get the people to think once more positively and constructively in regard to our obligations to mankind to get behind the President in this great statesmanlike drive of his for disarmament.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator from Oregon. The task of working in the field of foreign policy, particularly in the area of disarmament, is one that sometimes is subject to misinterpretation. There are persons in our country and elsewhere who feel that if one discusses disarmament, he is revealing weakness, is indulging in appeasement, or recommending some form of unilateral disarmament which would gravely weaken our national security. I feel certain that every sensible, reasonable person knows that what we are seeking to do is to discuss the complex problem of arms control and disarmament in the framework of, as the Senator from Oregon has said, international inspection and international control, with enforcibility through the institutions of the United Nations, the World Court, and others. No one recommends that we take these actions alone; all these proposals are encased in the doctrine of mutuality. Whatever we do in the field of disarmament must be done by others; it must be all embracing.

I say this because I can almost hear now the charges that will be brought against this proposal and against those of us who think that the proposal deserves the most careful consideration and study.

Everyone knows that when he discusses disarmament, he lays himself open to the false charges of weakness or of being unwilling to face up to the Communist menace. I have tried to say on these problems that the world today has a choice of risks. One is the great risk with which we are living right now, the risk of an ever-increasing arms race, a race which history demonstrates must end in catastrophe. The other is the risk of negotiating a safeguarded agreement to end the armaments race. I would be the last person to say that there was not a risk involved in the lat-

ter alternative; but I think that risk, if we are careful enough in our negotiations, if our plans are meticulously and carefully designed, is the lesser of the two risks.

What is more, as the Senator from Oregon has said, the people of our political faith, the people of our ideals and religious conviction, ought to be the peacemakers, with honor and with justice, and in freedom. There is not a thing wrong in being a peacemaker. The strongest force, the strongest personality, the strongest spirit the world has ever known was a peacemaker; while the weakest man was a warrior, and warmaker.

I am hopeful that in this Easter season we may discuss this subject with sincerity and in the conviction that we yearn for a just and enduring peace, and that we may find the ways and paths to accomplish it.

In any case, the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, under the leadership of Mr. William Foster and with the expert assistance of officials throughout our Government, came up with a plan that tries to meet Soviet objections without compromising our basic objective of controlled, foolproof disarmament. Our draft treaty calls on all nations, but principally the United States and the Soviet Union, to divide their territory into a number of zones and to make a full report at the beginning of each disarmament step as to the type and amount of armaments, forces, and military activity in each zone. There have been suggestions of a checkerboard pattern of 20 zones for each nation.

Once the zones were agreed upon, the International Disarmament Organization would then choose at random one zone to inspect for disarmament and residual military capacity. No one would know in advance what zone was to be inspected, but once it was selected, the home country would give a full accounting of the arms and forces based in the zone, and the IDO would verify the statement. This method would guard the Nation being inspected against full-scale espionage while accomplishing the purpose of progressively total disarmament. A zone once inspected would "remain open for further inspection while verification was being extended to additional zones." Thus, beginning with approximately 5 percent of a nation's territory, disarmament and inspection would extend progressively to 100 percent of the territory by the end of stage II. In this way the most stubborn obstacle to a workable disarmament treaty—the conflict between international and national inspection concepts—would be scientifically overcome.

This spot-check proposal is an ingenious alternative to trust in international relations. I could never understand how such a pathologically suspicious country as the Soviet Union could ever agree to disarmament without controls unless it really intended to cheat while the other fellow disarmed—just as it cheated in breaking the nuclear test moratorium last fall.

At least, it is worthy of serious study, which, I am sure, will result in an improvement of the principle itself. Why

cannot the Soviet Union see that this procedure takes full account of its need for national security? It eliminates any possibility of espionage, and at the same time fulfills the responsibility of safeguarding disarmament.

Without examining every feature of the new disarmament plan, Mr. President, I want to mention one important new proposal which would let disarmament enter its first stage even without the adherence of Communist China. Our disarmament plan entails a reduction of 30 percent in categories and types of weapons which at the present time are possessed in quantity only by the Soviet Union, Britain, and the United States. These include missiles, missile-launching pads, heavy bombers, missile-launching submarines, and the like. Armed Forces personnel would be reduced in stage I to 2.1 million men each for the United States and Soviet Russia. But even if such reductions take place without corresponding reductions by China, none of the great powers would be militarily vulnerable to Chinese aggression.

For one thing, nuclear weapons would be frozen at their existing levels without, however, reducing United States or Soviet nuclear retaliatory power in the first stage. Limitations would be imposed on the production of armaments; the production or transfer of fissionable materials for use in nuclear weapons would be halted forthwith; and a nuclear test ban treaty under international control and inspection would go into effect if it had not already done so.

This is all in stage 1. Plainly none of these measures would permit a shift of the balance of power in favor of Communist China or any other militarily significant state.

However, Communist China would have to abide by the second-stage commitments. In other words, if the second stage is to be fulfilled, then it must include the militarily significant states, particularly Communist China. For at this point, any meaningful disarmament agreement would have to include all nations, and particularly any aggressive military power such as Communist China. Why? Because during stage II those nations which, like the United States and the Soviet Union, had already reduced their armaments by 30 percent would undergo a further reduction of 50 percent. Communist China, therefore, would have to list all its armaments by category and type and would have to make a 65-percent reduction so as to bring itself into line with the other powers. No one is suggesting that Communist China would agree easily to this course, but at least the methods and procedures would be airtight. The great powers could go it alone without China up to a certain point. After that, Communist China would have to follow suit or bear the odium of frustrating mankind's desire for a lasting peace.

This thought leads me to say it is entirely probable that Communist China does not care at all about world public opinion or about bearing the odium of frustrating mankind's desire for a lasting peace. This is a probability and a possibility that we must face.

If in stage II Communist China or other militarily significant states did not adhere, then the treaty would be "off"; there would be no agreement. I wish to make this clear because I have long felt that we could not recommend any form of overall disarmament unless it included all possible major military powers. I do not believe the question of disarmament is strictly one between the United States and the Soviet Union, even though they are the two nations today which have the capacity for a surprise attack; which have the capacity for an all-out nuclear war.

Nevertheless, if there is to be disarmament which provides any modicum or degree of security for the world, it must include Communist China, which is the most aggressive military power today. Fortunately for mankind, Communist China does not have the weapons for massive destruction; it does not have the means to deliver thermonuclear weapons. But we must face the fact that in the years to come, these most destructive weapons and vehicles of delivery most likely will be in the possession of Communist China. That is why the senior Senator from Minnesota is so gravely concerned about the prospects of an expansion of the arms race. The arms race is not merely one between the United States and the Soviet Union; it is not merely a race between the Warsaw Pact countries and the NATO countries.

Every hour of the day, every day of the week, and every day of the month, Communist China comes closer to developing nuclear weapons; and as she does, she also develops missiles and rockets. With more than 700 million people, with her aggressive leaders, with her apparently utter disdain for human life, and with her declared bitterness and hostility toward the West, I say that the day when Communist China gets nuclear weapons and the means of delivering them, not a single mortal will live in peace and security. That will be a dark day for humanity, and will literally be a day of fear, suspicion, and distrust that will know no length or bounds.

Therefore, Mr. President, it seems to me to be imperative that every effort be made by intelligent and rational human beings to bring to a halt the expansion of nuclear weapons, the proliferation of those weapons, and the development of the means of their delivery by nations other than those which now possess them; and even those which now possess them must be willing to agree to inspection and control under effective and balanced controls.

It is very easy for us to talk about our military strength and to presume that it will always be very great. But, Mr. President, the fact is that in the world today there is an antagonist even more belligerent and more aggressive than the Soviet Union, and that antagonist—even with all its problems and weaknesses of today—is Communist China. I warn the American people and the other free peoples of the world that when Communist China gets nuclear weapons and the means of delivering them, all mankind will live in the shadow of death.

That is why we are discussing disarmament. It is not an act of weakness—instead, I say it is an act of bravery and courage—to propose plans of disarmament; and only a great Nation such as ours, with the great power it now possesses, is capable of making this proposal in sincerity. We make it because we have the moral, the political, the military, and the economic strength to make it and because we believe we should be making it.

That is why I rise to commend the President and his associates for their great statesmanlike act.

Mr. President, I have shown that the U.S. proposal is the world's first detailed blueprint for general disarmament on a global scale. It removes any ground for complaint by the Soviet Union that the United States stands for "control without disarmament" or "legalized espionage." It also removes any ground for justifiable criticism here at home that the U.S. disarmament proposals may weaken our security. The U.S. proposal is carefully designed with appropriate safeguards—inspection and controls at every stage and at every step.

I emphasize this point because in speeches made in the Senate and in speeches made elsewhere in the Nation it has been said that these disarmament proposals are unilateral and that they jeopardize our security and would weaken our military strength but would not weaken that of the Soviet Union. Mr. President, I brand such arguments as false, as misrepresentations, and without any foundation in fact. We are not proposing a single thing which in any way would weaken our security. We are proposing staged, step-by-step reductions in disarmaments and a slowing down of the production and accumulation of armaments, not only for ourselves, but also for others; and we have said that unless others accept the inspection, control, and supervision that will guarantee fulfillment of the agreement beyond any shadow of doubt, there will be no agreement. Let us make that point clear before the discussion proceeds further.

Furthermore, in the event of disagreement or noncompliance, the matter could be referred to the United Nations Security Council where we, as well as the Soviet Union, have the power of veto. Although the first two stages are designed to be completed in 6 years, there is no time limit for completion of the third, and final, stage. Final compliance with the treaty could take from 9 to 15 years.

In other places, some have said that in 9 years we would be totally disarmed. But, Mr. President, such talk is irresponsible. There is no guarantee that even in 19 years either we or the Soviet Union would be totally disarmed. The agreement declares that under stage 1 and stage 2, in 6 years, certain things will be accomplished. But stage 3—the important one, which provides for final reduction of arms—will come about only if certain conditions are fulfilled; and they require the establishment of an international disarmament organization of sufficient proportions and sufficient

quality so that we can be sure there will be no cheating, no avoidance of responsibility, and no way in which anyone could in any way disobey or violate the terms of the agreement. It is clearly recognized that the Soviet Union does not trust us, and I am sure the United States does not trust the Soviet Union. Therefore, as Admiral Radford, formerly Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, said in testimony before the Foreign Relations Committee, it is the task of modern statesmen to develop an alternative to trust. He was then speaking of the international inspection system required for disarmament.

We do not trust the Soviets, nor should we; and in every measure or proposal we have presented, we have insisted that there be an alternative to trust, known as the international control and inspection system. No such treaty would ever be ratified by the Senate unless it provided that as a minimum protection.

At no stage will our power, relative to that of any other state or combination of states, be dangerously reduced. Every clause of the treaty is based on the principle that what we do, the Soviets must do. It guarantees that no nation can take advantage of disarmament, to threaten the security of any other nation. It promises the blessings of peace to all nations with the will and the foresight to set in motion the treaty machinery.

Several important aspects of the U.S. plan should be set in motion even before formal ratification of the entire treaty. The treaty is not a package; some parts can be implemented now—separately. I particularly refer to the provision in the first stage for ending nuclear weapons production and development, for guaranteeing the peaceful exploration of outer space. Outer space must be effectively quarantined against weapons of mass destruction in orbit and for reducing the risk of war.

None of these is beyond our grasp at this very moment. Again I call upon the Geneva Disarmament Conference to recommend an immediate special meeting between the United States and the Soviet Union on the means of avoiding accidental war. U.S. efforts in 1957 and 1958 to get an agreement limiting the danger of surprise attack, with special emphasis on the Arctic, were spuriously vetoed by the Soviet Union in the U.N. Security Council. Nevertheless, the time seems ripe to renew these efforts. The scope of any agreement along these lines should be expanded.

There is growing danger of war by miscalculation or escalation, and the world has a right to expect the two greatest military powers to control their weapons of mass destruction. These weapons have become so complex, and yet paradoxically so simple and automatic to unleash, that they could reduce the civilized world to ashes in a matter of minutes. Procedures equally complex and yet simple to operate, must be agreed upon to guard against the danger of war by accident. We have the technical means to destroy ourselves. We must develop and use the technical means to

save ourselves from destruction. Surely this is something as important to Chairman Khrushchev as it is to President Kennedy.

Our press, our magazines, and our public documents have revealed for the world to see the many measures which have been taken by us to prevent accidental war, to prevent the detonation of a nuclear weapon, for example, that may be carried in a B-52 plane that crashes, to prevent the launching of a missile because some electrical or electronic device may be faulty and set off that missile. We have taken elaborate measures to prevent accidental war. My question to the world is, What has the Soviet Union done to prevent accidental war?

Last year I spoke here in the Senate urging our delegation to the U.N. to press a resolution in the U.N. to call upon the Soviet Union to list for the public, for the world, and for U.N. inspection itself, those measures which its military leaders and political officers had taken to prevent accidental war or war by miscalculation.

Every Member of this body knows there is a danger of such possibility every hour. With vast numbers of airplanes on the alert, with our air fleet in the sky loaded with weapons, and with our ships at sea loaded with nuclear weapons, ready to go out at a moment's notice, the danger is there. The same is true of the Soviet Union, and perhaps more so. Our scientists and military leaders have built in an elaborate protective system against the possibility of accidental war. We have told the world about it. In fact, we may have slowed down our retaliatory possibilities because of our concern over accidental war.

Has not humanity the right to know what the Soviet Union has done in that respect? What have the Russians done to prevent the possibility of this happening? Today we stand in ignorance of it. I submit, that at Geneva, even if progress should bog down on every other subject on the agenda, we should press relentlessly, in the name of humanity, and in the name of the Russian people themselves, who could be destroyed by accidental war, for a conference to prevent accidental war or surprise attack.

One step which need not be part of any formal disarmament plan, but which would help establish the atmosphere for meaningful disarmament, would be the proclamation of an International Space Cooperation Year modeled on the International Geophysical Year of 1958. During this year the United States, the Soviet Union, and other interested nations could implement the initial feelers that have already been made for joint space activities. Such cooperation is essential if outer space is to become a laboratory of peaceful research and scientific exploration, rather than a battlefield filled with the hideous weapons of mass production. I first proposed an International Space Cooperation Year a little over a year ago. The need for it is even greater today.

We must seek, above all things else, to prevent outer space from becoming another launching platform for weapons of mass production. Time is running

out. The next 2 to 5 years may well determine whether or not we are going to permit outer space to become a grotesque battlefield that can destroy the entire world, or whether we are going to convert it into a laboratory that will make this world the garden of plenty and happiness it should be.

Finally, even the first steps of a disarmament agreement mean that all nations, great and small, must endow the United Nations and the International Court of Justice with progressively greater power and confidence. With the withering away of the possibility of unilateral military action, nations will have to transfer the settlement of their disputes from the national to the international level.

It is for this reason that I have long felt we ought to strengthen the International Court of Justice and ought to remove from our own adherence to the treaty relating to the International Court of Justice or World Court the so-called Connally reservation. If we want international law, we must have a chance of having international justice when it is especially needed.

In stage 2, for instance, all parties to the disarmament treaty would have to accept the compulsory jurisdiction of the World Court. This would have the effect, if the Senate ratified the disarmament treaty, of nullifying the Connally reservation to our participation in the World Court. Yes, this is a step I have long proposed. It is long overdue. It serves no useful purpose for a free people and for our Nation.

Mr. President, I have given some of my first impressions of the latest U.S. plan for general and complete disarmament. My remarks do not pretend to be a complete and exhaustive analysis. Nor do I say this treaty is all it should be. It is a proposal. It is a draft treaty. It is a beginning. It is a document around which men of good will and reasonable intelligence can negotiate. We can make whatever adjustments are required. I think the plan is a good one which deserves to be studied and to be improved.

I have no illusions about the success it will meet at Geneva, although I am glad to note that our proposals have produced a favorable impression upon many neutral delegates and even upon some Soviet representatives in their off-duty moments.

I understand that the Soviet Union takes a negative attitude on this proposal. It is in a negative frame of mind. But I have never believed the United States should govern its actions or should permit its actions to be determined by the actions of the Soviet Union. Let us establish our own standards. Let us chart our own course. Let us lay down the principles in which we believe, and let us ask others to rally to those principles.

At long last we have come to grips with the problem of disarmament. We have done it fearlessly, courageously, and openly; and I will predict that many of the nations of the world will cheer and herald this initiative on our part. Mark my words, as nation after nation

finds out that the Soviets are unwilling to negotiate, that they are afraid to negotiate, those nations will become our friends—and give sympathetic support to the principles for which we stand.

This plan is a worthy embodiment of the principles of the peace race as enunciated by President Kennedy on September 25, and reiterated by Secretary Rusk at Geneva on March 15. It is a blueprint of which the United States can justly be proud throughout the negotiations that lie ahead.

If accepted in the spirit in which it is offered, if considered in the spirit in which it is offered, it could be a broad steppingstone toward peace.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the "Digest of U.S. Outline of Basic Provisions of a Treaty on General and Complete Disarmament in a Peaceful World," as prepared by the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

DIGEST OF U.S. OUTLINE OF BASIC PROVISIONS OF A TREATY ON GENERAL AND COMPLETE DISARMAMENT IN A PEACEFUL WORLD

(Prepared by the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, Washington, D.C., Apr. 18, 1962)

FOREWORD

The "Outline of Basic Provisions of a Treaty on General and Complete Disarmament" was submitted by the U.S. delegation in order to facilitate progress in the negotiations now taking place in Geneva. This document is based upon the proposal submitted by President Kennedy to the General Assembly on September 25, 1961. The present document, however, represents both an elaboration and modification of the September 25 proposals.

If nations are to agree on a disarmament program, it will be necessary in negotiations to move from general proposals to discussion of more specific and detailed provisions of a disarmament program. The new U.S. document represents an effort to set forth in more specific terms an outline of the provisions which could form the basis for negotiation of specific treaty obligations.

The new document is the most comprehensive and detailed proposal in the field of general disarmament ever put forward, by any government.

The goal of the United States in proposing the new document is a free, secure, and peaceful world for independent states where force has been subjected to the rule of law, where change is peaceful, and where there is general and complete disarmament under effective international control.

The objectives stated in the "U.S. Outline of Basic Provisions of a Treaty on General and Complete Disarmament in a Peaceful World" are to insure that war is eliminated; that the world is disarmed except for forces necessary to maintain internal order and to establish U.N. Peace Force and that procedures are established for the peaceful settlement of disputes in accordance with the U.N. Charter.

Among the guiding principles to achieve these objectives are:

1. Disarmament should be balanced so that no state can gain a military advantage.
2. Compliance with disarmament obligations, including the maintenance of agreed levels of armaments and armed forces, should be effectively verified.
3. The United Nations should be progressively strengthened for the preservation of international security and the peaceful settlement of differences.

Disarmament would proceed in three stages. Stage I would begin when the United States, the U.S.S.R., and such other states as might be agreed have ratified the treaty; stage II when all militarily significant states had become parties; stage III when all armed states had become parties. Transition from stage to stage would take place when the Control Council of the IDO determined all undertakings in a prior stage had been carried out and all arrangements for the subsequent stage had been made. In the event of disagreement, the matter would be referred to the Security Council of the U.N.

Stage I

Stage I would consist of three 1-year steps. Major categories of both nuclear delivery vehicles and conventional armaments of specified parties to the treaty would be reduced by 30 percent of the inventory at an agreed date. The parties would declare inventories of all types of armaments within the agreed categories. For example, the United States would declare as types of armaments the B-52 aircraft, Atlas missile, Titan missile, etc. Fixed launching pads would be reduced with their related missiles. In the first part of each step, one-third of the armaments to be eliminated would be placed in depots under the IDO. During the second part, the deposited armaments would be destroyed or converted to peaceful uses. The IDO would verify that armaments were destroyed and that retained armaments did not exceed agreed levels. Production of armaments would be limited to agreed allowances but there would be compensating destruction of armaments in the same category to assure that the reductions would not be impaired.

Force levels of the United States and the U.S.S.R. would be reduced to 2.1 million each and for other parties to be specified, to levels not exceeding 2.1 million. Other parties would, with agreed exceptions, reduce force levels to 100,000 or 1 percent of their population, whichever were higher; but no party would exceed present levels.

Fissionable material production for nuclear weapons would be halted and agreed quantities of weapons-grade U²³⁵ would be transferred by the United States and U.S.S.R. from stocks to nonweapons purposes. The nuclear powers would agree not to transfer to any nonnuclear state control over nuclear weapons nor give to such a state aid in manufacturing nuclear weapons, and non-nuclear states would agree not to seek control over nuclear weapons or to manufacture them. Nuclear weapons tests would be halted under effective international control if this had not already been done.

Parties in this stage would examine ways to eliminate nuclear weapons stockpiles, to reduce stocks of chemical and biological weapons, and to reduce military expenditures.

Measures would be taken to reduce the risk of war and would include advance notice of, and observation posts to report on, military movements. The parties would examine other means of further diminishing the risk of war by accident, miscalculation, or surprise attack.

The parties would agree to cooperate in the peaceful use of outer space and not to place in orbit weapons of mass destruction. Production and tests of space vehicle boosters would be limited.

The IDO would have adequate powers to verify disarmament measures and would consist of a general conference of all parties, a control council with major powers as permanent members and other parties on a rotating basis, and an administrator.

To strengthen peacekeeping arrangements, the parties would refrain from the threat or use of force contrary to the United Nations Charter and also from indirect aggression and subversion. They would utilize specified processes for peaceful settlement of all dis-

putes and support a study to make such processes more effective. They would develop arrangements for the establishment of a United Nations Peace Force in stage II and would also create a United Nations Peace Observation Corps.

Stage II

Stage II would be of 3 years' duration. Those parties reducing their armaments by 30 percent in stage I would reduce their armaments to levels 50 percent below those at the end of stage I. Parties which had not been subject to reductions in stage I would reduce their armaments to levels 65 percent below those at the beginning of stage II. Additional categories of armaments would be subject to reduction by all parties. Production of armaments would be halted except for production of parts for maintenance.

Armed Forces of the United States and the U.S.S.R. would be reduced to levels 50 percent below the levels agreed for the end of stage I. The forces of other states would be reduced by agreed percentages.

Parties to the treaty would reduce remaining nuclear weapons and fissionable materials for use in nuclear weapons to minimum levels determined in the light of their examination of the means of reducing and eliminating nuclear weapons stockpiles. Fissionable materials for use in weapons would be reduced on the basis of agreed percentages by safeguarded transfers to nonweapons purposes, and nonnuclear components of nuclear weapons from which fissionable materials had been removed would be destroyed. To facilitate verification of the final reduction of nuclear weapons in stage III, nuclear weapons and fissionable materials for use in nuclear weapons would be internationally registered at the end of stage II.

Agreed military bases and facilities, wherever they might be located, would be dismantled or converted to peaceful uses, in an agreed sequence.

The strengthening of peacekeeping arrangements begun in stage I would continue. This process would include acceptance of the compulsory jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice, the development of rules of conduct related to disarmament and methods for settling disputes, and the establishment of a United Nations Peace Force. In addition, the International Disarmament Organization would be strengthened to insure its capacity to verify measures in stage II.

Stage III

Stage III, which would be of an agreed duration, would continue the disarmament process until states had at their disposal only those forces and agreed types of non-nuclear armaments required to maintain internal order and protect the personal security of citizens. The United Nations Peace Force would be progressively strengthened until it had sufficient armed forces and armaments so that no state could challenge it.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent that the "Outline of Basic Provisions of a Treaty on General and Complete Disarmament in a Peaceful World," as prepared by the same Agency, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

OUTLINE OF BASIC PROVISIONS OF A TREATY ON GENERAL AND COMPLETE DISARMAMENT IN A PEACEFUL WORLD

(Prepared by the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency)

In order to assist in the preparation of a treaty on general and complete disarmament in a peaceful world, the United States submits the following outline of basic provisions of such a treaty.

A. OBJECTIVES

1. To insure that (a) disarmament is general and complete and war is no longer an instrument for settling international problems, and (b) general and complete disarmament is accompanied by the establishment of reliable procedures for the settlement of disputes and by effective arrangements for maintenance of peace in accordance with the principles of the Charter of the United Nations.

2. Taking into account paragraphs 3 and 4 below, to provide, with respect to the military establishment of every nation, for—

(a) Disbanding of armed forces, dismantling of military establishments, including bases, cessation of the production of armaments as well as their liquidation or conversion to peaceful uses;

(b) Elimination of all stockpiles of nuclear, chemical, biological, and other weapons of mass destruction and cessation of the production of such weapons;

(c) Elimination of all means of delivery of weapons of mass destruction;

(d) Abolition of the organizations and institutions designed to organize the military efforts of states, cessation of military training, and closing of all military training institutions; and

(e) Discontinuance of military expenditures.

3. To insure that, at the completion of the program for general and complete disarmament, states would have at their disposal only those nonnuclear armaments, forces, facilities and establishments as are agreed to be necessary to maintain internal order and protect the personal security of citizens.

4. To insure that during and after implementation of general and complete disarmament, states also would support and provide agreed manpower for a United Nations Peace Force to be equipped with agreed types of armaments necessary to insure that the United Nations can effectively deter or suppress any threat or use of arms.

5. To establish and provide for the effective operation of an International Disarmament Organization within the framework of the United Nations for the purpose of insuring that all obligations under the disarmament program would be honored and observed during and after implementation of general and complete disarmament; and to this end to insure that the International Disarmament Organization and its inspectors would have unrestricted access without veto to all places as necessary for the purpose of effective verification.

B. PRINCIPLES

The guiding principles during the achievement of these objectives are:

1. Disarmament would be implemented until it is completed by stages to be carried out within specified time limits.

2. Disarmament would be balanced so that at no stage of the implementation of the treaty could any state or group of states gain military advantage, and so that security would be insured equally for all.

3. Compliance with all disarmament obligations would be effectively verified during and after their entry into force. Verification arrangements would be instituted progressively as necessary to insure throughout the disarmament process that agreed levels of armaments and armed forces were not exceeded.

4. As national armaments are reduced, the United Nations would be progressively strengthened in order to improve its capacity to insure international security and the peaceful settlement of differences as well as to facilitate the development of international cooperation in common tasks for the benefit of mankind.

5. Transition from one stage of disarmament to the next would take place upon de-

cision that all measures in the preceding stage had been implemented and verified and that any additional arrangements required for measures in the next stage were ready to operate.

INTRODUCTION

The treaty would contain three stages designed to achieve a permanent state of general and complete disarmament in a peaceful world. The treaty would enter into force upon the signature and ratification of the United States of America, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, and such other states as might be agreed. Stage II would begin when all military significant states had become parties to the treaty and other transition requirements had been satisfied. Stage III would begin when all states possessing armed forces and armaments had become parties to the treaty and other transition requirements had been satisfied. Disarmament, verification, and measures for keeping the peace would proceed progressively and proportionately, beginning with the entry into force of the treaty.

Stage I

Stage I would begin upon the entry into force of the treaty and would be completed within 3 years from that date.

During stage I the parties to the treaty would undertake:

1. To reduce their armaments and armed forces and to carry out other agreed measures in the manner outlined below;

2. To establish the International Disarmament Organization upon the entry into force of the treaty in order to insure the verification in the agreed manner of the obligations undertaken; and

3. To strengthen arrangements for keeping the peace through the measures outlined below.

A. Armaments

1. Reduction of armaments:

a. Specified parties to the treaty, as a first stage toward general and complete disarmament in a peaceful world, would reduce by 30 percent the armaments in each category listed in subparagraph b below. Except as adjustments for production would be permitted in stage I in accordance with paragraph 3 below, each type of armament in the categories listed in subparagraph b would be reduced by 30 percent of the inventory existing at an agreed date.

b. All types of armaments within agreed categories would be subject to reduction in stage I (the following list of categories, and of types within categories, is illustrative):

(1) Armed combat aircraft having an empty weight of 40,000 kilograms or greater; missiles having a range of 5,000 kilometers or greater, together with their related fixed launching pads; and submarine-launched missiles and air-to-surface missiles having a range of 300 kilometers or greater.

(Within this category, the United States, for example, would declare as types of armaments: the B-52 aircraft; Atlas missiles together with their related fixed launching pads; Titan missiles together with their related fixed launching pads; Polaris missiles; Hound Dog missiles; and each new type of armament, such as Minuteman missiles, which came within the category description, together with, where applicable, their related fixed launching pads. The declared inventory of types within the category by other parties to the treaty would be similarly detailed.)

(2) Armed combat aircraft having an empty weight of between 15,000 kilograms and 40,000 kilograms and those missiles not included in category (1) having a range between 300 kilometers and 5,000 kilometers, together with any related fixed launching pads. (The parties would declare their armaments by types within the category.)

(3) Armed combat aircraft having an empty weight of between 2,500 and 15,000

kilograms. (The parties would declare their armaments by types within the category.)

(4) Surface-to-surface (including submarine-launched missiles) and air-to-surface aerodynamic and ballistic missiles and free rockets having a range of between 10 kilometers and 300 kilometers, together with any related fixed launching pads. (The parties would declare their armaments by types within the category.)

(5) Antimissile missile systems, together with related fixed launching pads. (The parties would declare their armaments by types within the category.)

(6) Surface-to-air missiles other than antimissile missile systems, together with any related fixed launching pads. (The parties would declare their armaments by types within the category.)

(7) Tanks. (The parties would declare their armaments by types within the category.)

(8) Armored cars and armored personnel carriers. (The parties would declare their armaments by types within the category.)

(9) All artillery, and mortars and rocket launchers having a caliber of 100 millimeters or greater. (The parties would declare their armaments by types within the category.)

(10) Combatant ships with standard displacement of 400 tons or greater of the following classes: Aircraft carriers, battleships, cruisers, destroyer types, and submarines. (The parties would declare their armaments by types within the category.)

2. Method of reduction:

a. Those parties to the treaty which were subject to the reduction of armaments would submit to the International Disarmament Organization an appropriate declaration respecting inventories of their armaments existing at the agreed date.

b. The reduction would be accomplished in three steps, each consisting of 1 year. One-third of the reduction to be made during stage I would be carried out during each step.

c. During the first part of each step, one-third of the armaments to be eliminated during stage I would be placed in depots under supervision of the International Disarmament Organization. During the second part of each step, the deposited armaments would be destroyed or, where appropriate, converted to peaceful uses. The number and location of such depots and arrangements respecting their establishment and operation would be set forth in an annex to the treaty.

d. In accordance with arrangements which would be set forth in a treaty annex on verification, the International Disarmament Organization would verify the foregoing reduction and would provide assurance that retained armaments did not exceed agreed levels.

3. Limitation on production of armaments and on related activities:

a. Production of all armaments listed in subparagraph b of paragraph 1 above would be limited to agreed allowances during stage I and, by the beginning of stage II, would be halted except for production within agreed limits of parts for maintenance of the agreed retained armaments.

b. The allowances would permit limited production in each of the categories of armaments listed in subparagraph b, of paragraph 1, above. In all instances during the process of eliminating production of armaments:

(1) any armament produced within a category would be compensated for by an additional armament destroyed within that category to the end that the 10 percent reduction in numbers in each category in each step, and the resulting 30 percent reduction in stage I, would be achieved; and furthermore

(2) In the case of armed combat aircraft having an empty weight of 15,000 kilograms

or greater and of missiles having a range of 300 kilometers or greater, the destructive capability of any such armaments produced within a category would be compensated for by the destruction of sufficient armaments within that category to the end that the 10-percent reduction in destructive capability as well as numbers in each of these categories in each step, and the resulting 30-percent reduction in stage I, would be achieved.

c. Should a party to the treaty elect to reduce its production in any category at a more rapid rate than required by the allowances provided in subparagraph b. above, that party would be entitled to retain existing armaments to the extent of the unused portion of its production allowance. In any such instance, any armament so retained would be compensated for in the manner set forth in subparagraph b(1) and, where applicable, b(2) above to the end that the 10-percent reduction in numbers and, where applicable, destructive capability in each category in each step, and the resulting 30-percent reduction in stage I, would be achieved.

d. The flight testing of missiles would be limited to agreed annual quotas.

e. In accordance with arrangements which would be set forth in the annex on verification, the International Disarmament Organization would verify the foregoing measures at declared locations and would provide assurance that activities subject to the foregoing measures were not conducted at undeclared locations.

4. Additional measures:

The parties to the treaty would agree to examine unresolved questions relating to means of accomplishing in stages II and III the reduction and eventual elimination of production and stockpiles of chemical and biological weapons of mass destruction. In light of this examination, the parties to the treaty would agree to arrangements concerning chemical and biological weapons of mass destruction.

B. Armed Forces

1. Reduction of armed forces:

Force levels for the United States of America and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics would be reduced to 2.1 million each and for other specified parties to the treaty to agreed levels not exceeding 2.1 million each. All other parties to the treaty would, with agreed exceptions, reduce their force levels to 100,000 or 1 percent of their population, whichever were higher, provided that in no case would the force levels of such other parties to the treaty exceed levels in existence upon the entry into force of the treaty.

2. Armed forces subject to reduction:

Agreed force levels would include all full-time, uniformed personnel maintained by national governments in the following categories:

a. Career personnel of active armed forces and other personnel serving in the active armed forces on fixed engagements on contracts.

b. Conscripts performing their required period of full-time active duty as fixed by national law.

c. Personnel of militarily organized security forces and of other forces or organizations equipped and organized to perform a military mission.

3. Method of reduction of armed forces:

The reduction of force levels would be carried out in the following manner:

a. Those parties to the treaty which were subject to the foregoing reductions would submit to the International Disarmament Organization a declaration stating their force levels at the agreed date.

b. Force level reductions would be accomplished in three steps each having a duration of 1 year. During each step force levels

would be reduced by one-third of the difference between force levels existing at the agreed date and the levels to be reached at the end of stage I.

c. In accordance with arrangements that would be set forth in the annex on verification, the International Disarmament Organization would verify the reduction of force levels and provide assurance that retained forces did not exceed agreed levels.

4. Additional measures:

The parties to the treaty which were subject to the foregoing reductions would agree upon appropriate arrangements, including procedures for consultation, in order to insure that civilian employment by military establishments would be in accordance with the objectives of the obligations respecting force levels.

C. Nuclear Weapons

1. Production of fissionable materials for nuclear weapons:

a. The parties to the treaty would halt the production of fissionable materials for use in nuclear weapons.

b. This measure would be carried out in the following manner:

(1) The parties to the treaty would submit to the International Disarmament Organization a declaration listing by name, location, and production capacity every facility under their jurisdiction capable of producing and processing fissionable materials at the agreed date.

(2) Production of fissionable materials for purposes other than use in nuclear weapons would be limited to agreed levels. The parties to the treaty would submit to the International Disarmament Organization periodic declarations stating the amounts and types of fissionable materials which were still being produced at each facility.

(3) In accordance with arrangements which would be set forth in the annex on verification, the International Disarmament Organization would verify the foregoing measures at declared facilities and would provide assurance that activities subject to the foregoing limitations were not conducted at undeclared facilities.

2. Transfer of fissionable material to purposes other than use in nuclear weapons:

a. Upon the cessation of production of fissionable materials for use in nuclear weapons, the United States of America and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics would each transfer to purposes other than use in nuclear weapons an agreed quantity of weapons-grade U²³⁵ from past production. The purposes for which such materials would be used would be determined by the state to which the material belonged, provided that such materials were not used in nuclear weapons.

b. To insure that the transferred materials were not used in nuclear weapons, such materials would be placed under safeguards and inspection by the International Disarmament Organization either in stockpiles or at the facilities in which they would be utilized for purposes other than use in nuclear weapons. Arrangements for such safeguards and inspection would be set forth in the annex on verification.

3. Transfer of fissionable materials between states for peaceful uses of nuclear energy:

a. Any transfer of fissionable materials between states would be for purposes other than for use in nuclear weapons and would be subject to a system of safeguards to insure that such materials were not used in nuclear weapons.

b. The system of safeguards to be applied for this purpose would be developed in agreement with the International Atomic Energy Agency and would be set forth in an annex to the treaty.

4. Nontransfer of nuclear weapons:

The parties to the treaty would agree to seek to prevent the creation of further

national nuclear forces. To this end the parties would agree that:

a. Any party to the treaty which had manufactured, or which at any time manufactures, a nuclear weapon would:

(1) Not transfer control over any nuclear weapons to a state which had not manufactured a nuclear weapon before an agreed date;

(2) Not assist any such state in manufacturing any nuclear weapons.

b. Any party to the treaty which had not manufactured a nuclear weapon before the agreed date would:

(1) Not acquire, or attempt to acquire, control over any nuclear weapons;

(2) Not manufacture, or attempt to manufacture, any nuclear weapons.

5. Nuclear weapons test explosions:

a. If an agreement prohibiting nuclear weapons test explosions and providing for effective international control had come into force prior to the entry into force of the treaty, such agreement would become an annex to the treaty, and all the parties to the treaty would be bound by the obligations specified in the agreement.

b. If, however, no such agreement had come into force prior to the entry into force of the treaty, all nuclear weapons test explosions would be prohibited, and the procedures for effective international control would be set forth in an annex to the treaty.

6. Additional measures:

The parties to the treaty would agree to examine remaining unresolved questions relating to the means of accomplishing in Stages II and III the reduction and eventual elimination of nuclear weapons stockpiles. In the light of this examination, the parties to the treaty would agree to arrangements concerning nuclear weapons stockpiles.

D. Outer Space

1. Prohibition of weapons of mass destruction in orbit: The parties to the treaty would agree not to place in orbit weapons capable of producing mass destruction.

2. Peaceful cooperation in space: The parties to the treaty would agree to support increased international cooperation in peaceful uses of outer space in the United Nations or through other appropriate arrangements.

3. Notification and prelaunch inspection: With respect to the launching of space vehicles and missiles:

a. Those parties to the treaty which conducted launchings of space vehicles or missiles would provide advance notification of such launchings to other parties to the treaty and to the International Disarmament Organization together with the track of the space vehicle or missile. Such advance notification would be provided on a timely basis to permit prelaunch inspection of the space vehicle or missile to be launched.

b. In accordance with arrangements which would be set forth in the annex on verification, the International Disarmament Organization would conduct prelaunch inspection of space vehicles and missiles and would establish and operate any arrangements necessary for detecting unreported launchings.

4. Limitations on production and on related activities: The production, stockpiling and testing of boosters for space vehicles would be subject to agreed limitations. Such activities would be monitored by the International Disarmament Organization in accordance with arrangements which would be set forth in the annex on verification.

E. Military Expenditures

1. Report on expenditures: The parties to the treaty would submit to the International Disarmament Organization at the end of each stage a report on their military expenditures. Such reports would include an itemization of military expenditures.

2. Verifiable reduction of expenditures: The parties to the treaty would agree to examine questions related to the verifiable reduction of military expenditures. In the light of this examination, the parties to the treaty would consider appropriate arrangements respecting military expenditures.

F. Reduction of the Risk of War

In order to promote confidence and reduce the risk of war, the parties to the treaty would agree to the following measures:

1. Advance notification of military movements and maneuvers: Specified parties to the treaty would give advance notification of major military movements and maneuvers to other parties to the treaty and to the International Disarmament Organization. Specific arrangements relating to this commitment, including the scale of movements and maneuvers to be reported and the information to be transmitted, would be agreed.

2. Observation posts: Specified parties to the treaty would permit observation posts to be established at agreed locations, including major ports, railway centers, motor highways, river crossings, and air bases to report on concentrations and movements of military forces. The number of such posts could be progressively expanded in each successive step of stage I. Specific arrangements relating to such observation posts, including the location and staffing of posts, the method of receiving and reporting information, and the schedule for installation of posts would be agreed.

3. Additional observation arrangements: The parties to the treaty would establish such additional observation arrangements as might be agreed. Such arrangements could be extended in an agreed manner during each step of stage I.

4. Exchange of military missions: Specified parties to the treaty would undertake the exchange of military missions between states or groups of states in order to improve communications and understanding between them. Specific arrangements respecting such exchanges would be agreed.

5. Communications between heads of government: Specified parties to the treaty would agree to the establishment of rapid and reliable communications among their heads of government and with the Secretary General of the United Nations. Specific arrangements in this regard would be subject to agreement among the parties concerned and between such parties and the Secretary General.

6. International Commission on Reduction of the Risk of War: The parties to the treaty would establish an International Commission on Reduction of the Risk of War as a subsidiary body of the International Disarmament Organization to examine and make recommendations regarding further measures that might be undertaken during stage I or subsequent stages of disarmament to reduce the risk of war by accident, miscalculation, failure of communications, or surprise attack. Specific arrangements for such measures as might be agreed to by all or some of the parties to the treaty would be subject to agreement among the parties concerned.

G. The International Disarmament Organization

1. Establishment of the International Disarmament Organization: The International Disarmament Organization would be established upon the entry into force of the treaty and would function within the framework of the United Nations and in accordance with the terms and conditions of the treaty.

2. Cooperation of the parties to the treaty: The parties to the treaty would agree to cooperate promptly and fully with the International Disarmament Organization and to assist the International Disarmament Organization in the performance of its functions

and in the execution of the decisions made by it in accordance with the provisions of the treaty.

3. Verification functions of the International Disarmament Organization: The International Disarmament Organization would verify disarmament measures in accordance with the following principles which would be implemented through specific arrangements set forth in the annex on verification:

a. Measures providing for reduction of armaments would be verified by the International Disarmament Organization at agreed depots and would include verification of the destruction of armaments and, where appropriate, verification of the conversion of armaments to peaceful uses. Measures providing for reduction of armed forces would be verified by the International Disarmament Organization either at the agreed depots or other agreed locations.

b. Measures halting or limiting production, testing, and other specified activities would be verified by the International Disarmament Organization. Parties to the treaty would declare the nature and location of all production and testing facilities and other specified activities. The International Disarmament Organization would have access to relevant facilities and activities wherever located in the territory of such Parties.

c. Assurance that agreed levels of armaments and armed forces were not exceeded and that activities limited or prohibited by the treaty were not being conducted clandestinely would be provided by the International Disarmament Organization through agreed arrangements which would have the effect of providing that the extent of inspection during any step or stage would be related to the amount of disarmament being undertaken and to the degree of risk to the parties to the treaty of possible violations. This might be accomplished, for example, by an arrangement embodying such features as the following:

(1) All parts of the territory of those parties to the treaty to which this form of verification was applicable would be subject to selection for inspection from the beginning of stage I as provided below.

(2) Parties to the treaty would divide their territory into an agreed number of appropriate zones and at the beginning of each step of disarmament would submit to the International Disarmament Organization a declaration stating the total level of armaments, forces, and specified types of activities subject to verification within each zone. The exact location of armaments and forces within a zone would not be revealed prior to its selection for inspection.

(3) An agreed number of these zones would be progressively inspected by the International Disarmament Organization during stage I according to an agreed time schedule. The zones to be inspected would be selected by procedures which would insure their selection by parties to the treaty other than the party whose territory was to be inspected or any party associated with it. Upon selection of each zone, the party to the treaty whose territory was to be inspected would declare the exact location of armaments, forces, and other agreed activities within the selected zone. During the verification process, arrangements would be made to provide assurance against undeclared movements of the objects of verification to or from the zone or zones being inspected. Both aerial and mobile ground inspection would be employed within the zone being inspected. Insofar as agreed measures being verified were concerned, access within the zone would be free and unimpeded, and verification would be carried out with the full cooperation of the state being inspected.

(4) Once a zone had been inspected it would remain open for further inspection

while verification was being extended to additional zones.

(5) By the end of stage III, when all disarmament measures had been completed, inspection would have been extended to all parts of the territory of parties to the treaty.

4. Composition of the International Disarmament Organization:

a. The International Disarmament Organization would have:

(1) A General Conference of all the parties to the treaty;

(2) A Control Council consisting of representatives of all the major signatory powers as permanent members and certain other parties to the treaty on a rotating basis; and

(3) An Administrator who would administer the International Disarmament Organization under the direction of the Control Council and who would have the authority, staff, and finances adequate to insure effective and impartial implementation of the functions of the International Disarmament Organization.

b. The General Conference and the Control Council would have power to establish such subsidiary bodies, including expert study groups, as either of them might deem necessary.

5. Functions of the General Conference: The General Conference would have the following functions, among others, which might be agreed:

a. Electing nonpermanent members to the Control Council;

b. Approving certain accessions to the treaty;

c. Appointing the Administrator upon recommendation of the Control Council;

d. Approving agreements between the International Disarmament Organization and the United Nations and other international organizations;

e. Approving the budget of the International Disarmament Organization;

f. Requesting and receiving reports from the Control Council and deciding upon matters referred to it by the Control Council;

g. Approving reports to be submitted to bodies of the United Nations;

h. Proposing matters for consideration by the Control Council;

i. Requesting the International Court of Justice to give advisory opinions on legal questions concerning the interpretation or application of the treaty, subject to a general authorization of this power by the General Assembly of the United Nations;

j. Approving amendments to the treaty for possible ratification by the parties to the treaty;

k. Considering matters of mutual interest pertaining to the treaty or disarmament in general.

6. Functions of the Control Council: The Control Council would have the following functions, among others which might be agreed:

a. Recommending appointment of the Administrator;

b. Adopting rules for implementing the terms of the treaty.

c. Establishing procedures and standards for the installation and operation of the verification arrangements, and maintaining supervision over such arrangements and the Administrator;

d. Establishing procedures for making available to the parties to the treaty data produced by verification arrangements;

e. Considering reports of the Administrator on the progress of disarmament measures and of their verification, and on the installation and operation of the verification arrangements;

f. Recommending to the Conference approval of the budget of the International Disarmament Organization;

g. Requesting the International Court of Justice to give advisory opinions on legal questions concerning the interpretation or

application of the treaty, subject to a general authorization of this power by the General Assembly of the United Nations;

h. Recommending to the Conference approval of certain accessions to the treaty;

1. Considering matters of mutual interest pertaining to the treaty or to disarmament in general.

7. Functions of the Administrator:

The Administrator would have the following functions, among others which might be agreed:

a. Administering the installation and operation of the verification arrangements, and serving as chief executive officer of the International Disarmament Organization;

b. Making available to the parties to the treaty data produced by the verification arrangements;

c. Preparing the budget of the International Disarmament Organization;

d. Making reports to the Control Council on the progress of disarmament measures and of their verification, and on the installation and operation of the verification arrangements.

8. Privileges and Immunities: The privileges and immunities which the parties to the treaty would grant to the International Disarmament Organization and its staff and to the representatives of the parties to the International Disarmament Organization, and the legal capacity which the International Disarmament Organization should enjoy in the territory of each of the parties to the treaty would be specified in an annex to the treaty.

9. Relations with the United Nations and other international organizations:

a. The International Disarmament Organization, being established within the framework of the United Nations, would conduct its activities in accordance with the purposes and principles of the United Nations. It would maintain close working arrangements with the United Nations, and the Administrator of the International Disarmament Organization would consult with the Secretary General of the United Nations on matters of mutual interest.

b. The Control Council of the International Disarmament Organization would transmit to the United Nations annual and other reports on the activities of the International Disarmament Organization.

c. Principal organs of the United Nations could make recommendations to the International Disarmament Organization, which would consider them and report to the United Nations on action taken.

(NOTE.—The above outline does not cover all the possible details or aspects of relationships between the International Disarmament Organization and the United Nations.)

H. Measures To Strengthen Arrangements for Keeping the Peace

1. Obligations concerning the threat or use of force: The parties to the treaty would undertake obligations to refrain, in their international relations, from the threat or use of force of any type—including nuclear, conventional, chemical, or biological means of warfare—contrary to the purposes and principles of the United Nations Charter.

2. Rules of international conduct:

a. The parties to the treaty would agree to support a study by a subsidiary body of the International Disarmament Organization of the codification and progressive development of rules of international conduct related to disarmament.

b. The parties to the treaty would refrain from indirect aggression and subversion. The subsidiary body provided for in subparagraph a would also study methods of assuring states against indirect aggression or subversion.

3. Peaceful settlement of disputes:

a. The parties to the treaty would utilize all appropriate processes for the peaceful settlement of all disputes which might arise

between them and any other state, whether or not a party to the treaty, including negotiation, inquiry, mediation, conciliation, arbitration, judicial settlement, resort to regional agencies or arrangements, submission to the Security Council or the General Assembly of the United Nations, or other peaceful means of their choice.

b. The parties to the treaty would agree that disputes concerning the interpretation or application of the treaty which were not settled by negotiation or by the International Disarmament Organization would be subject to referral by any party to the dispute to the International Court of Justice, unless the parties concerned agreed on another mode of settlement.

c. The parties to the treaty would agree to support a study under the General Assembly of the United Nations of measures which should be undertaken to make existing arrangements for the peaceful settlement of international disputes, whether legal or political in nature, more effective; and to institute new procedures and arrangements where needed.

4. Maintenance of international peace and security: The parties to the treaty would agree to support measures strengthening the structure, authority, and operation of the United Nations so as to improve its capability to maintain international peace and security.

5. United Nations Peace Force:

The parties to the treaty would undertake to develop arrangements during stage I for the establishment in stage II of a United Nations Peace Force. To this end, the parties to the treaty would agree on the following measures within the United Nations:

a. Examination of the experience of the United Nations leading to a further strengthening of United Nations forces for keeping the peace;

b. Examination of the feasibility of concluding promptly the agreements envisaged in article 43 of the United Nations Charter;

c. Conclusion of an agreement for the establishment of a United Nations Peace Force in stage II, including definitions of its purpose, mission, composition and strength, disposition, command and control, training, logistical support, financing, equipment, and armaments.

6. United Nations Peace Observation Corps: The parties to the treaty would agree to support the establishment within the United Nations of a Peace Observation Corps, staffed with a standing cadre of observers who could be despatched promptly to investigate any situation which might constitute a threat to or a breach of the peace. Elements of the Peace Observation Corps could also be stationed as appropriate in selected areas throughout the world.

I. Transition

1. Transition from stage I to stage II would take place at the end of stage I, upon a determination that the following circumstances existed:

a. All undertakings to be carried out in stage I had been carried out;

b. All preparations required for stage II had been made; and

c. All militarily significant states had become parties to the treaty.

2. During the last 3 months of stage I, the Control Council would review the situation respecting these circumstances with a view to determining whether these circumstances existed at the end of stage I.

3. If, at the end of stage I, one or more permanent members of the Control Council should declare that the foregoing circumstances did not exist, the agreed period of stage I would, upon the request of such permanent member or members, be extended by a period or periods totaling no more than 3 months for the purpose of bringing about the foregoing circumstances.

4. If, upon the expiration of such period or periods, one or more of the permanent members of the Control Council should declare that the foregoing circumstances still did not exist, the question would be placed before a special session of the Security Council; transition to stage II would take place upon a determination by the Security Council that the foregoing circumstances did in fact exist.

Stage II

Stage II would begin upon the transition from stage I and would be completed within 3 years from that date.

During stage II, the parties to the treaty would undertake:

1. To continue all obligations undertaken during stage I;

2. To reduce further the armaments and armed forces reduced during stage I and to carry out additional measures of disarmament in the manner outlined below;

3. To insure that the International Disarmament Organization would have the capacity to verify in the agreed manner the obligations undertaken during stage II; and

4. To strengthen further the arrangements for keeping the peace through the establishment of a United Nations Peace Force and through the additional measures outlined below.

A. Armaments

1. Reduction of armaments:

a. Those parties to the treaty which had during stage I reduced their armaments in agreed categories by 30 percent would during stage II further reduce each type of armament in the categories listed in section A, subparagraph 1.b of stage I by 50 percent of the inventory existing at the end of stage I.

b. Those parties to the treaty which had not been subject to measures for the reduction of armaments during stage I would submit to the International Disarmament Organization an appropriate declaration respecting the inventories by types, within the categories listed in stage I, of their armaments existing at the beginning of stage II. Such parties to the treaty would during stage II reduce the inventory of each type of such armaments by 65 percent in order that such parties would accomplish the same total percentage of reduction by the end of stage II as would be accomplished by those parties to the treaty which had reduced their armaments by 30 percent in stage I.

2. Additional armaments subject to reduction:

a. The parties to the treaty would submit to the International Disarmament Organization a declaration respecting their inventories existing at the beginning of stage II of the additional types of armaments in the categories listed in subparagraph b. below, and would during stage II reduce the inventory of each type of such armaments by 50 percent.

b. All types of armaments within further agreed categories would be subject to reduction in stage II (the following list of categories is illustrative):

(1) Armed combat aircraft having an empty weight of up to 2,500 kilograms (declarations by types).

(2) Specified types of unarmed military aircraft (declarations by types).

(3) Missiles and free rockets having a range of less than 10 kilometers (declarations by types).

(4) Mortars and rocket launchers having a caliber of less than 100 millimeters (declarations by types).

(5) Specified types of unarmored personnel carriers and transport vehicles (declarations by types).

(6) Combatant ships with standard displacement of 400 tons or greater which had not been included among the armaments listed in stage I, and combatant ships with

standard displacement of less than 400 tons (declarations by types).

(7) Specified types of noncombatant naval vessels (declarations by types).

(8) Specified types of small arms (declarations by types).

c. Specified categories of ammunition for armaments listed in stage I, section A, subparagraph 1.b and in subparagraphs b. above would be reduced to levels consistent with the levels of armaments agreed for the end of stage II.

3. Method of reduction: The foregoing measures would be carried out and would be verified by the International Disarmament Organization in a manner corresponding to that provided for in stage I, section A, paragraph 2.

4. Limitation on production of armaments and on related activities:

a. The parties to the treaty would halt the production of armaments in the specified categories except for production, within agreed limits, of parts required for maintenance of the agreed retained armaments.

b. The production of ammunition in specified categories would be reduced to agreed levels consistent with the levels of armaments agreed for the end of stage II.

c. The parties to the treaty would halt development and testing of new types of armaments. The flight testing of existing types of missiles would be limited to agreed annual quotas.

d. In accordance with arrangements which would be set forth in the annex on verification, the International Disarmament Organization would verify the foregoing measures at declared locations and would provide assurance that activities subject to the foregoing measures were not conducted at undeclared locations.

5. Additional measures:

a. In the light of their examination during stage I of the means of accomplishing the reduction and eventual elimination of production and stockpiles of chemical and biological weapons of mass destruction, the parties to the treaty would undertake the following measures respecting such weapons:

(1) The cessation of all production and field testing of chemical and biological weapons of mass destruction.

(2) The reduction, by agreed categories, of stockpiles of chemical and biological weapons of mass destruction to levels 50 percent below those existing at the beginning of stage II.

(3) The dismantling or conversion to peaceful uses of all facilities engaged in the production or field testing of chemical and biological weapons of mass destruction.

b. The foregoing measures would be carried out in an agreed sequence and through arrangements which would be set forth in an annex to the treaty.

c. In accordance with arrangements which would be set forth in the annex on verification the International Disarmament Organization would verify the foregoing measures and would provide assurance that retained levels of chemical and biological weapons did not exceed agreed levels and that activities subject to the foregoing limitations were not conducted at undeclared locations.

B. Armed Forces

1. Reduction of armed forces:

a. Those parties to the treaty which had been subject to measures providing for reduction of force levels during stage I would further reduce their force levels on the following basis:

(1) Force levels of the United States of America and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics would be reduced to levels 50 percent below the levels agreed for the end of stage I.

(2) Force levels of other parties to the treaty which had been subject to measures

providing for the reduction of force levels during stage I would be further reduced, on the basis of an agreed percentage, below the levels agreed for the end of stage I to levels which would not in any case exceed the agreed level for the United States of America and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics at the end of stage II.

b. Those parties to the treaty which had not been subject to measures providing for the reduction of armed forces during stage I would reduce their force levels to agreed levels consistent with those to be reached by other parties which had reduced their force levels during stage I as well as stage II. In no case would such agreed levels exceed the agreed level for the United States of America and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics at the end of stage II.

c. Agreed levels of armed forces would include all personnel in the categories set forth in section B, paragraph 2 of stage I.

2. Method of reduction: The further reduction of force levels would be carried out and would be verified by the International Disarmament Organization in a manner corresponding to that provided for in section B, paragraph 3 of stage I.

3. Additional measures: Agreed limitations consistent with retained force levels would be placed on compulsory military training, and on refresher training for reserve forces of the parties to the treaty.

C. Nuclear Weapons

1. Reduction of nuclear weapons:

In the light of their examination during stage I of the means of accomplishing the reduction and eventual elimination of nuclear weapons stockpiles, the parties to the treaty would undertake to reduce in the following manner remaining nuclear weapons and fissionable materials for use in nuclear weapons:

a. The parties to the treaty would submit to the International Disarmament Organization a declaration stating the amounts, types and nature of utilization of all their fissionable materials.

b. The parties to the treaty would reduce the amounts and types of fissionable materials declared for use in nuclear weapons to minimum levels on the basis of agreed percentages. The foregoing reduction would be accomplished through the transfer of such materials to purposes other than use in nuclear weapons. The purposes for which such materials would be used would be determined by the state to which the materials belonged, provided that such materials were not used in nuclear weapons.

c. The parties to the treaty would destroy the nonnuclear components and assemblies of nuclear weapons from which fissionable materials had been removed to effect the foregoing reduction of fissionable materials for use in nuclear weapons.

d. Production or refabrication of nuclear weapons from any remaining fissionable materials would be subject to agreed limitations.

e. The foregoing measures would be carried out in an agreed sequence and through arrangements which would be set forth in an annex to the treaty.

f. In accordance with arrangements that would be set forth in the verification annex to the treaty, the International Disarmament Organization would verify the foregoing measures at declared locations and would provide assurance that activities subject to the foregoing limitations were not conducted at undeclared locations.

2. Registration of nuclear weapons for verification purposes: To facilitate verification during stage III that no nuclear weapons remained at the disposal of the parties to the treaty, those parties to the treaty which possessed nuclear weapons would, during the last 6 months of stage II, register and serialize their remaining nuclear

weapons and would register remaining fissionable materials for use in such weapons. Such registration and serialization would be carried out with the International Disarmament Organization in accordance with procedures which would be set forth in the annex on verification.

D. Military bases and facilities

1. Reduction of military bases and facilities: The parties to the treaty would dismantle or convert to peaceful uses agreed military bases and facilities, wherever they might be located.

2. Method of reduction:

a. The list of military bases and facilities subject to the foregoing measures and the sequence and arrangements for dismantling or converting them to peaceful uses would be set forth in an annex to the treaty.

b. In accordance with arrangements which would be set forth in the annex on verification, the International Disarmament Organization would verify the foregoing measures.

E. Reduction of the Risk of War

In the light of the examination by the International Commission on Reduction of the Risk of War during stage I the parties to the treaty would undertake such additional arrangements as appeared desirable to promote confidence and reduce the risk of war. The parties to the treaty would also consider extending and improving the measures undertaken in stage I for this purpose. The Commission would remain in existence to examine extensions, improvements, or additional measures which might be undertaken during and after stage II.

F. The International Disarmament Organization

The International Disarmament Organization would be strengthened in the manner necessary to insure its capacity to verify the measures undertaken in stage II through an extension of the arrangements based upon the principles set forth in section G, paragraph 3 of stage I.

G. Measures To Strengthen Arrangements for Keeping the Peace

1. Peaceful settlement of disputes:

a. In light of the study of peaceful settlement of disputes conducted during Stage I, the parties to the treaty would agree to such additional steps and arrangements as were necessary to assure the just and peaceful settlement of international disputes, whether legal or political in nature.

b. The parties to the treaty would undertake to accept without reservation, pursuant to article 36, paragraph (1) of the statute of the International Court of Justice, the compulsory jurisdiction of that Court to decide international legal disputes.

2. Rules of international conduct:

a. The parties to the treaty would continue their support of the study by the subsidiary body of the International Disarmament Organization initiated in stage I to study the codification and progressive development of rules of international conduct related to disarmament. The parties to the treaty would agree to the establishment of procedures whereby rules recommended by the subsidiary body and approved by the Control Council would be circulated to all parties to the treaty and would become effective 3 months thereafter unless a majority of the parties to the treaty signified their disapproval, and whereby the parties to the treaty would be bound by rules which had become effective in this way unless, within a period of 1 year from the effective date, they formally notified the International Disarmament Organization that they did not consider themselves so bound. Using such procedures, the parties to the treaty would adopt such rules of international conduct related to disarmament as might be necessary to begin stage III.

b. In the light of the study of indirect aggression and subversion conducted in stage I, the parties to the treaty would agree to arrangements necessary to assure states against indirect aggression and subversion.

3. United Nations Peace Force: The United Nations Peace Force to be established as the result of the agreement reached during stage I would come into being within the first year of stage II and would be progressively strengthened during stage II.

4. United Nations Peace Observation Corps: The parties to the treaty would conclude arrangements for the expansion of the activities of the United Nations Peace Observation Corps.

5. National legislation: Those parties to the treaty which had not already done so would, in accordance with their constitutional processes, enact national legislation in support of the treaty imposing legal obligations on individuals and organizations under their jurisdiction and providing appropriate penalties for noncompliance.

H. Transition

1. Transition from stage II to stage III would take place at the end of stage II, upon a determination that the following circumstances existed:

a. All undertakings to be carried out in stage II had been carried out;

b. All preparations required for stage III had been made; and

c. All states possessing armed forces and armaments had become parties to the treaty.

2. During the last 3 months of stage II, the Control Council would review the situation respecting these circumstances with a view to determining at the end of stage II whether they existed.

3. If, at the end of stage II, one or more permanent members of the Control Council should declare that the foregoing circumstances did not exist, the agreed period of stage II would, upon the request of such permanent member or members, be extended by a period or periods totaling no more than 3 months for the purpose of bringing about the foregoing circumstances.

4. If, upon the expiration of such period or periods, one or more of the permanent members of the Control Council should declare that the foregoing circumstances still did not exist, the question would be placed before a special session of the Security Council; transition to stage III would take place upon a determination by the Security Council that the foregoing circumstances did in fact exist.

Stage III

Stage III would begin upon the transition from stage II and would be completed within an agreed period of time as promptly as possible.

During stage III, the parties to the treaty would undertake:

1. To continue all obligations undertaken during stages I and II;

2. To complete the process of general and complete disarmament in the manner outlined below;

3. To insure that the International Disarmament Organization would have the capacity to verify in the agreed manner the obligations undertaken during stage III and of continuing verification subsequent to the completion of stage III; and

4. To strengthen further the arrangements for keeping the peace during and following the achievement of general and complete disarmament through the additional measures outlined below.

A. Armaments

1. Reduction of armaments: Subject to agreed requirements for nonnuclear armaments of agreed types for national forces required to maintain internal order and protect the personal security of citizens, the parties to the treaty would eliminate all

armaments remaining at their disposal at the end of stage II.

2. Method of reduction:

a. The foregoing measure would be carried out in an agreed sequence and through arrangements that would be set forth in an annex to the treaty.

b. In accordance with arrangements that would be set forth in the annex on verification, the International Disarmament Organization would verify the foregoing measures and would provide assurance that retained armaments were of the agreed types and did not exceed agreed levels.

3. Limitations on production of armaments and on related activities:

a. Subject to agreed arrangements in support of national forces required to maintain internal order and protect the personal security of citizens and subject to agreed arrangements in support of the United Nations Peace Force, the parties to the treaty would halt all applied research, development, production, and testing of armaments and would cause to be dismantled or converted to peaceful uses all facilities for such purposes.

b. The foregoing measures would be carried out in an agreed sequence and through arrangements which would be set forth in an annex to the treaty.

c. In accordance with arrangements which would be set forth in the annex on verification, the International Disarmament Organization would verify the foregoing measures at declared locations and would provide assurance that activities subject to the foregoing measures were not conducted at undeclared locations.

B. Armed Forces

1. Reduction of armed forces:

To the end that upon completion of stage III they would have at their disposal only those forces and organizational arrangements necessary for agreed forces to maintain internal order and protect the personal security of citizens and that they would be capable of providing agreed manpower for the United Nations Peace Force, the parties to the treaty would complete the reduction of their force levels, disband systems of reserve forces, cause to be disbanded organizational arrangements comprising and supporting their national military establishment, and terminate the employment of civilian personnel associated with the foregoing.

2. Method of reduction:

a. The foregoing measures would be carried out in an agreed sequence through arrangements which would be set forth in an annex to the treaty.

b. In accordance with arrangements which would be set forth in the annex on verification, the International Disarmament Organization would verify the foregoing measures and would provide assurance that the only forces and organizational arrangements retained or subsequently established were those necessary for agreed forces required to maintain internal order and to protect the personal security of citizens and those for providing agreed manpower for the United Nations Peace Force.

3. Other limitations: The parties to the treaty would halt all military conscription and would undertake to annual legislation concerning national military establishments or military service inconsistent with the foregoing measures.

C. Nuclear Weapons

1. Reduction of nuclear weapons: In light of the steps taken in stages I and II to halt the production of fissionable material for use in nuclear weapons and to reduce nuclear weapons stockpiles, the parties to the treaty would eliminate all nuclear weapons remaining at their disposal, would cause to be dismantled or converted to peaceful use all facilities for production of such weapons, and would transfer all materials remaining at

their disposal for use in such weapons to purposes other than use in such weapons.

2. Method of reduction:

a. The foregoing measures would be carried out in an agreed sequence and through arrangements which would be set forth in an annex to the treaty.

b. In accordance with arrangements which would be set forth in the annex on verification, the International Disarmament Organization would verify the foregoing measures and would provide assurance that no nuclear weapons or materials for use in such weapons remained at the disposal of the parties to the treaty and that no such weapons or materials were produced at undeclared facilities.

D. Military Bases and Facilities

1. Reduction of military bases and facilities: The parties to the treaty would dismantle or convert to peaceful uses the military bases and facilities remaining at their disposal, wherever they might be located, in an agreed sequence except for such agreed bases or facilities within the territory of the parties to the treaty for agreed forces required to maintain internal order and protect the personal security of citizens.

2. Method of reduction:

a. The list of military bases and facilities subject to the foregoing measure and the sequence and arrangements for dismantling or converting them to peaceful uses during stage III would be set forth in an annex to the treaty.

b. In accordance with arrangements which would be set forth in the annex on verification, the International Disarmament Organization would verify the foregoing measure at declared locations and provide assurance that there were no undeclared military bases and facilities.

E. Research and Development of Military Significance

1. Reporting requirement:

The parties to the treaty would undertake the following measures respecting research and development of military significance subsequent to stage III:

a. The parties to the treaty would report to the International Disarmament Organization any basic scientific discovery and any technological invention having potential military significance.

b. The Control Council would establish such expert study groups as might be required to examine the potential military significance of such discoveries and inventions and, if necessary, to recommend appropriate measures for their control. In the light of such expert study, the parties to the treaty would, where necessary, establish agreed arrangements providing for verification by the International Disarmament Organization that such discoveries and inventions were not utilized for military purposes. Such arrangements would become an annex to the treaty.

c. The parties to the treaty would agree to appropriate arrangements for protection of the ownership rights of all discoveries and inventions reported to the International Disarmament Organization in accordance with subparagraph a above.

2. International cooperation: The parties to the treaty would agree to support full international cooperation in all fields of scientific research and development, and to engage in free exchange of scientific and technical information and free interchange of views among scientific and technical personnel.

F. Reduction of the Risks of War

1. Improved measures: In the light of the stage II examination by the International Commission on Reduction of the Risk of War, the parties to the treaty would undertake such extensions and improvements of existing arrangements and such additional arrangements as appeared desirable to pro-

mote confidence and reduce the risk of war. The Commission would remain in existence to examine extensions, improvements or additional measures which might be taken during and after stage III.

2. Application of measures to continuing forces: The parties to the treaty would apply to national forces required to maintain internal order and protect the personal security of citizens those applicable measures concerning the reduction of the risk of war that had been applied to national armed forces in stages I and II.

G. International Disarmament Organization

The International Disarmament Organization would be strengthened in the manner necessary to insure its capacity (1) to verify the measures undertaken in stage III through an extension of arrangements based upon the principles set forth in section G, paragraph 3 of stage I so that by the end of stage III, when all disarmament measures had been completed, inspection would have been extended to all parts of the territory of parties to the treaty; and (2) to provide continuing verification of disarmament after the completion of stage III.

H. Measures To Strengthen Arrangements for Keeping the Peace

1. Peaceful change and settlement of disputes: The parties to the treaty would undertake such additional steps and arrangements as were necessary to provide a basis for peaceful change in a disarmed world and to continue the just and peaceful settlement of all international disputes, whether legal or political in nature.

2. Rules of international conduct: The parties to the treaty would continue the codification and progressive development of rules of international conduct related to disarmament in the manner provided in stage II and by any other agreed procedure.

3. United Nations Peace Force: The parties to the treaty would progressively strengthen the United Nations Peace Force established in stage II until it had sufficient armed forces and armaments so that no state could challenge it.

I. Completion of Stage III

1. At the end of the time period agreed for stage III, the Control Council would review the situation with a view to determining whether all undertakings to be carried out in stage III had been carried out.

2. In the event that one or more of the permanent members of the Control Council should declare that such undertakings had not been carried out, the agreed period of stage II would, upon the request of such permanent member or members, be extended for a period or periods totaling no more than 3 months for the purpose of completing any uncompleted undertakings. If, upon the expiration of such period or periods, one or more of the permanent members of the Control Council should declare that such undertakings still had not been carried out, the question would be placed before a special session of the Security Council, which would determine whether stage III had been completed.

3. After the completion of stage III, the obligations undertaken in stages I, II, and III would continue.

GENERAL PROVISIONS APPLICABLE TO ALL STAGES

1. Subsequent modifications or amendments of the treaty: The parties to the treaty would agree to specific procedures for considering amendments or modifications of the treaty which were believed desirable by any party to the treaty in the light of experience in the early period of implementation of the treaty. Such procedures would include provision for a conference on revision of the treaty after a specified period of time.

2. Interim agreement: The parties to the treaty would undertake such specific arrangements, including the establishment of a Preparatory Commission, as were necessary between the signing and entry into force of the treaty to insure the initiation of stage I immediately upon the entry into force of the treaty, and to provide an interim forum for the exchange of views and information on topics relating to the treaty and to the achievement of a permanent state of general and complete disarmament in a peaceful world.

3. Parties to the treaty, ratification, accession, and entry into force of the treaty:

a. The treaty would be open to signature and ratification, or accession, by all members of the United Nations or its specialized agencies.

b. Any other state which desired to become a party to the treaty could accede to the treaty with the approval of the Conference on recommendation of the Control Council.

c. The treaty would come into force when it had been ratified by—states, including the United States of America, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, and an agreed number of the following states:

d. In order to assure the achievement of the fundamental purpose of a permanent state of general and complete disarmament in a peaceful world, the treaty would specify that the accession of certain militarily significant states would be essential for the continued effectiveness of the treaty or for the coming into force of particular measures or stages.

e. The parties to the treaty would undertake to exert every effort to induce other states or authorities to accede to the treaty.

f. The treaty would be subject to ratification or acceptance in accordance with constitutional processes.

g. A depository government would be agreed upon which would have all of the duties normally incumbent upon a depository. Alternatively, the United Nations would be the depository.

4. Finance:

a. In order to meet the financial obligations of the International Disarmament Organization, the parties to the treaty would bear the International Disarmament Organization's expenses as provided in the budget approved by the General Conference and in accordance with a scale of apportionment approved by the General Conference.

b. The General Conference would exercise borrowing powers on behalf of the International Disarmament Organization.

5. Authentic texts: The text of the treaty would consist of equally authentic versions in English, French, Russian, Chinese, and Spanish.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that certain newspaper items in the morning press, relating to the proposal for a general disarmament, along with an editorial from the New York Times of this morning, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

[From the Washington Post, Apr. 19, 1962]
KENNEDY HOPES PROPOSAL MAY BE BLUEPRINT

(By Murrey Marder)

The United States yesterday presented its most ambitious disarmament plan, to cut world military forces by two-thirds in 6 years and ultimately replace all armies by a United Nations force.

There is no real prospect that this plan, or the Soviet counterpart to disarm totally

in 4 years, is attainable in the foreseeable future.

What advocates of the new United States' program privately hope, however, is that it may provide a negotiating base to check the arms race spiral and initiate a start on disarmament.

President Kennedy, at his news conference yesterday, called the three-stage U.S. proposal, which he first outlined in general terms before the United Nations on September 25, a blueprint for disarmament progress. Secretary of State Dean Rusk discussed the President's proposals in Geneva on March 15.

Mr. Kennedy said the present 25-page draft treaty is "the most comprehensive and specific series of proposals the United States or any other country has ever made on disarmament."

With this plan, the President said, "the United States is making a major effort to achieve a breakthrough on disarmament negotiations" in Geneva.

In the 17-nation Geneva disarmament conference where the expected American plan was formally unveiled yesterday, the United States and the Soviet Union are in absolute deadlock on the core of the whole Western outlook on disarmament: effective inspection.

The Soviet Union insists that as disarmament develops, there can be inspection only of what weapons are marked for destruction; the Western Powers insist there must also be inspection of the weapons which remain in a nation's possession, to forestall cheating.

The new U.S. plan attempts to meet Soviet insistence that any inspection of Soviet territory represents "espionage," by limiting the amount of inspection to zones chosen at random by an international authority. The amount of inspection would only be equal to the amount of disarmament.

Privately, some Soviet officials have indicated interest in this kind of a spot check, but officially the Soviet Union so far has adamantly held its ground while refusing to accept any kind of onsite inspection in the more limited field of nuclear test suspension.

In other words, instead of throwing all of the Soviet Union open to inspection at the outset, initially a zone representing only one-twentieth of its territory might be inspected. This would be followed by opening a second zone of equal size the next year, and so on, in both the United States and the Soviet Union, until full disarmament is achieved. No nation would know in advance what zone would be inspected.

Chief U.S. delegate Arthur H. Dean said in Geneva that the new plan, to "realize the oldest dream of man," is one "to freeze the military situation" and then "to shrink it to zero."

LIKENED TO BALLOON

Ambassador Dean said that the disarmament concept is "like a balloon—instead of permitting more and more air to be blown into the balloon until it bursts, the air is let out of the balloon, and the balloon shrinks in simple proportion until all the air is gone."

By presenting the plan yesterday in Geneva, the United States accomplished at least one thing. It countered Soviet insistence that the Geneva disarmament conference had to concentrate on the Soviet disarmament plan, because it was the only one before the delegates "in treaty form."

MONTHS IN PREPARATION

The plan is the product of many months of effort by the new United States Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, headed by William C. Foster, and much consultation inside the Kennedy administration. It has been discussed, largely sympathetically, on Capitol Hill, but there is no congressional commitment on it.

The disarmament offer is not a package which must be accepted or rejected in total, officials said. It is negotiable in detail. While it provides a 30-percent cut in all weapons in its first stage of 3 years, and a second cut of 35 percent in the next 3 years, the time period for achieving the third stage of "general and complete disarmament" is unspecified. Officials said this might be anywhere from 9 to 15 years, or more.

Stage I of the plan could go into effect without Communist China. But the participation of Red China and "all militarily significant states" would be required before stage II could begin. For stage III to become effective, when nations theoretically would be left with only the nonnuclear forces necessary for "internal order," it would be necessary for all states possessing armed forces and armaments" to be treaty signers.

TRANSFORMATION NEEDED

Officials acknowledge bluntly that before that day can dawn there would have to be a vast transformation in the international scene. Among other things, it would require acceptance by the United States, and all nations of the jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice in matters affecting world peace, and acceptance of a whole set of new procedures in the United Nations for maintaining international order.

In brief, the new U.S. plan provides:

Stage I: In three 1-year steps, major categories of nuclear and conventional weapons would be reduced 30 percent. The United States, for example, in the top category, would declare its numbers of B-52 bombers, Atlas, Polaris, and other big missiles, and the Soviets would do the same.

The reductions, however, could be in terms of destructive power, and not just in numbers. That is, the United States could choose to dispose of nuclear-carrying aircraft and keep its Polaris missiles in this stage. The same would be true in other categories of combat aircraft, tanks, artillery, etc.

Arms to be eliminated would be placed in depots and later destroyed or converted to peaceful uses, under an International Disarmament Organization, which would operate closely with the U.N. Military force levels of the United States and Soviet Union would be reduced to 2.1 million men each, and for other nations to corresponding levels.

Production of fissionable material for military use would be halted. Measures to reduce risks of war would be taken, and studies made of ways to eliminate nuclear weapons and reduce stocks of chemical and biological weapons. Participants would agree to cooperate in peaceful uses of outer space. Arrangements for a U.N. Peace Observation Corps would begin. (Officials suggest it might even be advisable to equip a U.N. force with nuclear weapons.)

To verify that disarmament was taking place, it is suggested that each participating nation could be divided into a number of agreed zones, on a checkerboard pattern. For example, there might be 20 zones each in the United States and the Soviet Union and each would declare in advance what weapons and forces were in the zone.

WOULD REMAIN OPEN

A selection then would be made by agreed process of which zone was to be inspected on another nation's territory. Upon selection of the zone, the country involved would then declare the exact location in it of arms and forces. Once a zone was inspected, it would remain open to further inspection while additional zones were opened, as disarmament progressed.

Stage II: A further reduction, during 3 years, of 35 percent in numbers of weapons and forces. Nations just joining the pact at this point would have to reduce their armaments an equivalent of 65 percent.

Armed forces of the United States and U.S.S.R. would be reduced 50 percent more. Military bases and facilities, in agreed numbers, would be reduced. Building of peace-keeping machinery would continue.

HALT IN TESTING

Development and testing of new weapons would be halted. The U.N. Peace Force would come into being within the first year of stage II and would be progressively strengthened.

Stage III: In this final period, "of an agreed duration," disarmament would continue until each nation retained only forces for internal order and personal security of its citizens. The U.N. Peace Force would be bolstered "until it had sufficient armed forces and armaments so that no state could challenge it."

During the disarmament process, machinery would be created to try to adjudicate disputes; any gross violation, however, presumably would cancel the treaty.

TRANSCRIPT OF PRESIDENT KENNEDY'S NEWS CONFERENCE YESTERDAY

The President. I have several announcements to make.

DISARMAMENT

The United States has today tabled at Geneva an outline of basic provision of a Treaty on General and Complete Disarmament in a Peaceful World. It provides a blueprint of our position on general and complete disarmament as well as elaboration of the nature, sequence and timing of specific disarmament measures.

This outline of a treaty represents the most comprehensive and specific series of proposals the United States or any other country has ever made on disarmament. In addition to stating the objectives and principles which should govern agreements for disarmament, the document calls for the grouping of individual measures in three balanced and safeguarded stages. We are hopeful that through the give and take of the conference table this plan will have a constructive influence upon the negotiations now in progress.

I want to stress that with this plan the United States is making a major effort to achieve a breakthrough on disarmament negotiations. We believe that the nations represented at Geneva have a heavy responsibility to lay the foundations for a genuinely secure and peaceful world starting through a reduction in arms.

AMERICA'S DISARMAMENT PLAN

In a major effort to achieve a breakthrough toward realizing man's ancient dream of beating swords into plowshares, the United States has submitted to the Geneva Disarmament Conference a complete and detailed draft treaty for total disarmament. Characterized by President Kennedy as the "most comprehensive" such plan ever advanced by any nation, it calls for the abolition of all national armaments and armed forces, except for domestic police, within approximately 9 years.

This goal is to be reached in three stages under supervision of an international control organization. It would have ever-widening powers, both to prevent cheating and to maintain the balance of power on which peace now depends, until peace can be safeguarded by a United Nations peace force so powerful that no nation would dare to challenge it.

By submitting a complete draft treaty, the United States has at last overcome the self-imposed disadvantage of making a merely piecemeal approach toward limited disarmament. Having now put forward a positive program of our own in the field of disarmament, we should meet Russian tactics in the ideological and political arenas also—

by countering the Communist manifestos with a "Manifesto of Freedom," and by proposing a broad European peace settlement, on which real disarmament in the last analysis depends.

The American disarmament plan is so sweeping and of such fateful impact on the life or death of nations that it must be subjected to the most searching scrutiny before final judgment can be passed on it. But at first sight the American plan seems to represent a practical basis for further negotiations. It envisages gradual, progressive, and balanced reduction of national armaments and armed forces, including in particular nuclear weapons, until they are wholly eliminated and their function is taken over by the "peace force" built up in the meantime. A nuclear test ban under effective international control is to be one of the first steps.

An innovation that involves a serious but calculated risk is the dilution of the controls that must be the crux of all disarmament measures. To meet professed Soviet apprehensions about "espionage," the plan drops the previous Western insistence on an initial census of all armaments to establish a basis for the reductions. It also drops the previous demands for unhindered inspection of disarmament and of rearmament. For both aspects of the problem it adopts the "sampling" technique used in checking commodities, the idea being that the "sampling" of one area could be projected for the whole country.

This new control idea is a very great concession to the Soviet Union; and it is one more earnest of the American determination to reach a disarmament agreement with the Russians if it is possible for reasonable men to reach one.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I just quote this one paragraph from the New York Times editorial which I think is worthy of our attention:

In a major effort to achieve a breakthrough toward realizing man's ancient dream of beating swords into plowshares, the United States has submitted to the Geneva disarmament conference a complete and detailed draft treaty for total disarmament.

The editorial also points out:

The American disarmament plan is so sweeping and of such fateful impact on the life or death of nations that it must be subjected to the most searching scrutiny before final judgment can be passed on it.

With this I fully agree. That is the purpose of the discussion. That is why I have said that the draft treaty should be the subject of rational discussion as well as the subject of such modification and adjustment as may be required following such discussion.

The final paragraph of the editorial is worthy of our attention:

This new control idea is a very great concession to the Soviet Union; and it is one more earnest of the American determination to reach a disarmament agreement with the Russians if it is possible for reasonable men to reach one.

In other words, we have walked the extra mile. We have extended the hand of friendship in a spirit of trying to save the world from catastrophe.

I believe the President of the United States, in taking this courageous step—which will undoubtedly subject him to criticism, along with those of us who support him—has taken a necessary step. It reveals spiritual and moral courage on the part of the President, his officers, the Secretary of State and the disarma-

ment agency. This is the kind of courage needed in the quest for peace.

Men who will go to the battlefield if there is a nuclear war will need courage, also. That courage may be obliterated in the fiery furnace of nuclear destruction.

The President has asked the world to join us in the peace race. He is leading. He has not been afraid to lead. He has marched out to the front of the forces, seeking a just and enduring peace, asking all to follow. This is a quality of statesmanship which merits the approval—at least the genuine friendly support—not only of the American people, but of all other peoples throughout the world.

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

Mr. HUMPHREY. I yield.

Mr. CARLSON. The distinguished acting majority leader has discussed a topic which I think is most appropriate as we approach the Easter period. I was glad to hear him state that no action would be taken on the part of our Government without rigid—and I trust foolproof—inspection, because we have had some experiences in dealing with the group of people in the Soviet Union who are ideologically opposed to us.

On September 1, 1961, Mr. Khrushchev violated agreements with our people meeting at Geneva on nuclear tests, and since that time the Russians have exploded more than 50 nuclear bombs. Those bombs were not made after September 1 of last year. They were made in the preceding 2 or 3 years.

I have great faith in our negotiators. I think Arthur Dean is one of the great men of this period, and is a very able negotiator. He is a tough negotiator, and certainly he has great patience.

As one Senator, I appreciate the great interest in a program of disarmament. I hope we shall be able to make progress but as we make this progress let us not let our defensive guard down.

I think we must proceed cautiously, as we take these steps, and proceed on the theory that there will be rigid and foolproof inspection of any program entered into.

I thank the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I thank the Senator from Kansas, whose ideas on these questions are always constructive and helpful. I am sure the Senator knows that I feel very much the same as he does, as I so expressed myself during my remarks. We cannot rely upon the word of the Soviets, and sometimes not even upon the word of others. We must build into the proposals the safeguards which will give reassurance to ourselves and to the world.

Whatever we do in the field of national security is not merely for the security of the United States, but for the security of the entire world. We have commitments to many nations. Even as we negotiate a treaty, we must think of our commitments to others.

It is the record of this U.S. Senator to vote for every measure for the defense for this country. The same is true of the Senator from Kansas. I have voted to strengthen our country. I have never

seen any conflict between having the United States of America militarily strong, and at the same time seeking, at the conference table, to negotiate a reduction in the arms race.

That is the only basis on which we can ever negotiate with the Soviets. We must come to the negotiation with confidence which comes from strength, and the Soviets must know we are strong.

To those who say, "Senator, how can you be for disarmament on the one hand and yet vote for a big Air Force, vote for Polaris missiles, and vote for increased strength of our Armed Forces?" I say, "In the kind of world in which we live, we have no choice other than to be strong militarily, whatever the cost."

By the same token, we should use our strength not to wage war, but to launch a peace race. We should launch the peace race. I know this is the general feeling of Members of Congress and of the people of the United States.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks the address by President Kennedy before the United Nations General Assembly, on September 25, 1961.

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

LET US CALL A TRUCE TO TERROR
(Address by President Kennedy)

We meet in an hour of grief and challenge. Dag Hammarskjöld is dead. But the United Nations lives. His tragedy is deep in our hearts, but the task for which he died is at the top of our agenda. A noble servant of peace is gone. But the quest for peace lies before us.

The problem is not the death of one man; the problem is the life of this Organization. It will either grow to meet the challenge of our age, or it will be gone with the wind, without influence, without force, without respect. Were we to let it die, to enfeeble its vigor, to cripple its powers, we would condemn the future.

For in the development of this Organization rests the only true alternative to war, and war appeals no longer as a rational alternative. Unconditional war can no longer lead to unconditional victory. It can no longer serve to settle disputes. It can no longer concern the great powers alone. For a nuclear disaster, spread by winds and waters and fear, could well engulf the great and the small, the rich and the poor, the committed and the uncommitted alike. Mankind must put an end to war, or war will put an end to mankind.

So let us here resolve that Dag Hammarskjöld did not live—or die—in vain. Let us call a truce to terror. Let us invoke the blessings of peace. And, as we build an international capacity to keep peace, let us join in dismantling the national capacity to wage war.

DEDICATION TO U.N. CHARTER AND WORLD LAW

This will require new strength and new roles for the United Nations. For disarmament without checks is but a shadow, and a community without law is but a shell. Already the United Nations has become both the measure and the vehicle of man's most generous impulses. Already it has provided—in the Middle East, in Asia, in Africa this year in the Congo—a means of holding violence within bounds.

But the great question which confronted this body in 1945 is still before us: whether man's cherished hopes for progress and peace are to be destroyed by terror and disruption,

whether the foul winds of war can be tamed in time to free the cooling winds of reason, and whether the pledges of our charter are to be fulfilled or defied—pledges to secure peace, progress, human rights, and world law.

In this hall there are not three forces, but two. One is composed of those who are trying to build the kind of world described in articles 1 and 2 of the charter. The others, seeking a far different world, would undermine this Organization in the process.

Today of all days our dedication to the charter must be maintained. It must be strengthened, first of all, by the selection of an outstanding civil servant to carry forward the responsibilities of the Secretary General—a man endowed with both the wisdom and the power to make meaningful the moral force of the world community. The late Secretary General nurtured and sharpened the United Nations' obligation to act. But he did not invent it. It was there in the charter. It is still there in the charter.

However difficult it may be to fill Mr. Hammarskjöld's place, it can better be filled by one man rather than by three. Even the three horses of the troika did not have three drivers, all going in different directions. They had only one, and so must the United Nations executive. To install a triumvirate, or any rotating authority, in the United Nations administrative offices would replace order with anarchy, action with paralysis, and confidence with confusion.

The Secretary General, in a very real sense, is the servant of the General Assembly. Diminish his authority and you diminish the authority of the only body where all nations, regardless of power, are equal and sovereign. Until all the powerful are just, the weak will be secure only in the strength of this Assembly.

Effective and independent executive action is not the same question as balanced representation. In view of the enormous change in membership in this body since its founding, the American delegation will join in any effort for the prompt review and revision of the composition of United Nations bodies.

But to give this organization three drivers, to permit each great power to decide its own case, would entrench the cold war in the headquarters of peace. Whatever advantages such a plan may hold out to my own country, as one of the great powers, we reject it. For we far prefer world law, in the age of self-determination, to world war, in the age of mass extermination.

PLAN FOR GENERAL AND COMPLETE
DISARMAMENT

Today, every inhabitant of this planet must contemplate the day when this planet may no longer be habitable. Every man, woman, and child lives under a nuclear sword of Damocles, hanging by the slenderest of threads, capable of being cut at any moment by accident or miscalculation or by madness. The weapons of war must be abolished before they abolish us.

Men no longer debate whether armaments are a symptom or a cause of tension. The mere existence of modern weapons—10 million times more powerful than anything the world has ever seen and only minutes away from any target on earth—is a source of horror and discord and distrust. Men no longer maintain that disarmament must await the settlement of all disputes, for disarmament must be a part of any permanent settlement. And men may no longer pretend that the quest for disarmament is a sign of weakness, for in a spiraling arms race a nation's security may well be shrinking even as its arms increase.

For 15 years this organization has sought the reduction and destruction of arms. Now that goal is no longer a dream; it is a practical matter of life or death. The risks inherent in disarmament pale in comparison to the risks inherent in an unlimited arms race.

It is in this spirit that the recent Belgrade Conference, recognizing that this is no longer a Soviet problem or an American problem but a human problem, endorsed a program of "general, complete and strictly and internationally controlled disarmament." It is in this same spirit that we in the United States have labored this year, with a new urgency and with a new, now-statutory agency fully endorsed by the Congress, to find an approach to disarmament which would be so far-reaching yet realistic, so mutually balanced and beneficial, that it could be accepted by every nation. And it is in this spirit that we have presented, with the agreement of the Soviet Union, under the label both nations now accept of general and complete disarmament, a new statement of newly agreed principles for negotiation.

But we are well aware that all issues of principle are not settled and that principles alone are not enough. It is therefore our intention to challenge the Soviet Union, not to an arms race but to a peace race—to advance together step by step, stage by stage, until general and complete disarmament has been achieved. We invite them now to go beyond agreement in principle to reach agreement on actual plans.

The program to be presented to this Assembly for general and complete disarmament under effective international control moves to bridge the gap between those who insist on a gradual approach and those who talk only of the final and total achievement. It would create machinery to keep the peace as it destroys the machines of war. It would proceed through balanced and safeguarded stages designed to give no state a military advantage over another. It would place the final responsibility for verification and control where it belongs—not with the big powers alone, not with one's adversary or one's self, but in an international organization within the framework of the United Nations. It would assure that indispensable condition of disarmament—true inspection—and apply it in stages proportionate to the stage of disarmament. It would cover delivery systems as well as weapons. It would ultimately halt their production as well as their testing, their transfer as well as their possession. It would achieve, under the eye of an international disarmament organization, a steady reduction in forces, both nuclear and conventional, until it has abolished all armies and all weapons except those needed for internal order and a new United Nations Peace Force. And it starts that process now, today, even as the talks begin.

In short, general and complete disarmament must no longer be a slogan, used to resist the first steps. It is no longer to be a goal without means of achieving it, without means of verifying its progress, without means of keeping the peace. It is now a realistic plan and a test—a test of those only willing to talk and a test of those willing to act.

Such a plan would not bring a world free from conflict or greed, but it would bring a world free from the terrors of mass destruction. It would not usher in the era of the super state, but it would usher in an era in which no state could annihilate or be annihilated by another.

In 1946, this Nation proposed the Baruch plan to internationalize the atom before other nations even possessed the bomb or demilitarized their troops. We proposed with our allies the disarmament plan of 1951 while still at war in Korea. And we make our proposals today, while building up our defenses over Berlin, not because we are inconsistent or insincere or intimidated but because we know the rights of free men will prevail—because, while we are compelled against our will to rearm, we look confidently beyond Berlin to the kind of disarmed world we all prefer.

I therefore propose, on the basis of this plan, that disarmament negotiations resume promptly and continue without interruption until an entire program for general and complete disarmament has not only been agreed but has been actually achieved.

PROPOSALS TO HALT TESTING AND NUCLEAR ARMS RACE

The logical place to begin is a treaty assuring the end of nuclear tests of all kinds, in every environment, under workable controls. The United States and the United Kingdom have proposed such a treaty that is both reasonable, effective, and ready for signature. We are still prepared to sign that treaty today.

We also proposed a mutual ban on atmospheric testing, without inspection or controls, in order to save the human race from the poison of radioactive fallout. We regret that that offer was not accepted.

For 15 years we have sought to make the atom an instrument of peaceful growth rather than of war. But for 15 years our concessions have been matched by obstruction, our patience by intransigence. And the pleas of mankind for peace have met with disregard.

Finally, as the explosions of others beclouded the skies, my country was left with no alternative but to act in the interests of its own and the free world's security. We cannot endanger that security by refraining from testing while others improve their arsenals. Nor can we endanger it by another long, uninspected ban on testing. For 3 years we accepted those risks in our open society while seeking agreement on inspection. But this year, while we were negotiating in good faith in Geneva, others were secretly preparing new experiments in destruction.

Our tests are not polluting the atmosphere. Our deterrent weapons are guarded against accidental explosion or use. Our doctors and scientists stand ready to help any nation measure and meet the hazards to health which inevitably result from the tests in the atmosphere.

But to halt the spread of these terrible weapons, to halt the contamination of the air, to halt the spiraling nuclear arms race, we remain ready to seek new avenues of agreement. Our new disarmament program thus includes the following proposals:

First, signing the test ban treaty by all nations. This can be done now. Test ban negotiations need not and should not await general disarmament.

Second, stopping the production of fissionable materials for use in weapons and preventing their transfer to any nation now lacking in nuclear weapons.

Third, prohibiting the transfer of control over nuclear weapons to states that do not own them.

Fourth, keeping nuclear weapons from seeding new battlegrounds in outer space.

Fifth, gradually destroying existing nuclear weapons and converting their materials to peaceful uses; and

Finally, halting the unlimited testing and production of strategic nuclear delivery vehicles and gradually destroying them as well.

WORLDWIDE LAW AND LAW ENFORCEMENT

To destroy arms, however, is not enough. We must create even as we destroy—creating worldwide law and law enforcement as we outlaw worldwide war and weapons. In the world we seek, the United Nations emergency forces which have been hastily assembled, uncertainly supplied, and inadequately financed will never be enough.

Therefore, the United States recommends that all member nations earmark special peacekeeping units in their armed forces, to be on call of the United Nations, to be specially trained and quickly available, and

with advance provision for financial and logistic support.

In addition, the American delegation will suggest a series of steps to improve the United Nations' machinery for the peaceful settlement of disputes, for on-the-spot fact-finding, mediation, and adjudication, for extending the rule of international law. For peace is not solely a matter of military or technical problems; it is primarily a problem of politics and people. And unless man can match his strides in weaponry and technology with equal strides in social and political development, our great strength, like that of the dinosaur, will become incapable of proper control and, like the dinosaur, vanish from the earth.

EXTENDING THE RULE OF LAW TO OUTER SPACE

As we extend the rule of law on earth, so must we also extend it to man's new domain—outer space.

All of us salute the brave cosmonauts of the Soviet Union. The new horizons of outer space must not be given by the old bitter concepts of imperialism and sovereign claims. The cold reaches of the universe must not become the new arena of an even colder war.

To this end we shall urge proposals extending the United Nations Charter to the limits of man's exploration in the universe, reserving outer space for peaceful use, prohibiting weapons of mass destruction in space or on celestial bodies, and opening the mysteries and benefits of space to every nation. We shall further propose cooperative efforts between all nations in weather prediction and eventually in weather control. We shall propose, finally, a global system of communications satellites linking the whole world in telegraph and telephone and radio and television. The day need not be far away when such a system will televise the proceedings of this body to every corner of the world for the benefit of peace.

UNITED NATIONS DECADE OF DEVELOPMENT

But the mysteries of outer space must not divert our eyes or our energies from the harsh realities that face our fellow men. Political sovereignty is but a mockery without the means of meeting poverty and illiteracy and disease. Self-determination is but a slogan if the future holds no hope.

That is why my Nation, which has freely shared its capital and its technology to help others help themselves, now proposes officially designating this decade of the 1960's as the United Nations Decade of Development. Under the framework of that resolution, the United Nations' existing efforts in promoting economic growth can be expanded and coordinated. Regional surveys and training institutes can now pool the talents of many. New research, technical assistance, and pilot projects can unlock the wealth of less developed lands and untapped waters. And development can become a cooperative and not a competitive enterprise, to enable all nations, however diverse in their systems and beliefs, to become in fact as well as in law free and equal nations.

COLONIALISM AND THE PRINCIPLE OF FREE CHOICE

My country favors a world of free and equal states. We agree with those who say that colonialism is a key issue in this Assembly. But let the full facts of that issue be discussed in full.

On the one hand is the fact that, since the close of World War II, a worldwide declaration of independence has transformed nearly 1 billion people and 9 million square miles into 42 free and independent states. Less than 2 percent of the world's population now lives in dependent territories.

I do not ignore the remaining problems of traditional colonialism which still confront this body. Those problems will be solved, with patience, good will, and determination. Within the limits of our responsibility in

such matters, my country intends to be a participant and not merely an observer in the peaceful, expeditious movement of nations from the status of colonies to the partnership of equals. That continuing tide of self-determination, which runs so strong, has our sympathy and our support.

But colonialism in its harshest forms is not only the exploitation of new nations by old, of dark skins by light—or the subjugation of the poor by the rich. My Nation was once a colony, and we know what colonialism means; the exploitation and subjugation of the weak by the powerful, of the many by the few, of the governed who have given no consent to be governed, whatever their continent, their class, or their color.

And that is why there is no ignoring the fact that the tide of self-determination has not reached the Communist empire, where a population far larger than that officially termed "dependent" lives under governments installed by foreign troops instead of free institutions, under a system which knows only one party and one belief, which suppresses free debate and free elections and free newspapers and free books and free trade unions, and which builds a wall to keep truth a stranger and its own citizens prisoners. Let us debate colonialism in full and apply the principle of free choice and the practice of free plebiscites in every corner of the globe.

TWO THREATS TO THE PEACE

Finally, as President of the United States, I consider it my duty to report to this Assembly on two threats to the peace which are not on your crowded agenda but which cause us, and most of you, the deepest concern.

The first threat on which I wish to report is widely misunderstood: the smoldering coals of war in southeast Asia. South Vietnam is already under attack—sometimes by a single assassin, sometimes by a band of guerrillas, recently by full battalions. The peaceful borders of Burma, Cambodia, and India have been repeatedly violated. And the peaceful people of Laos are in danger of losing the independence they gained not so long ago.

No one can call these wars of liberation. For these are free countries living under their own governments. Nor are these aggressions any less real because men are knifed in their homes and not shot in the fields of battle.

The very simple question confronting the world community is whether measures can be devised to protect the small and weak from such tactics. For if they are successful in Laos and south Vietnam, the gates will be opened wide.

The United States seeks for itself no base, no territory, no special position in this area of any kind. We support a truly neutral and independent Laos, its people free from outside interference, living at peace with themselves and with their neighbors, assured that their territory will not be used for attacks on others, and under a government comparable (as Mr. Khrushchev and I agreed at Vienna) to Cambodia and Burma.

But now the negotiation over Laos are reaching a crucial stage. The ceasefire is at best precarious. The rainy season is coming to an end. Laotian territory is being used to infiltrate south Vietnam. The world community must recognize—all those who are involved—that this potent threat to Laotian peace and freedom is indivisible from all other threats to their own.

Secondly, I wish to report to you on the crisis over Germany and Berlin. This is not the time or the place for immoderate tones, but the world community is entitled to know the very simple issues as we see them. If there is a crisis it is because an existing peace is under threat, because an existing

island of free people is under pressure, because solemn agreements are being treated with indifference. Established international rights are being threatened with unilateral usurpation. Peaceful circulation has been interrupted by barbed wire and concrete blocks.

One recalls the order of the Czar in Pushkins' Boris Godunof: "Take steps at this very hour that our frontiers be fenced in by barriers. * * * That not a single soul pass o'er the border, that not a hare be able to run or a crow to fly."

It is absurd to allege that we are threatening a war merely to prevent the Soviet Union and East Germany from signing a so-called "treaty of peace." The Western Allies are not concerned with any paper arrangement the Soviets may wish to make with a regime of their own creation, on territory occupied by their own troops and governed by their own agents. No such action can affect either our rights or our responsibilities.

If there is a dangerous crisis in Berlin—and there is—it is because of threats against the vital interests and the deep commitments of the Western Powers and the freedom of West Berlin. We cannot yield these interests. We cannot fail these commitments. We cannot surrender the freedom of these people for whom we are responsible. A "peace treaty" which carried with it the provisions which destroy the peace would be a fraud. A "free city" which was of genuinely free would suffocate freedom and would be an infamy.

For a city or a people to be truly free, they must have the secure right, without economic, political, or police pressure, to make their own choice and to live their own lives. And as I have said before, if anyone doubts the extent to which our presence is desired by the people of West Berlin, we are ready to have that question submitted to a free vote in all Berlin and, if possible, among all the German people.

The elementary fact about this crisis is that it is unnecessary. The elementary tools for a peaceful settlement are to be found in the charter. Under its law, agreements are to be kept, unless changed by all those who made them. Established rights are to be respected. The political disposition of peoples should rest upon their own wishes, freely expressed in plebiscites or free elections. If there are legal problems, they can be solved by legal means. If there is a threat of force, it must be rejected. If there is desire for change, it must be a subject for negotiation, and if there is negotiation, it must be rooted in mutual respect and concern for the rights of others.

The Western Powers have calmly resolved to defend, by whatever means are forced upon them, their obligations and their access to the free citizens of West Berlin and the self-determination of those citizens. This generation learned from bitter experience that either brandishing or yielding to threats can only lead to war. But firmness and reason can lead to the kind of peaceful solution in which my country profoundly believes.

We are committed to no rigid formula. We see no perfect solution. We recognize that troops and tanks can, for a time, keep a nation divided against its will, however unwise that policy may seem to us. But we believe a peaceful agreement is possible which protects the freedom of West Berlin and Allied presence and access, while recognizing the historic and legitimate interests of others in assuring European security.

The possibilities of negotiation are now being explored; it is too early to report what the prospects may be. For our part, we would be glad to report at the appropriate time that a solution has been found. For there is no need for a crisis over Berlin, threatening the peace, and if those who

created this crisis desire peace, there will be peace and freedom in Berlin.

RESPONSIBILITIES OF U.N. GENERAL ASSEMBLY

The events and decisions of the next 10 months may well decide the fate of man for the next 10,000 years. There will be no avoiding those events. There will be no appeal from these decisions. And we in this hall shall be remembered either as part of the generation that turned this planet into a flaming funeral pyre or the generation that met its vow "to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war."

In the endeavor to meet that vow, I pledge you every effort this Nation possesses. I pledge you that we shall neither commit nor provoke aggression, that we shall neither flee nor invoke the threat of force, that we shall never negotiate out of fear, we shall never fear to negotiate.

Terror is not a new weapon. Throughout history it has been used by those who could not prevail, either by persuasion or example. But inevitably they fall, either because men are not afraid to die for a life worth living or because the terrorists themselves come to realize that freemen cannot be frightened by threats and that aggression would meet its own response. And it is in the light of that history that every Nation today should know, be he friend or foe, that the United States has both the will and the weapons to join freemen in standing up to their responsibilities.

But I come here today to look across this world of threats to the world of peace. In that search we cannot expect any final triumph, for new problems will always arise. We cannot expect that all nations will adopt like systems, for conformity is the jailer of freedom and the enemy of growth. Nor can we expect to reach our goal by contrivance, by fiat, or even by the wishes of all.

But however close we sometimes seem to that dark and final abyss, let no man of peace and freedom despair. For he does not stand alone. If we all can persevere—if we can in every land and office look beyond our own shores and ambitions—then surely the age will dawn in which the strong are just and the weak secure and the peace preserved.

Ladies and gentlemen of this Assembly, the decision is ours. Never have the nations of the world had so much to lose—or so much to gain. Together we shall save our planet, or together we shall perish in its flames. Save it we can—and save it we must—and then shall we earn the eternal thanks of mankind and, as peacemakers, the eternal blessing of God.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, as I said earlier today, I am highly pleased that at the last session of the Senate prior to Easter, the chairman of our Subcommittee on Disarmament of the Committee on Foreign Relations, the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], made the very able and eloquent speech that he made in support of our Government's disarmament program.

I wish to discuss a few facets of American foreign policy relating to the thesis set forth by the Senator from Minnesota.

How well he put it when he called attention to the life of the great Peacemaker. On this subject I speak as a religious man, proud to be a Christian. Time and again I have failed, as we have all failed—because of the human frailties with which we are also endowed—to live up to the great spiritual obligations and trusts of our faith. But as I speak as a Christian today, I think I also speak in keeping with the faiths of

all religions based upon belief in a divine being, for it has been my observation, as I have read over the years the writings of authorities on comparative religions, that there is no question about the ultimate goals or the comity of the spiritual teachings of all faiths that believe in a divine being.

When we are dealing with the problem of disarmament, we are dealing with a subject that imposes a great spiritual trust on all governments, for I believe we have a spiritual obligation to rise above the limitations of human frailties and seek to lead mankind into a disarmament program that will bring an end of the scourge of war for future generations.

As the Senator from Minnesota so ably pointed out today, when we speak on this subject, we must expect to be misunderstood, and we must be ready for criticism. But he and I have faced those consequences for many years as members of the Foreign Relations Committee, as we have been willing to warn the American people time and time again that unless an enforceable way is found to end the mad, immoral nuclear armament race that now plagues mankind, the best of civilization as it has developed so far in the history of mankind will be destroyed, for we know—and I think the Russians know—that there will be no victors in a nuclear war. The antagonists in this great armament race have gotten themselves into a position in which they can bring about a mutuality of destruction. I would have those who are still trying to convince others—if in fact they have convinced themselves—that we must use American military might in an endeavor to establish a system of permanent peace in the world, that it will not work. If we eliminate for a moment in such a discussion the moral principle involved in that proposal, the reality is that American military might cannot establish a system of permanent peace in the world.

The exercise of American military might would lead to world destruction, so far as the great civilized nations are concerned, just as the use of Russian military might would accomplish the same horrendous result. So as we bow our heads in reverence to the great spiritual teachings and obligations during these holy days, I would have the American people reflect on what some of our obligations of statesmanship are in respect to peace, for, as my colleagues know, I hold to the point of view that the statesmanship of the officials of our Government, by and large, will never be any higher or more notable than the statesmanship of the American people as a whole. The American people cannot shuffle off that responsibility to the officials of their Government. They must join the officials of their Government in evolving and developing a foreign policy that will give mankind its best hope of survival and future generations their only hope of inheriting freedom and peace.

One's motivations, of course, can always be questioned by those who disagree. But for the record I speak from a nonpartisan motivation today. As I have said before, I speak as a disciple of a great Republican in the field of foreign policy, who was my leading teacher when

I first came to this body in 1945. I refer to Senator Arthur Vandenberg, with whom I worked very closely on a series of foreign policy issues. In my judgment, there is no answer to the tenet of that great man when he said so many times in those historic speeches on the floor of the Senate that partisanship in the field of foreign policy must stop at the water's edge.

There is great need for a rededication to that principle among many in our country today. Speaking nonpartisanly, I wish to pay a deserved tribute to our great President, who has shown not only courage, but an enlightened understanding of this issue unsurpassed in our Republic or in our world today.

Would that we could come back 25, 35 or 50 years from today, provided there is anything to come back to, to read the evaluation that history will place upon the magnificent speech of President Kennedy at the United Nations last September. In that great speech our President laid down the blueprint for disarmament. He laid down the blueprint for the substitution of the rule of law for the law of the jungle. He had the courage to refer in that speech to the willingness on the part of our Government to adjudicate differences.

However, the important point in that speech, I believe history will record, is that he laid down an unanswerable challenge to the Communists. He made perfectly clear the willingness of the United States to engage in a full-scale disarmament program. It was the effective answer to the demagoguery of Khrushchev. As Khrushchev, in his propaganda endeavors, seeks to convince the people of the underdeveloped areas of the world that Russia stands for total disarmament, he of course completely ignores the essentiality of enforceable disarmament. Unless there is enforceable disarmament there will be no disarmament at all. Essential to disarmament, of course, are both inspection and control. They are completely absent from the Russian program—or, more accurately described, the Russian propaganda about disarmament, because if we are to attribute to it the label of a program, it ought to contain within its provisions the procedures for enforcing it. Up to the moment that I speak the Russians have made very clear time and time again that they will not go along with the doctrine of enforceability of disarmament.

The President of the United States, in his disarmament program, as he announced it in his great speech in September at the United Nations, and as he brilliantly presented it again yesterday in stating his position on this subject, has made clear to the world that we stand ready and willing to enter into a disarmament program which would result in enforceability, which would provide for inspection and control, and which would authorize the United Nations to enforce it.

I can well imagine some of the articles that we shall read about that part of the President's statement, on the part of those who seem to think that American military might be used to enforce peace. I shall refer to some of their specific suggestions before I finish this discussion.

However, the President of the United States has made perfectly clear that he recognizes there cannot be disarmament unless all the powers are disarmed. That includes the United States, of course. In my judgment there will be no permanent peace until that happens; and, as Senator Vandenberg used to point out, until the nations of the world are willing to set up a system of procedures, under an international body such as the United Nations, for the application of the rules of reason to every dispute threatening the peace of the world, for final and binding decision in accordance with the principles of international law, each decision to be enforced by an international body such as the United Nations.

In this closing hour of the session before Easter, I dissociate myself from all the recent attacks on the United Nations, in this body and elsewhere, and from the downgrading of the United Nations, and the attempt on the part of some to substitute NATO or any other military alliance for the United Nations. I am satisfied that a resort to military alliances at the expense of weakening the United Nations will lead us directly to a nuclear war.

If we could imagine any degree of survival from such a war, we would have to start all over again, because ultimately we would have to set up an alliance of all the nations of the world; not a military alliance, but an alliance of all the nations of the world who are willing to pursue a course of peace under such a challenge and a charter as is set forth in the San Francisco Charter.

In my judgment there is as much need for putting into practice the ideals of the San Francisco Charter as there was at the very critical time that that charter was signed.

Many leaders of the world played a noble part in bringing about the birth of the United Nations. However, Americans can take great pride in the part played by Franklin Roosevelt, ably assisted by Members of Congress. I know of no one who gave him greater assistance than did Senator Vandenberg. Franklin Roosevelt did not live to see the consummation of his dream. However, the interesting thing is that the first act that President Harry Truman did after he was sworn in as President was to make the announcement that the San Francisco Conference would go on.

What a great record he made as President of the United States in support of peaceful procedures for the settling of disputes, confronted as he was, time and time again, by the actions of the Russians, which were anything but peaceful. Standing for disarmament, and urging the substitution of the rule of law for military might as an instrumentality for settling disputes among nations, does not mean that we cannot support the President of the United States in his great, statesmanlike speeches in September, in the United Nations and, again, yesterday; it does not mean that we shall be a party to weakening the defenses of our country.

Many people do not understand the paradox which confronts us as members of the Committee on Foreign Relations. Many of them like to think that there is

some inconsistency in the position we take. We sit in the Senate and vote billions of dollars for the defense of our country, knowing that if we do so indefinitely, the armaments race will be bound to result in war. But in fairness to myself and those who have confidence in me, I say once more that I have voted not only for large requests for defense purposes from all the Presidents under whom I have had the honor to serve in the Senate, but I have voted for more money for defense than each one of them has recommended. I voted for more money for defense than Franklin Roosevelt recommended on some occasions; I voted for more than Harry Truman recommended; for more than Dwight Eisenhower recommended; and already on one occasion I have voted for more than President Kennedy has recommended, and I may do so again if I think the facts warrant my doing so.

Inconsistency? I think not, unless one wishes to reject my major premise. Of course, if one disagrees with my major premise, then my argument, so far as he is concerned, falls to the carpet of the floor of the Senate. But my major premise, based upon my work on the Committee on Foreign Relations and based upon my work as a U.S. Delegate to the United Nations in the 15th General Assembly, convinces me that if Russia ever thinks we are weak enough to enable her to make a nuclear war, Pearl Harbor type of attack on us, she will not hesitate to do so. Therefore, by keeping ourselves as strong as I have voted to do by way of military appropriations, I have tried to make it clear that we are buying time. It is important that we have time to seek to arrive at the blueprint for disarmament, about which the President has spoken; and to devise procedures for the settlement of these disputes by the application of a rule of law.

It is necessary to have faith that the Russian people and the Russian leaders will eventually recognize our peaceful purposes and motivations. We must have faith that sooner or later the masses of the people of the countries of the world will come to understand our peaceful purposes; then our program will eventually be adopted. I do not know what the alternative is because, as I have said before, war is an unthinkable alternative.

Speaking in regard to the major premise to which I have referred, this conviction of mine explains why I have taken certain courses of action during my many years of service in the Senate, which sometimes have been misunderstood or criticized or rejected by many of my liberal friends. How well I remember speaking in the Senate as one of the three authors—the then Senator from Massachusetts, Mr. Kennedy, and the senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] being the others—of the bill which outlawed the Communist Party in the United States. We were subject to much attack then; but if one will check through the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—and I handled the legal argument at that time for my colleagues, under an arrangement for a division of

work in the debate—he will see that I pointed out that I had no doubt that the Communist Party, as it operates in the United States and elsewhere in the world, meets the definition of a criminal conspiracy. There is no doubt that the party and its apparatus seek to use whatever means they can to destroy the United States, and would not hesitate to use force if they thought that by force they could succeed.

The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD will speak for itself; but in that speech I pointed out that when one is dealing with a conspiracy, it is not necessary to wait for the conspirator to take direct, overt action in order to carry out the objectives of the conspiracy. Individual rights were protected in the Kennedy-Humphrey-Morse bill to outlaw the Communist Party in the United States, because we made it a *mens rea* crime. We made it perfectly clear that there must be a finding of knowingly, willingly, and intentionally being a party to the conspiracy. We made it very clear that if a defendant in one of those cases could demonstrate to the satisfaction of a jury that he did not know the kind of organization to which he belonged—in other words, that he was unaware of the import of the conspiracy which had succeeded in spinning its web around him—he would not be guilty under the law; the jury would have to find specific intent. It was not a *malum prohibitum* crime which was set forth in the bill outlawing the Communist Party; it was a *malum in se* crime; but we knew its essentiality so far as checking the Communist conspiracy in this country was concerned.

One law enforcement official after another has assured me that it has been a very effective legislative tool in carrying out the obligations and the trust of the law enforcement agencies of the country.

But I stress, as we talk about disarmament today, that enforceability, inspection, and control are its essentials; and the President has made that clear over and over again in his brilliant statements on the subject. To those sincere, dedicated, deeply religious people—and I receive much mail from them these days—who are members of various peace groups in the United States, and who say, "We are somewhat at a loss to understand your position in this whole matter," because I refuse to accept their proposal for unilateral disarmament, I say again, as I said to them last Saturday in my home State, and as I have said to many of their delegations which have visited my office in Washington, D.C., "Where we part company is on this premise: You seem to think that the United States could unilaterally disarm and still survive. You seem to think that Russia would not commit a nuclear attack upon us if we got ourselves into a position so defenseless that we could not counter that attack, although we know that war would destroy both countries."

So there is a complete failure to have any meeting of minds on this subject matter, for these wonderful people—and they are wonderful, and I always have

great admiration for those who are motivated by sincerity of purpose, even though I think their case is completely unsound; nevertheless, they stand by their convictions—have no common premise with me, insofar as the crux of the problem is concerned, although I certainly share all their ideals, and I certainly agree with them about the great moral principles for which they stand. But as a Member of this body, I have a trust to perform which they do not have. As I said to them the other evening, I really wonder whether they would vote or take the position they are asking me to take, if they sat in the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, as Members of the U.S. Senate, and became convinced, on the basis of the evidence submitted to the members of the committee, that to follow such a course of action would certainly guarantee the destruction of the United States. Under such circumstances, I wonder whether they would cast such a vote or take such a position.

Mr. President, there can be no meeting of minds, so far as I am concerned, with those who propose unilateral disarmament. I will not run the risk, I will not make the gamble, I refuse to take the chance, because I believe I have a great responsibility to the people of the United States to resolve all doubts in this field in favor of adequate defense which will make clear at all times—day and night—to Khrushchev that he has everything to lose and nothing to gain by a nuclear war.

But that leads me to discuss another aspect of this problem. There are many groups—not only the so-called peace groups composed of very dedicated men and women, but also others, including some scientists—who are very much alarmed and disturbed because of the possibility and, with each passing day, the increased probability, that once more the United States will engage in atmospheric testing.

It is well known by Members of the Senate that I believe atmospheric testing to be immoral. It is a rather sad reflection on today's level of civilization that we are even confronted with the problem of nuclear testing. Yet it leads us into another paradox. In this instance I wish to state that in my judgment Senators are put in the position of having to make a choice between degrees of immorality, for let the record clearly show that I support the position the President has taken in regard to atmospheric testing. I reluctantly support it, as I know he reluctantly reached his decision. I sadly support it, as I know he was sad when, after the evidence was presented to him, he felt it necessary, in fulfillment of his trust to the Nation, to announce to all the world that unless a workable understanding could be reached with Russia in regard to ending all atmospheric tests in the future, it would be necessary for him to authorize atmosphere testing, although highly limited in scope, by our country. The last part of the President's program is very easily overlooked by many persons; but again it should be said, as some of us have said before, that the President

is not proposing wide-open atmospheric testing. He is acting on the basis of an accumulation of evidence, which has been submitted to him as Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces of our country, regarding what was accomplished by the Russians when they broke faith and engaged in the ignominious deception practiced upon the group meeting at Geneva for the purpose of trying to reach some agreement on nuclear weapons testing. Nevertheless, even while they were meeting, the Russians were preparing their bombs for atmospheric testing—preparations which required a minimum of 30 days for any bomb they would test, and for the larger ones—and most of them were larger—required from 90 to 120 days.

To some of my friends who find it most difficult to believe that the leaders of any government, such as Russia, could possibly be as amoral as they demonstrated themselves to be at the Geneva conference in regard to nuclear testing, I say that it is only necessary to consider the evidence. The Russian delegates sat for weeks in that international conference, complete deceivers, planning—even while they pretended to be trying to work out such an arrangement—again to endanger mankind by engaging in atmospheric testing of nuclear weapons.

All I can say in a public address such as this is that I am satisfied, as the President has tried to make clear, by the use of language which I think so clear that those who read cannot possibly misunderstand, that the evidence clearly shows that in their last atmospheric testing the Russians made great headway in regard to perfecting the delivery of nuclear warheads.

We do not know how much progress they made in regard to the development of an antimissile missile. But again all we can do as members of the Foreign Relations Committee—and I understand the same is true insofar as the briefings received by members of the Armed Services Committee are concerned—is to operate as jurors on the evidence submitted to us when we come to pass judgment in regard to the policy to be established. That evidence left no room for doubt in my mind, and I know of not one member of the Foreign Relations Committee who does not share with me this point of view. I think this is one point on which there is complete unanimity—as there is, to the surprise of many persons, but not to the surprise of those of us who serve on the committee, on most of the issues which come to the Foreign Relations Committee, once its members receive briefings by the experts, scientists, and diplomats who bring to that committee information which, for security reasons, cannot be brought to the country as a whole—

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McGEE in the chair). Does the Senator from Oregon yield to the Senator from Idaho?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. DWORSHAK. I am impressed by the Senator's statement that generally there is unanimity of opinion among the

members of the Foreign Relations Committee, after they are briefed—presumably by officials from the executive departments, including, no doubt, the State Department. Does the Senator from Oregon mean to imply that, after they receive such briefings, members of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee are generally in accord in regard to, and that they thoroughly support, the recommendations and policies of the State Department?

Mr. MORSE. No. The votes taken in the committee show that, when the members of the committee come to decide on a legislative course or policy to be recommended by the committee to the Senate, time and time again they find themselves unanimous, or with only a small number of minority votes.

I am proud to say to the Senator from Idaho that in the Foreign Relations Committee I never think of the Democratic or Republican side of the committee table, and I do not think any of my colleagues do; but there is general recognition that there is a common trust in that committee to make a determination based on where the facts lead. Very often, on both sides of the table, we find ourselves practically unanimous in our opposition to a recommendation, as well as practically unanimous in support of a recommendation.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. DWORSHAK. I am sure the Senator's mail from back home, as is true of mine, is extremely critical of some of the policies and programs sponsored by the State Department, particularly in handling the aid program and in operating measures in South America, for example, where the Senator from Oregon is vitally interested. I wonder if, in such cases, the Senator's committee takes any steps involving remedial action to correct what may be abuses or ineptitude on the part of the State Department.

Mr. MORSE. Time and time again we have done so. At the present time we are completing our hearings in regard to the authorization bill for mutual security. Time after time an overwhelming majority, or sometimes all of us, have found ourselves in disagreement with some suggestions that have been made, or in agreement on the need for modifying them.

I am proud of the Foreign Relations Committee's part in modifying some of the foreign policies as they have come before the committee in both Democratic and Republican administrations.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Of course, that is logical procedure, because the State Department is largely dominated, not by the Secretary of State, but by so-called career professional personnel, who make the contacts and formulate the policies after considering the developments in various countries abroad. In those circumstances it is natural that partisanship should be missing in the deliberations and activities and policies outlined by the State Department.

Mr. MORSE. There is no doubt that the administrative officers of the State Department, the Secretary of State, the

Under Secretary of State, and the various Assistant Secretaries of State, must rely very heavily for their information upon our embassies and missions abroad; but let me say to the Senator from Idaho that I think we have reason to be very proud of the valued judgments which the administrative officers have made, at least under all the administrations in the 18 years I have been a Member of the Senate.

Many persons have the false notion that policies in the State Department are not subject to the precious protection that the American people are entitled to, which we know as the system of checks. I happen to know that time and time again the Secretary of State has opposed and rejected proposals made to him by foreign missions or embassies or subordinates in the State Department.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one more question?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. DWORSHAK. I know the Senator from Oregon has made many inspection tours in Latin American countries. In view of the extensive commitments made last year by the United States to support, during the next decade, the Alliance for Progress program to bring greater security to the underdeveloped countries of South America, I am wondering whether the Senator has sensed any lack of understanding on the part of our personnel in the embassies and the various agencies of the executive department which are supervising the aid program in South America, particularly insofar as self-help and cooperative features inherent in the program are concerned.

Mr. MORSE. No. My answer must be in the negative. By and large, our Foreign Service officers and our officials in embassies in Latin America are not only dedicated public servants, but are very able. Some of the very best help we have had in evaluating proposals in some of the Latin American countries for assistance has come from our embassies, both prior to the Alliance for Progress program and now under the program. A good many caveats, a good many warnings, a good many suggestions for changes being made in proposals made by Latin American countries, have come from some of our embassies themselves.

Of course, there cannot be such a far-flung organization as our Foreign Service without having persons in it from time to time follow a course of action where the composite judgment is bad. It has always been so, and will always be so, in an organization composed of human beings. We have all been pained in recent days to learn it is possible in domestic affairs, as was the case in the Department of Agriculture, that a few public officials may not have lived up to the highest standards we are entitled to expect from a public servant. I was not surprised to see the Secretary of Agriculture lose no time in eliminating from the service that type of person.

I do not hold to the point of view that the American people have not been receiving very high level and dedicated service from our Foreign Service people.

I happen to believe in a career Foreign Service corps with checks in it. It is a good thing to have a considerable number of noncareer ambassadors. It is a good thing to have a good many of our missions composed, not entirely of career service people, but of persons taken from a cross section of American life.

I shall not go into the subject now, but I intend later to discuss at some length in the Senate, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Latin America, the fact that the most important technical assistance that has been rendered for years in Latin America has been the technical assistance provided by American businessmen. The technical assistance provided by American businessmen, both in quantity and quality, has been far superior to any Government program we have been able to inaugurate thus far. Having raised the question, I think I ought to document it with at least one example.

I made a video tape yesterday on a subject matter I shall discuss later in my speech. It was one of these roundtable give-and-take affairs. This subject matter came up in respect to our technical assistance program to Latin America. I pointed out that the story is not known as to how long a great technical assistance program has been going on in Latin America on the part of American business concerns.

On that telecast I said, "Let us consider the work of the McGee Construction Co. of Ohio." Who knows about the technical assistance it has rendered in Latin America? I can cite two of its great pieces of construction, and they are only two of many: the great steel plant of the Argentine and the great steel plant of Brazil. How many people know that those steel plants now are being operated, so far as supervisory staff is concerned, by the people of those countries for the most part? Of course, that is even more true with respect to those below the supervisory staff. From the foreman level up 90 percent plus of the supervisory staff members the employees come from the indigenous population. It took the people who built the plant and invested in the plant a long time to provide the technical assistance which made it possible to turn the operation of those plants over to the Brazilians and to the people of Argentina. In my judgment that is the most worthwhile type of technical assistance. I could cite legions of examples.

It was interesting to note, as I went through Latin America and talked to American businessmen, their reactions. As the Senator knows, in all principal cities there are U.S. Chamber of Commerce groups, composed of American businessmen who operate in the area.

I have always been pleased to find very little criticism from those men in regard to our Embassy staffs and in regard to our Government policies in relation to American businessmen in Latin America. They have many suggestions for improved policy. Always they will have those. But one does not run into criticism of efficiency, of cooperation, and of high standards of our personnel.

I am in favor of a career service, with a check upon it by having people out of the career service participate in it to a degree, yet I look at foreign service personnel of some of our allies. Let the record be perfectly clear. I do not wish to substitute the British system for the American system. I do not wish to substitute the Canadian system for the American system. I only wish to learn from them the lessons of value they can teach us.

As the Senator knows, those are out-and-out career services, by and large. There are a few exceptions. One who good-naturedly refers to himself—and I refer to Her Majesty's Ambassador in Washington, D.C., at the present time—says he is not a career servant; but he is a pretty able one. He climbed up the political ladder in Great Britain. By and large the embassies are operated by men who, as young men, went into the career service and were trained in diplomacy.

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

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Last November I was a member of a senatorial group which made an inspection tour of South American countries. I recall that in every large city there was a group with whom we did confer, the so-called American chambers of commerce, to receive suggestions, advice, and complaints if there were any.

As I remember the trip, there was probably a quite limited criticism of the operation of our Embassy offices in the various countries. However, I recall there was very much alarm and apprehension in regard to the hostility which was becoming more apparent on the part of some of the governments in Latin American countries. Some of the governments were proposing punitive tax measures. Expropriation of American business properties was occurring.

While it was the general consensus of the members of the American business community that every cooperative effort should be made to help develop those countries and to stabilize their economies, there was an apparent concern and doubt in regard to whether the American businessman could accomplish much toward bringing greater stability to those countries.

Does the Senator recognize the threat of expropriation in those countries?

Mr. MORSE. There was a great deal of concern about it in the Committee on Foreign Relations. In fact, the committee discussed it as recently as day before yesterday with State Department officials.

It happened to be my responsibility to ask for it, but as chairman of the subcommittee I asked for the preparation of a detailed memorandum, to be followed by a conference, in respect to the problem in Brazil, about which we have all been hearing or reading so much in the newspapers. We will get that detailed memorandum, and we will be briefed in respect to what steps are being taken by way of negotiations in respect to the problem.

This is one of the most troublesome of all the issues confronting us in Latin America. I shall comment upon it very briefly.

The Senator may recall that in 1960 the Senator from Vermont [Mr. ARKEN] and I filed a report with the Senate in respect to what our policy should be in connection with the so-called government monopolies which are being operated by various countries; such as Mexico, in respect to oil; Brazil, in respect to oil; and at one time the Argentine—and they may get back into it, for who knows what will happen?

One of the great dangers which confronts us is the successful propaganda of the Communists that if we seek to influence the Latin American countries against government monopolies we are seeking to participate in economic intervention. It is true that in many places in Latin America the leaders are as much concerned about economic intervention as they are concerned about military intervention. We must find some balance.

I happen to be one who is opposed to nationalization of industry, yet I would be less than honest if I did not frankly recognize that if some foreign country wishes to nationalize its industry it has a sovereign right to do so.

The question is, if it involves American property, what will be done diplomatically to see to it that adequate compensation—and I underline the word "adequate"—is paid for the property which is expropriated.

I have no knowledge in regard to the progress which has been made in connection with the Brazilian incident. I am confident, if they go ahead with the program of taking over the utilities involved, that there is no question about the position our Government will take; that is, compensation will have to be adequate.

I am a strong believer in that. I shall have something to say before I finish in respect to certain Latin American problems which relate to it.

I now wish to finish the part of my speech which deals with disarmament.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, before the distinguished Senator leaves the Latin American part of his speech—and particularly the colloquy between him and the distinguished Senator from Idaho—I wonder if he will yield to me for a question.

Mr. MORSE. I am glad to yield.

Mr. SPARKMAN. The Senator discussed the bipartisanship or nonpartisanship approach which the Foreign Relations Committee uniformly takes toward measures. The Senator recalls, I am sure, that the late distinguished Senator from Michigan to whom he referred, Senator Vandenberg, who was a very able member and a very able chairman of that committee, used to refer to it as "unpartisanship."

He took the viewpoint that there should be no partisanship whatsoever. In other words, he distinguished even as against the term "bipartisan," because he wanted it to be absolutely unpartisan.

Is it not the feeling of the Senator from Oregon that during all those years, particularly since shortly after the end of World War II, when Senator Vandenberg exercised such great leadership in bringing about this nonpartisan feeling, the Committee on Foreign Relations has acted in that respect with reference to all questions before it?

Mr. MORSE. There is no doubt of it. The leadership of the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], our present chairman, the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], who is the ranking Democrat on the committee next to the chairman, the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], who are the ranking Republicans on the committee—and I shall say something further about them in a moment—has given us the assurance that in the committee we shall follow the Vandenberg policy of what the Senator has referred to as “unpartisanship,” and which I refer to as “nonpartisanship.”

Mr. SPARKMAN. If the Senator will yield to me further, I would particularly like to call to the attention of the Senator from Idaho [Mr. DWORSHAK] a point of which he knows, I am sure, but one that is pertinent at this time. The Senator from Oregon has talked about some of the various forces that play upon the final determination of an issue involving our international relations with any particular country.

The Senator from Oregon omitted one particular force. It is something that I think has played a very great part in international relations over the last several years. That has been the frequent consultation between the executive branch—sometimes the President and sometimes the Secretary of State—and the Foreign Relations Committee, and particularly the subcommittees of that committee that serve geographical areas. Elaborating upon that subject, there is a pulling in of congressional representation in connection with international conferences.

I remember when the OAS Conference was held at Punta del Este in connection with the Cuban situation. The distinguished Senator from Oregon, as chairman of the Latin American subcommittee, and the distinguished Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], who was the ranking Republican member of that subcommittee, were invited from the Senate to accompany the Secretary of State. The delegation that went there included two Representatives from the House. They were my colleague from Alabama, Representative ARMISTEAD I. SELDEN, JR., who is chairman of the Subcommittee on Latin American Affairs of the House of Representatives, and Representative CHESTER E. MERROW, from New Hampshire, who is the ranking Republican on that committee. The four of them went down to Punta del Este. I was particularly interested in the reports that came back to this country during the time of that Conference.

I do not know whether the point has been called to the attention of the Senator from Oregon, but from time to time during the course of that conference we

received reports that the delegation had exercised a great influence on that conference. I had the pleasure of being at the White House when the delegation returned. I heard the President pay his respect to the work that had been done down there. He called the names of the four congressional representatives who went to that conference and paid his respects to the work that they had done.

Later, when Secretary of State Rusk was making his remarks, he likewise called the names of the four representatives and mentioned what they had accomplished. At times the part that has been played by the fine cooperation and coordination between the executive and legislative branches of our Government has been overlooked.

Mr. MORSE. I am very glad to have the comments of the Senator from Alabama. I wish to say a word about my Republican colleagues on the Foreign Relations Committee. As the Senator knows, the ranking Republican member of that committee and, when the Republicans controlled Congress, the chairman of the committee, is the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY]. Many times when we have had rather vigorous discussion in the committee, the Senator from Alabama has heard him say, “Will someone tell me what is in the best interests of our country?”

That is the only thing that counts. It is the attitude that the Senator from Wisconsin has taken as the ranking Republican member of the committee. He richly deserves the high commendation that I now give him.

I should like to refer to the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], who is the ranking Republican member of my Subcommittee on Latin American Affairs. The Senator from Iowa would be the first to agree with me that on a great many domestic issues he and I do not always vote the same in the Senate. I suppose the majority of times we do not vote together. But it has been a thrilling experience to serve with him over the years on the committee designated to examine Latin American problems. We were joint delegates to the Bogotá Conference in 1960 that brought out the Act of Bogotá, which was really the forerunner of Punta del Este and the Alliance for Progress program. It was really the forerunner of the increasing acceptance on the part of the Latin American countries—at least their governments—of the essentiality of self-help programs on their part if they are going to expect the American people to help them further.

I wish to pay my very high tribute to the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] because he, too, asked the question, What do the facts show the public interest to be? It is in that spirit that we have worked cooperatively in the Foreign Relations Committee.

Mr. President, before the colloquy I had with the Senator from Idaho [Mr. DWORSHAK] and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], I was discussing the paradoxical situation in which we find ourselves in respect to the resumption of atmospheric testing. I had made the point that we must make the choice among degrees of immorality. That is

difficult. I have made clear that I support the President's program for the resumption of limited atmospheric testing if the Russians are not willing to accept an enforceable control system. Every indication is that they are not. I had already made the point that while we were negotiating in good faith at Geneva, the Russians were obviously negotiating in bad faith and shocking deception, because at the very time they were negotiating, they were preparing their bombs for testing.

I had made the point that atmospheric nuclear testing is immoral if we are to evaluate the question from the standpoint of its effects upon mankind. It is pretty shocking to sit and listen to the scientists tell us what fallout is bound to do to the human organism, although scientists dispute among themselves as to the degree of damage the fallout will cause. I have never talked with one of them who, when pressed under cross-examination, was not willing to admit that it would be much better for mankind if none of the damage were done.

Atmospheric testing is immoral, in my judgment, but there is another thing more immoral connected with the nuclear issue. It would be so much more immoral for the Government of the United States and the people of the United States to make the mistake of not keeping themselves in a position where Khrushchev would understand that he has everything to lose and nothing to gain by all-out nuclear war. If we let him get such a lead, then my major premise, to which I referred earlier in my speech, might go into effect and have application. I repeat it. That major premise is that if the Communist segment of the world ever thinks that if the Communist segment of the world ever thinks that the Western Powers, particularly the United States, are permitting themselves to get into such a weakened defense position that the Russians can knock them out quickly in a nuclear war, and survive themselves, they would try that step.

Therefore, wrestling as one does with his conscience in this matter and communing with one's God—and I offer no apology for saying that—I have had no hesitancy in reaching the conclusion that the President should and must be supported.

I am very happy to note that the American people by and large recognize that fact. At the same time, as a religious people we feel that in some way, somehow, reason will come to prevail in the Russian minds and that they will be willing to sit down with us and negotiate the kind of disarmament agreement the President so nobly and eloquently presented once again to the American people yesterday.

That is my general position on disarmament. I am pleased to give my support to the Senator from Minnesota, who honors me with his presence as acting majority leader this afternoon, and to say to him once again that I believe the speech he made on the floor of the Senate this afternoon is a speech that not only the American people will have to come back to time and time again, but

is also a speech the premises of which must be accepted by the leaders of the nations of the world if we are to leave to our grandchildren the heritage of freedom to which I have referred.

Some say to me, "Mr. Senator, you keep on saying that we have got to do this to buy time."

Some, not so kind, have said to me, "Mr. Senator, you keep saying that we have got to have more time, but will you tell us how much time we can risk?"

I cannot answer that question, other than to say that, so long as there is hope, no other course is open to us.

I cannot imagine our making the mistake of changing this course of action which is giving so much hope to so many millions of people in the so-called weaker countries. They themselves recognize the fact that their hope for survival is for the United States, eventually with our Western allies, to lead the nations of the world to an enforceable disarmament agreement.

Once in a while I hear critics of the United Nations deplore the fact that many much smaller nations and much more underdeveloped nations than the United States have an equal voice in the United Nations with the United States. They seem to think that some great danger lurks in that fact.

I have sat in the United Nations. I wish to say that in the General Assembly the doctrine of equality, as far as votes are concerned, is one of our great strengths. I am not one of those who would give to the militarily mighty in the United Nations a greater voice than I would to smaller nations. I have seen those smaller nations operate. They recognize that their only hope for survival is putting into international practice the ideals of a Roosevelt and a Vandenberg and the program of a Truman.

We have a cause that stands upon its merits. When we talk on these international problems in the United Nations, we do not have to worry about the acceptability of the merits of our case.

I sat there during the session when Khrushchev came to the United Nations in a rage, because he had to leave the Congo or be thrown out by the United Nations. The great Dag Hammarskjöld made perfectly clear to the Russians, when they were trying to move into the Congo, that unless they moved out they would be moved out. I have always thought that that was one of the main reasons for Khrushchev's high state of rage when he came to New York and made for the first time his troika proposal which attempted to hamstring the effectiveness of the General Assembly.

I close this section of my speech by saying that I want the RECORD to show that I support the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], and give full and complete support to the President of the United States in regard to his program both in the field of testing and in the field of disarmament.

There are other developments in American foreign policy that concern me very much in these hours. So I close my speech with the last section, which deals with some problems of Latin America.

I speak in the capacity of my chairmanship of the subcommittee that deals with Latin American affairs.

There are thousands of Cuban exiles in the United States. No one could give greater support to their admission to the United States than the senior Senator from Oregon. In keeping with the spirit of the words engraved on the Statue of Liberty, we once again open our doors to the oppressed. We have become a great refuge and escape asylum for them. I am proud of it as an American. I am in favor of continuing to give them this haven of security. However, I speak most respectfully when I say that they, too, have responsibilities and obligations, which they in turn owe to the United States. Therefore, I am concerned when I pick up the New York Times and read a headline: "Ex-Castro Officers Build Force in the United States."

The article reads, in part:

WASHINGTON, April 18.—A compact guerrilla force built around former officers of Premier Fidel Castro's army is being organized in Florida and Puerto Rico for eventual action against the Cuban regime.

According to Cuban informants, this force has been in preparation since last summer and may soon be ready for action.

Its aim is to enter Cuba and engage in guerrilla operations at an opportune time—possibly if local uprisings occur as a result of the deterioration of the island's economic and political situation.

The group's recruiting headquarters is in Miami, and most of its training is conducted in Florida on an individual basis. The new guerrilla force has no direct connections, however, with the U.S. Government.

The bulk of this force is made up of officers and men who were prevented for political reasons from participating in the rebel invasion of Cuba a year ago yesterday. The Central Intelligence Agency was in charge of that invasion attempt.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the entire article may be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

EX-CASTRO OFFICERS BUILD FORCE IN UNITED STATES

WASHINGTON, April 18.—A compact guerrilla force built around former officers of Premier Fidel Castro's army is being organized in Florida and Puerto Rico for eventual action against the Cuban regime.

According to Cuban informants, this force has been in preparation since last summer and may soon be ready for action.

Its aim is to enter Cuba and engage in guerrilla operations at an opportune time—possibly if local uprisings occur as a result of the deterioration of the island's economic and political situation.

The group's recruiting headquarters is in Miami and most of its training is conducted in Florida on an individual basis. The new guerrilla force has no direct connections, however, with the U.S. Government.

The bulk of this force is made up of officers and men who were prevented for political reasons from participating in the rebel invasion of Cuba a year ago yesterday. The Central Intelligence Agency was in charge of that invasion attempt.

The objection against these men last year was that although they were violently anti-Communist and anti-Castro, they favored certain aspects of the Cuban social revolution. Many of them had broken out of Cuban prisons to reach the United States.

A large segment of the new force is made up of men identified with the People's Revolutionary Movement. This movement is headed by Manuel Ray, who, during the 1961 invasion, belonged to the Cuban Revolutionary Council. The abortive attack was staged in the name of this council.

However, an estimated total of 170 volunteers from the Revolutionary Movement were kept out of the invasion force after arriving at the staging area in Guatemala. Others were kept in Miami.

ALL-CUBAN OPERATION

The basic concept of the new guerrilla group is that all anti-Castro activities should be conducted and directed by Cubans and not by U.S. citizens. For the time being the only desire of these Cubans is that the United States grant them freedom of movement to aid them at a later stage, should the need arise.

Recently, informants said, Col. Ramon Barquin, a Cuban regular army officer and formerly military adviser to Señor Ray, agreed to head the new force.

Colonel Barquin, who now lives in Puerto Rico, where he operates a boys' military academy, has just finished a lecture tour of South America.

His top aids are reported to be Col. Martin Helena, who was chief of staff of the 1961 invasion army until he was deposed by a rightwing revolt in the Guatemala training camps, and Capt. José Lopes Legon, who was head of the movement's military camp in Florida.

Another contingent participating in the new force is the so-called Huber Matos Garrison group. This force is made up of officers of Premier Castro's "Rebel Army"—the official name of the Cuban military establishment—who served under Maj. Huber Matos in Camaguey Province in 1959.

At that time, Major Matos tried to resign his post in protest against the Communist infiltration in the army. He was arrested by Dr. Castro and sentenced to 30 years in prison.

OFFICERS ESCAPED

Most of his officers were jailed, but succeeded in fleeing to Miami in 1960. Although they offered their services to the invasion army, they were kept out, reportedly on orders of the CIA. Their leader is Capt. Napoleon Becker.

The main advantages of the new group are that most of the members have guerrilla experience and that they have acquaintances among the officers in Dr. Castro's rebel army in Cuba.

Intelligence reports have indicated that numerous officers and men in the Cuban army—and even in the militia—are in sympathy with anti-Castro movements. But the reports say they must be given to join the ranks of an active opposition.

The new guerrilla group rules out political ties with any Cuban refugee group and plans to operate primarily as a military entity. Some of its men are civilian underground specialists in sabotage.

CASTRO FOE SLAIN

KEY WEST, Fla., April 18.—Havana radio said today that Premier Castro's force had shot down a counterrevolutionary in an abortive attempt that was made under instructions from U.S. Intelligence Agency agents at the Guantanamo Naval Base.

The announcement of the death of the counterrevolutionary, Heriberto Rodriguez Pena, followed a report by the Havana radio that anti-Castro elements had taken refuge at the U.S. Naval Base and were agitating for weapons to fight the Cuban Government.

The Rodriguez case is the second official report in as many days of action against counterrevolutionaries.

The Havana broadcast said Señor Rodriguez was shot several days ago in Santiago

de Cuba. The city is an important port about 40 miles southwest of Guantanamo Bay.

Yesterday the radio reported the slaying of Osvaldo Ramirez Garcia, a top counterrevolutionary who was reported to have been active against the Castro regime since mid-1959.

FREED PRISONERS ARRIVE HERE

Seven Cuban prisoners arrived at New York International Airport yesterday and made an emotional appeal for funds to liberate the 1,119 prisoners still being held by Premier Castro.

About 300 persons, some of them relatives of the prisoners, cheered the men as they stepped off a plane from Miami. The greeters shouted in Spanish, "Long live free Cuba" and "Down with communism."

All seven prisoners had been seriously wounded or sick, and some were on crutches.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I have checked with the State Department, as was my duty upon a reading of that article. I have been assured that there is no U.S. involvement in or knowledge of such training operations in Florida. I made it perfectly clear that I intended to make a statement today in regard to whatever response I got from the State Department. I am satisfied that the State Department is dealing with me forthrightly, accurately, and honestly concerning this subject. Therefore, I have made this statement.

But in the April 19 issue of the Washington Star, I read another item which disturbs me. The dateline is "San Juan, P.R., April 19," and the article reads as follows:

A Cuban exile leader, Col. Ramon Barquin, called last night for the use of U.S. Marines to liberate Cuba from Fidel Castro's Red regime.

Mr. Barquin, onetime Cuban military attaché in Washington, told newsmen that Marines had been used in Latin American nations in the past and should be employed to free his country.

He made his remarks after returning from a 2-day trip to Miami, where it was reported he had conferred with heads of the People's Revolutionary Movement on plans for possible anti-Castro warfare.

Yesterday afternoon the present Presiding Officer of the Senate, the distinguished senior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. MCGEE], participated with me—and I referred to the incident earlier in my speech—in the making of a video tape to be shown later in respect to an article written by the Governor of Puerto Rico, the Honorable Luis Muñoz-Marín, and to be published in the May issue of Reader's Digest. I speak for myself when I say I was a little surprised in that program to find the undertone—and not too much of an undertone—that perhaps the time had come when there ought to be participation by the United States in some kind of invasion of Cuba. I felt that a distinguished Cuban exile who participated with us in the program did not speak out against such a proposal as I think Cuban exile leaders should speak out.

Delicate as this subject is, I feel that it is my duty, in my capacity as chairman of the Subcommittee on American Republics Affairs, to reject and repudiate any thought or proposal of U.S. invasion of Cuba. I have

some right to speak on this subject, because I led the fight in this body some years ago against U.S. support of Batista. It was the public hearings held by my subcommittee in January 1958, as the RECORD will show, that brought out the admission by the State Department that Batista could not remain in power without U.S. military aid. We who knew anything about Latin America knew that that was true. Some of us had for some time dared to challenge such aid by this country. Some of our problems in Latin America have been caused by too much exportation of bullets rather than bread to that area of the world. Many of the problems in Latin America have been caused by the American military interventions of the past, and we have been decades in living it down. Only in recent years has there developed a better understanding of what was meant when Franklin Roosevelt initiated the good-neighbor policy.

But the fear by Latin America of American military intervention has plagued us for decades. I think we must make it crystal clear at this hour that Cuban exile leaders, who, in my judgment, are betraying the obligation they owe their sanctuary, are presenting propaganda that is no part of American foreign policy. Yet I am concerned at how many persons seem to think—for I get their letters—that the way to handle Castro is to go in and conquer his country with American military might.

I say I have the right to speak on this subject because not only did I lead the fight in this body against the Batista regime, but I was the first, and the first for some time, to speak out against Castro, because it was clear to me almost from the beginning that Castro was adopting totalitarian procedures—and I judge a government by its procedures. The procedures of a government determine whether people are free. Governments can have the finest sounding constitutions; but unless those constitutions are implemented by procedures which guarantee freedom, they become but scraps of paper. We all know that the problem of implanting freedom in Latin America is a long-pull proposition. It will not be possible to press any button, whether it is for the Alliance for Progress program or any other type of program, and have freedom in Latin America overnight.

What must be made crystal clear to Latin America and the rest of the world at all times is that the United States has no intention of violating its treaty obligations; has no intention of conducting a unilateral military action anywhere in Latin America, including Cuba; but does have the intention of carrying out its share of the joint responsibilities under the charter of this hemisphere, the Charter of the Organization of American States. That was the purpose of Punta del Este. That was the purpose of the council meeting of the Organization of American States in Washington a few weeks ago, following Punta del Este. The time has come to make it perfectly clear to the Cuban leaders who are in exile in the United States that this

country is no place for them to stir up, by way of their propaganda—a considerable amount of which, upon checking, is found to be false—a public opinion which would seek to lead our Government into unilateral military action in Cuba.

No one could hate the Communist regime of Castro or any other Communist regime more than I do; but it is my view that if we participate in exporting freedom under the Alliance for Progress program, political freedom will take root in Latin America, and Latin America will gradually become a haven of economic and political freedom for the mass of the people there, and communism in Cuba will rot on the political vine.

In passing, Mr. President, we should note what some of the inevitable results of unilateral action by our country would be. I am convinced that there is no danger of it, for any administration in our country would make a colossal mistake if it let the Cuban exile propagandists lead us into military action in Cuba.

First, Mr. President, let me make clear that if any aggressive course of action were to be taken against the United States by Cuba or, through Cuba, by Russia, Red China, or any of the other members of the Communist bloc, there would be no question as to what our position then would be. However, there is a great deal of difference between being a defender against aggression and becoming an aggressor, regardless of the nature of the political sovereignty against which a country engaged in such aggression, whether it be Communist, Fascist, or of some other political ideology. The Cuban exile leaders who are advocating an American invasion of Cuba are proposing that the United States become an aggressor, in violation of all its treaty commitments—those under the OAS Treaty, the Rio Treaty, the Caracas Treaty, and the other treaties to which our Nation's signature has been affixed.

Mr. President, not one more hour should be allowed to pass without our registering a protest, here in the Senate, against the propaganda activities in this country by some of the Cuban exile leaders. But such activities are not limited to the Cuban exile leaders.

Yesterday, there was submitted to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee a statement by the Honorable Spruille Braden, a member of the Citizens Foreign Aid Committee. I wish to comment briefly on it, because I want the RECORD to leave no room for doubt that I reject and repudiate the major premises of his statement. If our country ever were to follow the foreign policy advocated by Mr. Braden in that statement, we would overnight, lose our friends around the world, for his statement cannot be reconciled with the glorious foreign-policy record of our country—a foreign policy based upon defense of our rights, but not based upon aggressive action. In a moment I shall refer in detail to his statement; but, first, let me point out what the newspapers yesterday and today have stated about it.

I read the following from the Washington Star of yesterday:

BRADEN URGES CUBA INVASION

Spruille Braden, a former U.S. Ambassador to Cuba, said today an invasion by U.S. military forces is the only way to rid the Caribbean country of communism.

"If we wipe out the Communists in Cuba," Mr. Braden said, "they will fall everywhere else in the Americas."

Mr. Braden told the Senate Foreign Relations Committee in a prepared statement that approval of President Kennedy's 10-year, \$20 billion Alliance for Progress program of aid to Latin American countries would be "a criminal waste of the taxpayers' money."

"The first, imperative, and for the moment the only thing to do," he said, "is immediately and quickly to drive communism out of Cuba and then out of the rest of the hemisphere, including our own country."

That is completely irresponsible talk by Mr. Braden.

I read further from the article:

URGES FULL ATTACK

Mr. Braden continued: "The only way to rid that island of Soviet domination and Communist control, not to mention Castro, is to give our leadership and with our patriotic and courageous Cuban and other Latin American friends to organize an all-out invasion by the U.S. Army, Navy, Air Corps, and Marines."

In addition to his Cuban assignment, Mr. Braden has been Ambassador to Colombia and Argentina and was Assistant Secretary of State for Latin American Affairs in the Truman administration. He made his statement to the committee as a member of the Citizens Foreign Aid Committee.

Mr. President, the rest of the article does not deal with Mr. Braden, so I shall not read it now. But so there may be no question about the accuracy of my reporting, I ask that the remainder of the article be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

CHAMBER ASKS CUT

The U.S. Chamber of Commerce recommended today a \$1,088,100,000 cut in President Kennedy's \$4,878,500,000 foreign aid program in earlier testimony.

Its spokesman, John O. Teeter, of New York, asked, in addition to the slash a concerted effort "to strengthen the role of private enterprise" in underdeveloped countries and more effective action to coordinate worldwide programs to stop duplication and waste.

Mr. Teeter, vice president of Pfizer International, Inc., was among a score of witnesses invited to appear for the committee's final day of hearings on the foreign aid authorization measure, on which the committee will start voting next week.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, for the purpose of additional emphasis, I call special attention to one paragraph of Mr. Braden's statement. On page 8 of his statement, as submitted to the committee, he said:

If we wipe out the Communists in Cuba, they will fall everywhere else in the Americas. The only way to rid that island of Soviet domination and Communist control, not to mention Castro, is to give our leadership and with our patriotic and courageous Cuban and other Latin American friends to organize an all-out invasion by the U.S. Army, Navy, Air Corps, and Marines.

Mr. President, let us consider for a moment that hypothesis. Let us assume that utter madness overcame our judgment, and that as madmen we followed such a course of action. What would be our justification in terms of international law, or in light of our commitments under the OAS Charter and under the Rio Treaty, the Caracas Treaty, and the other treaties to which we are signatory; and what would be our answer in the United Nations when a resolution of condemnation was introduced, and when it was asserted that we had violated treaty after treaty under which we had pledged ourselves to follow a nonaggressive course of action?

The Braden philosophy—and let me say it is held by too many persons in this country—is the philosophy of a return to the point of view that might makes right. It never has, and never will.

I am satisfied that the information I have received in my capacity as a member of the Foreign Relations Committee is correct when I have been told by our military and other experts that an attempt at such an invasion in its early stages would cost a minimum of 40,000 lives of American boys.

When the cause is just and right, there is no question of what the American people and the American military will do by way of sacrifice; but my answer to Mr. Braden is that he could not possibly justify in the pages of American history a sacrifice of a minimum of 40,000 lives of American boys, in the early stages of the invasion, when that cause would be unjust and wrong so far as American foreign policy is concerned.

I think the time has come when we no longer can take in silence the insidious and invidious propaganda program going on in our country to sell the American people the proposition that we ought to seize Cuba.

In closing, let me say that we can seize Cuba. But there would be sacrifices that cannot be justified in such a course of action, which would go down in history as international outlawry. And would we be ready, Mr. President, to face the consequences in the rest of Latin America? Would we be ready to lose the support of the masses of the people of Latin America for decades? Would we be ready to face the great crisis that would mount as one government after another toppled in Latin America?

The Bradens and their ilk are strengthening the Communist cause in Latin America by the irresponsible sponsorship of an aggressive course of action on the part of the United States of America against Cuba. I recommend the prevailing American foreign policy in Latin America. It is a policy of statesmanship and reality. It is a policy of keeping faith with our ideals and being true to the signature we have affixed to one treaty after another in Latin America. It is a policy whereby we say, in furthering the Roosevelt and the Truman good neighbor policy, the Eisenhower people-to-people policy, the Kennedy Alliance for Progress policy, "We seek to be partners with you in the cause of establishing a system of economic

freedom for the masses of the people of Latin America, out of which will develop political freedom and all the precious rights of individual freedom and dignity that men and women should enjoy."

The Punta del Este conference, in effect, quarantined Cuba. The Punta del Este conference in effect laid the foundation for the implementation of the Punta del Este program throughout the rest of the hemisphere. The Punta del Este conference was a pledge by the free nations of the American States to work jointly together to resist the spread of Castro communism, which we all know is fed and nurtured by the Marxist-Leninist line as set forth in Russia. But the Punta del Este conference did not advocate war. The Punta del Este conference made perfectly clear, Mr. President, that the way to peace in the Western Hemisphere is not by way of war.

I have all the sympathy that one could have for the patriots of Cuba who have fled Cuba to the United States, but I close by saying to their leaders, "In my judgment, you are not true to your obligations under the sanctuary granted you when you seek to use American soil as a propaganda platform to encourage the United States to follow a foreign policy course of action which is foreign to our ideals and inconsistent with our glorious history."

I hope, Mr. President, I have made myself unequivocally clear that, as chairman of the Senate Subcommittee on Latin-American Relations, I shall continue to do all that I can to implement the Alliance for Progress program, and I shall continue to stand out against those who aid and abet communism in Latin America, however unwillingly and unknowingly, by advocating American unilateral military action against Cuba.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

GOVERNOR EGAN'S CORRECT COURSE IN SEIZING JAPANESE FISHING VESSELS IN ALASKAN WATERS

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, upon the initiative of Gov. William A. Egan, of Alaska, the State of Alaska has seized two Japanese fishing boats that were fishing in Shelikof Strait, located between Kodiak Island and the Alaskan mainland.

The invasion of Alaska's fishing grounds by foreign vessels—Japanese and Russian—in recent months has been a very sore point with the people of Alaska. The fisheries—salmon, halibut, herring, king crab—have been and are Alaska's principal economic resource and industry. The economy of Alaska's long Pacific Ocean and Bering Sea coastlines, with their numerous communities from Ketchikan at the lower end of the Panhandle to Bristol Bay, depends upon it. It is the livelihood, directly or indirectly, of all the people who live there—and the overwhelming majority of Alaska's communities is coastal.

My reason for taking the floor on this subject is because of what I consider to

be the mistaken views and assumptions expressed in an editorial published in the Washington Post and Times Herald on Wednesday, April 18, which was highly critical of Governor Egan's action. I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be printed at this point in my remarks.

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

ALASKA ON ITS OWN

Gov. William A. Egan of Alaska apparently needs to be reminded that Alaska joined the Union and did not become an independent nation. His seizure of two fishing vessels during the last few days in Shelikof Strait and the arrest of the captain of another Japanese boat on charges of fishing without a license were undertaken without the advice or consent of the State Department. The Governor took upon himself the responsibility for creating an international incident that appears to be beyond his jurisdiction.

In defense of his action Governor Egan contends that Shelikof Strait between the Alaska Peninsula and Kodiak Island is an inland body of water. But this seems to be in conflict with the view of the Department of State. The Government has asserted no claim that this Strait, which varies in width from 21 to 30 miles, constitutes inland waters, and it would doubtless be very difficult to get such a claim recognized if it did so. Of course, Alaska has no standing to assert independent claims on questions of this sort.

The State does have authority, under an act of Congress, to control fishing off its shores out to the traditional 3-mile limit of sovereign jurisdiction recognized by the United States. Some reports are to the effect that one boat was seized 1 mile inside these territorial waters, and the controversy over where the seizures took place may have to be settled in court. Apart from this, however, Governor Egan has handled the problem with little regard for its delicacy.

Mr. Egan did protest to the State Department against what he regarded as illegal fishing from a Japanese fleet in Shelikof Strait. Both the State and Interior Departments sent men to consult with the Governor and investigate the alleged violations. Instead of waiting until they could report their findings in Washington, Governor Egan acted against the Japanese fishermen without so much as notifying the State Department of his intention. Whatever the final outcome may be, he needs to be taught a lesson to the effect that international relations are handled by the Department of State.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, it is Governor's Egan's view, which I share, that he felt compelled to act because of the inability to get appropriate and timely action by the State Department.

I telephoned Governor Egan Wednesday morning to read him the Post's editorial. Governor Egan informed me, first, that in practice the waters of Shelikof Strait has always been considered Alaskan waters. He stated to me categorically that in territorial days these waters had been subjected to the regulation of the Federal agency charged with that responsibility—the Fish and Wildlife Service. Since statehood these functions have been assumed by the corresponding State agency, the Alaska Department of Fish and Game.

When the Japanese fishing fleet began invading these waters, Governor Egan wrote the State Department on March 30 and followed it up with a telegram on April 2. Hearing nothing, he telephoned Acting Secretary George Ball on April

9. To the Governor's surprise and consternation, Acting Secretary Ball had no inkling of the previously sent letter and telegram. At Governor Egan's insistence, the State Department sent a representative to Alaska. However, this representative said it would require some 3 weeks for him to make up his mind whether the Japanese fishing was illegal.

By that time, Governor Egan naturally feared that the Japanese boats would have secured their catch of fish and departed, or, if succeeded by other fishing vessels in the absence of any restraining action, would come into contact with Alaskan fishermen, who would be reaching these areas in their own boats, with possibly unfortunate consequences. It should be noted that our Alaskan fishermen are subject to strict regulation in the interest of conservation. Foreign vessels can and do flout those conservation regulations, and can, in a few weeks, destroy the painstaking compliance of our own fishermen, and the efforts of our regulatory agencies.

Certainly by Governor Egan's prompt action he eliminated the possibility of violence, with casualties and loss of life, which in past decades has occurred between Alaskan and Japanese fishermen in analogous circumstances.

In addition to that, it was clear that at least one of these boats, if not more, had actually been fishing within the 3-mile limit.

I would say that I had a similar experience, which may be pertinent, some months ago.

On that occasion I was informed by Governor Egan that Russian fishing vessels were in Alaskan territorial waters and that he had sent a telegram to the Secretary of State, asking the Department of State immediately to notify the Navy and the Coast Guard to send out appropriate vessels or planes in order to observe these operations and see whether they were violative of law and treaty arrangements. This took place on a Tuesday. On Thursday, wishing to satisfy myself as to what the facts were, I telephoned Admiral Caldwell at Kodiak, Alaska, commandant of the 17th Naval District and of the Alaska Sea Frontier. To my amazement, he had received no word whatever from the State Department, and my phone call was his first appraisal of the situation.

I immediately telephoned the Acting Secretary of State, but was unable to reach him for a few hours. It was only upon my very urgent insistence that I finally was able to talk to him by phone. He said he would look into the matter. Subsequently, I was informed by State Department officials that the State Department's failure to act was due to the fact that the State Department official who usually handled such matters had been on his vacation, and upon his return—thinking that Governor Egan's telegram referred to an earlier situation which had passed he had therefore done nothing.

Meanwhile, I tried to reach the Secretary of the Navy, who was out of town, and left word as to the situation, and thereupon the Navy was officially alerted.

A more favorable and, I think, a more correct view of the situation and of

Governor Egan's action was taken by station WTOP, Washington, D.C., in an editorial of Wednesday evening, April 18, over both TV and radio, which editorial was repeated the morning of April 19. I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be printed at this point in my remarks.

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

The incident of the Japanese fishing boats in Shelikof Strait off the State of Alaska seems to prove one thing for sure—which is that the State Department had better make it a practice to move with somewhat more than deliberate speed in the handling of Alaskan fishing complaints.

It can be argued that Alaska's Gov. William Egan exceeded his authority when he ordered the impounding of a couple of Japanese vessels in the Shelikof Strait, which is the narrow body of water between the Alaska mainland and Kodiak Island.

But it can also be said that officialdom here in Washington might have prevented an unpleasant little episode if there had been less ponderous movement toward getting the dispute settled.

In a phone conversation with Senator Ernest Gruening, Governor Egan reported that he wrote the State Department to complain about the presence of Japanese fishing boats on March 30 and followed up with a telegram on April 2. Then, the Governor said, when he checked back with the Department on April 9, he found that little if any action had been taken. And, the Governor explained further, when a Department representative finally showed up in Alaska to see what was going on, he said he would need 3 weeks to furnish his report—by which time the fishing boats would be loaded and gone.

There seems to be considerable disagreement about the various legal implications of the presence of the Japanese fishermen in the strait. However, there is no doubt that Alaskans are genuinely disturbed about what they consider to be encroachments by Japanese—and Russians as well—in the State's territorial waters. Under these circumstances, the State Department ought to ring a loud alarm bell when and if future cries for help from Alaska are received here.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, I am happy to report, however, that the State Department appears now to be taking a more energetic attitude. I was informed yesterday by Secretary Ball that the prosecution in the Alaska courts will proceed without objection by the State Department and that an emphatic demand will be made of the Japanese to keep out of Shelikof Strait until a legal determination may be made as to the right—which the government of Alaska affirms—of Alaskans to consider these waters to be domestic, and not international, waters.

It is my view that Governor Egan deserves commendation for acting as and when he did. In the circumstances it was the only way to bring an intolerable situation to a head and to clarify the issues. It is my hope that the State Department will now insist vigorously on the protection of our American interests in Alaska.

I would like to say, also, that I am hopeful that the Japanese, with whom the State of Alaska is developing most useful and mutually beneficial commercial relations, will take a reasonable view

of this situation and accommodate themselves to Alaska's position. We in Alaska appreciate Japan's problems. Japanese capital has, in part, financed a most useful enterprise, a pulp mill in Sitka; the Japanese are exporting Alaskan lumber and are further interested in the acquisition of various of Alaska's raw materials, minerals, oil, and other vital resources, which they lack, and which Alaska would be willing to sell. We hope that this developing commercial intercourse and an otherwise friendly relationship will not be jeopardized.

However, it is, in my opinion, the almost unanimous view of Alaskans that the invasion of our traditional Alaskan fishing grounds by foreign vessels, would be intolerable. I heartily support that view. Shelikof Strait is only one of these fishing grounds.

What really should be secured, besides an affirmation of these rights, is the extension of our fishing grounds to a 12-mile limit. The 3-mile limit is an obsolete provision dating from days when 3 miles was the approximate distance a cannonball from a shore battery could hit a hostile vessel.

I ask unanimous consent that three articles from the Anchorage Daily Times of Monday, April 16, 1962, reporting on the seizure of these Japanese vessels, be included at this point in my remarks.

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

STATE TAKES TWO VESSELS, ARRESTS THREE CAPTAINS

KODIAK.—A second Japanese fishing boat has been seized and the captains of three Japanese fishing vessels charged in Alaska Superior Court with poaching in Alaska waters.

The seizure of the vessels and the arrests brought immediate reaction from the Japanese Government in Tokyo. Officials there called on the U.S. Government to make a full report of the incident.

The move by Alaska State officials climaxes years of dissension over fishing by the Japanese in waters claimed by Alaska.

The seizure of Japanese fishing fleet vessels began Saturday night when Capt. E. L. Mayfield of the Alaska State Police boarded the 65-foot herring catcher *Ohtori Maru No. 5* at the mouth of Uganik Bay in Shelikof Strait.

The *Ohtori Maru's* skipper, Tadao Higashama, was charged with fishing commercially without a license and without having registered his gear or boat. The *Ohtori Maru* was escorted to Kodiak by the Alaska State Fish and Game Department vessel *Teal* and held in lieu of \$25,000 bond.

A second boat, the *Shoishi Maru No. 7* was boarded in Shelikof Strait last night and escorted to Kodiak by the Alaska Fish and Game Department vessel *Widgeon*.

The *Shoishi Maru's* skipper, Tadashi Abe, was charged with violating Alaska's inland waters.

The 2 seized Japanese boats were part of a fleet of 5 accompanied by a 1,772-ton mother ship, the *Banshu Maru*, which has 123 people aboard. Alaska officials claim the Japanese have been taking herring in Shelikof Strait for about 2 weeks.

The *Banshu Maru's* captain, Mongo M. Hanasaki, also was charged with fishing commercially without having notified the State.

Judge Davis, who flew to Kodiak from Anchorage yesterday, released Tadao and Hanasaki on condition they return for a later hearing.

The only casualty of the incident occurred last night when Sgt. Gerald Williams, of Anchorage State Police Department, slipped and broke a leg while boarding the *Shoishi Maru*. He was evacuated to Kodiak by a U.S. Coast Guard rescue plane.

In Washington, officials said today the question of Japanese fishing operations in waters claimed by Alaska is in the process of being resolved. Until the United States determines whether the waters are U.S. territory, officials would not comment on the weekend incidents.

In Tokyo, the Japanese Foreign Office said it had cabled the Embassy in Washington to ask for a full report from the U.S. Government on the incident. Officials said the Japanese Government would protest if it found the Japanese ships had not violated territorial waters.

Also in Tokyo, a spokesman for the Taiyo Fisheries Co., which owns the vessels, commented:

"We have ordered the fleet to operate at least 5 miles off the coast of the United States, 2 miles outside the accepted territorial water boundary. We are confident no violation is involved."

Shelikof Strait, varying in width from 30 to 19½ miles, lies between Kodiak Island and the Alaska Peninsula. Alaska claims it as inland waters, reasoning that it is an extension of Cook Inlet. Kodiak Island lies off the southern tip of the Kenai Peninsula, which forms the eastern shore of Cook Inlet.

Gov. William A. Egan of Alaska said the strait "traditionally has been an inland body of water." He said it had been regulated by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service before Alaska was a State and by the State ever since statehood.

Egan wrote and wired George W. Ball, Under Secretary of State, asking the Federal Government to act when the fleet was first sighted. He said this week's action was taken without notification to Federal authorities, because he had not received any satisfaction from them.

The Governor said he was in telephone contact yesterday with the Departments of State and Justice. In Washington, neither Department would comment.

Alleged poaching by Japanese fishermen has been a hot issue in Alaska for at least 25 years. In 1938, the Alaskan delegate in Congress, Anthony Dimond, even suggested that the United States bomb Japanese fishing boats encroaching on Alaska waters. Tension continued until and after World War II, but this is believed to have been the first time arrests were made.

TWO CAPTAINS PROMISE TO RETURN

KODIAK.—Two Japanese fishing vessel captains arrested Saturday night in Shelikof Strait for alleged violation of Alaska fishing regulations were released following their arraignment here yesterday on condition they return when further court proceedings are scheduled.

Capt. Mongo Hanasaki, master of the mother ship *Banshu Maru*, and the captain of a catcher boat seized Saturday night by the State, Tadao Higashama, were arraigned here before Superior Court Judge Edward V. Davis who had been flown from Anchorage in an Alaska Air National Guard C-123 for the proceeding.

The two captains speak no English and an interpreter located in Kodiak had an insufficient grasp of English to permit Davis to convey an explanation of the charges against them and that they had a right to counsel before further proceedings are undertaken against them.

Hanasaki, wearing a blue uniform with four gold stripes on each sleeve, rose to his feet each time a question was asked by Mrs. Kinuko Perkins and replied at length, with great dignity. Davis understood him to say

that he believed he had been operating in international waters.

"He can't understand why he came here," Mrs. Perkins told Davis.

Assistant District Attorney Dick Bradley, who with Clarence Weberg, Director of the Division of Protection in the Department of Fish and Game, have been directing the vessel seizure operations from Kodiak, appeared for the State at the arraignment.

Upon Bradley's recommendation, the judge set bail in the case at \$25,000 and ordered the boat seized Saturday held in lieu of the bail.

Davis said the captains would be released if they promised to return when their presence was required. Hanasaki made such a promise but said he would not leave his ship "if a storm comes."

Davis accepted the promise, saying he understood that men have no control over the acts of nature.

Hanasaki was being returned to his ship by the State today. Higashama returned to his boat at anchor in Kodiak Harbor.

The captain of another vessel boarded by the State last night is expected to be arraigned here late today before Superior Court Judge James Fitzgerald who will fly from Anchorage.

Davis yesterday ordered Bradley to contact the nearest Japanese consulate and ask officials to provide legal assistance for the men under arrest.

ALASKA'S NAVY SCORES SUCCESS

(By Jerry Bowkett)

Everything could have gone wrong—but the Alaskan navy in its first action Saturday night, against a foreign fishing vessel off Kodiak Island was eminently successful.

For more than a week agents of the State's department of fish and game had watched closely from aircraft the movements of the 1,772-ton Japanese mother ship, *Banshu Maru* and her five smaller catcher boats in and near Shelikof Strait, claimed as inland waters by the State.

Two patrol vessels of the Alaska Department of Fish and Game had been standing by on the northern side of the island awaiting orders to run out into the strait and move against the Japanese.

They are not sleek fast patrol boats. One is a power barge, the *Widgeon*, that can do 8 knots, and the other the *Teal*, looks more like a real patrol boat but it can only run about a knot faster. Each is about 70 feet long. All of the vessels in the Japanese fleet have greater cruising speed.

On Saturday, a Japanese catcher boat, the *Ohtori Maru No. 5*, was spotted at anchor off Uganik Bay, and Gov. William A. Egan decided to seize it.

Shortly after 5 p.m. Saturday the two Alaskan vessels got underway from anchorages in two different bays—the *Teal* from Uyak Bay and the *Widgeon* from Port Bailey in Kupreanof Strait—and converged on the Japanese fishing boat at near maximum speed.

The weather was clear and the water unusually calm.

On each Alaska vessel were several National Guardsmen, State police, and agents of the fish and game department. The guardsmen had been issued ammunition for their weapons, which included automatic firing grease guns.

No one was sure just how the operation would be concluded, but there was no anticipation of trouble with the Japanese. Aboard the *Widgeon*, one person supposed that a shot probably should be fired across the bow of the Japanese vessel but wasn't sure how you went about it.

There was speculation the Federal Government, which is responsible for this Nation's foreign policy, might take a dim view of the State's naval operation and try to prevent it.

But Egan had given explicit orders—the Japanese vessel was to be seized and nothing should be allowed to interfere with the operation.

When the two patrol vessels approached the *Ohtori Maru* it was riding at anchor. No one was on deck and the Japanese apparently had no intention of running. It was decided the guardsmen, in their battle dress, could probably better serve by going below and staying out of sight.

The *Widgeon*, skippered by Lynn Crosby, was the first alongside and several Japanese came out on the deck of their vessel and appeared to be a bit puzzled as to what was going on. The *Teal*, under the command of Howard Marks, was coming up on their port side.

Widgeon crewmen heaved some lines over on the *Ohtori Maru* and the Japanese made them fast. It was 8 p.m. and growing dark. Crosby was elated at having gotten his barge to the Japanese vessel first.

"For an old slab like this that's pretty good," he grinned. "I could have taken the governors off the engines and got 400 more rpm's. If I was in a hurry I would."

State Police Capt. E. L. Mayfield, W. B. (Buck) Stewart, area protection supervisor for the Fish and Game Department, and Suman Moon, a Japanese-speaking Kodiak cannery employee, went aboard the Japanese vessel and told the captain, Tadao Higashama, he was under arrest for commercial fishing without a license and failing to obtain vessel and fishing gear licenses from the State.

Higashama was asked to come to Kodiak to answer the charges against him. The State representatives emphasized there was nothing personal about the arrest—the State wanted only to assert its right to inland waters. They also had a warrant for Mongo Hanasaki, captain of the mother ship, which was about 6 miles away. Hanasaki contacted the *Banshu Maru* and told of his plight. Hanasaki said he would bring his ship over and confer with the officers.

The *Teal* went alongside her when she arrived off Uganik Bay, and the same officers went aboard. After nearly 2 hours of discussions, Hanasaki agreed to go into Kodiak with the *Teal* and the *Ohtori Maru*.

In Kodiak harbor yesterday morning, while awaiting the arrival of U.S. Public Health Service Officer M. E. Lindburg from Anchorage to conduct a quarantine inspection, Hanasaki said he was surprised Alaskans were so upset over the presence of his boats near Kodiak.

His fleet was prospecting for herring but had not yet begun to fish, he said. He said he believed he was operating in international waters.

He had been charged by Alaska with operating a commercial fishing enterprise without providing the Department of Fish and Game with a written statement of intention to operate in State waters.

On April 1, the date of the alleged violation, the Japanese had caught some herring but did so only for subsistence he said. A skiff had broken loose on that day and drifted into a Kodiak island bay and a larger vessel went in to retrieve it, he said.

Department of Fish and Game agents said the Japanese had been spotted within the 3-mile limit around Kodiak on several occasions.

Crosby calculated the *Ohtori Maru* was 1 mile within the limit in 30 fathoms of water off Uganik Bay when seized by the State.

AN EASTER PRAYER

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, as we enter the concluding days of Holy Week, we again remind ourselves of the dark and dismal Friday, and we approach Easter Sunday with hope, light, and life.

This gives us strength and courage to carry on in a world that is fraught with distrust, unrest, and deep trouble.

God is our refuge and strength, a very present help in trouble. Therefore, we will not fear, though the earth be removed and though the mountains be carried into the midst of the sea. He maketh wars to cease unto the ends of the earth.

At this Easter season we pray that the glory of the Lord may shine on Thy people of every name; make them strong in the dark days ahead, rooted in the stability of faith until peace and rest shall be won. Oh, lead the struggle to emancipate all people in bondage and redeem the sacrifice and toil of the noble living and the noble dead.

Dr. James Shera Montgomery, a former Chaplain of the House of Representatives, whom we all loved, concluded one of his prayers with the following:

Break every weapon forged in fires of hate,
Turn back the foes that would assail Thy gate,

Where fields of strife lie desolate and bare
Take Thy sweet flowers of peace and plant them there.

Come, blessed peace, as when in hush of eve
God's benediction falls on souls that grieve.
As shines the star when weary day departs,
Come, peace of God, and shine in every heart.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL MONDAY NEXT

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I believe there is no further business to come before the Senate. Therefore I move that, pursuant to the previous order, the Senate stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock noon on Monday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 3 o'clock and 25 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned, pursuant to the previous order, until Monday, April 23, 1962, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate, April 19, 1962:

U.S. DISTRICT JUDGE

Stephen J. Roth, of Michigan, to be U.S. district judge for the eastern district of Michigan, vice Clifford O'Sullivan, elevated.

ECONOMIC COMMISSION FOR EUROPE

Walter M. Kotschnig, of Maryland, to be the Representative of the United States of America to the 17th plenary session of the Economic Commission for Europe of the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations.

IN THE ARMY

The following-named officers for promotion in the Regular Army of the United States, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3284 and 3299.

To be lieutenant colonel

Bailey, Leslie W., XXXXXX.

To be majors

Abagis, Kenneth M., XXXXXX.

Abele, Louis E., XXXX.

Aboe, Kenneth R., XXXXXX.

Abt, Frederick T., XXXXXX.

Adams, Arlye D., XXXXXX.

Adams, Billy J., XXXXXX.

Adams, Charles M., XXXXXX.

Adams, Dexter W., XXXX.

Adams, Earl R., Jr., XXXXXX.

Adams, Marvin L., XXXXXX.

Adams, Thomas E., Jr., XXXXXX.

Adkins, Alvin E., XXXXXX.

Ahern, John R., XXXXXX.

Akin, Karl E., XXXXXX.

Aldridge, George W., Jr., XXXXXX.

Alexander, David B., XXXXXX.

Allbee, Howard G., XXXXXX.

Allbright, Marion C., XXXXXX.

Allen, Andrew S., XXXXXX.

Allen, Boyde W., Jr., XXXXXX.

Allison, Charles C., XXXXXX.

Alloway, Curtis H., XXXXXX.

Alfred, William M., XXXXXX.

Allyn, John O., XXXXXX.

Alter, George M., XXXXXX.

Amburn, Warren G., XXXXXX.

Amos, Carl R., Jr., XXXXXX.

Anderson, William A., XXXXXX.

Andreen, Robert B., XXXXXX.

Andrews, William J., XXXXXX.

Antrim, Ralph C., Jr., XXXXXX.

Applin, Paul L., Jr., XXXXXX.

Armstrong, Frank H., XXXX.

Armstrong, George E., XXXXXX.

Armstrong, John R., XXXXXX.

Armstrong, Robert A., XXXXXX.

Arnette, John Q., XXXX.

Arnold, Stanley W., XXXX.

Arnold, William J., Jr., XXXXXX.

Ashley, Lewis J., XXXXX.

Ashley, Merle W., XXXXXX.

Autrey, Lewell V., XXXXXX.

Awalt, Thomas Y., Jr., XXXX.

Bache, Claude V., XXXXXX.

Backhaus, Gus, 3d, XXXXXX.

Bailey, Walter D., XXXXXX.

Baker, Dallas O., XXXXXX.

Baker, Joe, Jr., XXXXXX.

Baker, John E., XXXXXX.

Baldwin, Cecil C., XXXXX.

Bales, James C., XXXXXX.

Ball, Doric W. J., XXXXXX.

Ball, John J., Jr., XXXXXX.

Ballou, DeForrest, 3d, XXXXXX.

Ballou, William R., XXXXXX.

Balmer, Jesmond D., Jr., XXXXXX.

Bamford, Thomas F., XXXX.

Bangert, Robert L., XXXXXX.

Banks, Ray C., Jr., XXXXXX.

Barbero, Richard J., XXXXX.

Barlow, Raymon C., Jr., XXXXXX.

Barnes, Metullus A., Jr., XXXX.

Barnitz, Gerald W., XXXXXX.

Barnwell, John C., XXXXXX.

Barrett, Ernest F., XXXXXX.

Barrett, Frederick P., XXXXXX.

Barrett, George B., XXXXXX.

Barris, Donald F., XXXXXX.

Barrow, George R., XXXXXX.

Barry, Clarence D., XXXXX.

Barth, Sam L., XXXXXX.

Baskin, Ronald R., XXXX.

Bates, William E., Jr., XXXXXX.

Battreall, Raymond B., Jr., XXXX.

Bauer, Eugene R., XXXXXX.

Baumann, Lewis E., XXXXXX.

Baxley, John B., XXXXXX.

Bayard, Louis P., XXXXXX.

Beard, Rutland D., Jr., XXXXX.

Becker, Henry C., Jr., XXXX.

Beckwith, Charles M., XXXXXX.

Becton, Julius W., Jr., XXXX.

Beer, Warren C., XXXXXX.

Bell, Cleo O., XXXXXX.

Bell, Clyde B., Jr., XXXX.

Belnap, Glen D., XXXX.

Belser, Adolph L., XXXX.

Bender, John A., XXXXXX.

Benedict, William G., XXXXXX.

Bentley, Richard S., XXXXXX.

Bercaw, Woodson W., Jr., XXXXXX.

Berens, Robert J., XXXXXX.

Berger, Newell J., Jr., XXXX.

Bergner, John, XXXX.

Bernard, Carl F., XXXXXX.

Berres, John P., XXXXXX.

Bertholf, Cheney L., Jr., XXXXXX.

Bethany, Charles W., Jr., XXXX.

Betts, Earl C., XXXXXX.

Betts, Edward E., XXXXXX.

Biggs, Thomas R., XXXXXX.

Bishop, Bertram J., XXXXXX
 Bivens, Courtland C., Jr., XXXXXX
 Bjostad, Louis B., Jr., XXXXXX
 Black, George S., XXXXXX
 Black, Gorham L., Jr., XXXXXX
 Black, Robert W., XXXXXX
 Black, William E., XXXXXX
 Black, William L., XXXXXX
 Blair, Thomas G., XXXXXX
 Blake, Thomas B., XXXXXX
 Blalock, Bill R., XXXXXX
 Blodgett, Rexford J., XXXXXX
 Blood, William C., XXXXXX
 Blunck, Stanley R., XXXXXX
 Bodman, Walter R., Jr., XXXXXX
 Boggan, Edgar W., XXXXXX
 Boland, Herman T., Jr., XXXXXX
 Bolte, David E., XXXXXX
 Bolton, Virgil W., XXXXXX
 Bowman, Truman R., XXXXXX
 Bookout, Hal H., XXXXXX
 Booth, James R., XXXXXX
 Bosan, George S., XXXXXX
 Boss, Keith A., XXXXXX
 Bott, Frank M., XXXXXX
 Bounds, Marcellus W., XXXXXX
 Boyer, Samuel R., Jr., XXXXXX
 Bracey, Spencer M., XXXXXX
 Bradley, Charles R., Jr., XXXXXX
 Bradley, Jerry F., XXXXXX
 Bradley, Robert L., XXXXXX
 Bratton, Joseph K., XXXXXX
 Braun, Albert W., XXXXXX
 Braun, Walter D., XXXXXX
 Braunstein, Howard H., XXXXXX
 Brazier, Vincent M., XXXXXX
 Brettell, James A., Jr., XXXXXX
 Bringham, William N., XXXXXX
 Brister, Alan A., XXXXXX
 Britt, Colon R., Jr., XXXXXX
 Brock, Ernest O., XXXXXX
 Brock, Luther A., XXXXXX
 Brockmeier, William E., XXXXXX
 Brockmyer, James J., XXXXXX
 Broida, Donald, XXXXXX
 Brooks, Glenn P., XXXXXX
 Brooks, William A., XXXXXX
 Brown, Latham H., XXXXXX
 Brown, Lorence F., XXXXXX
 Brunkhorst, Harold H., XXXXXX
 Bryan, Leo C., XXXXXX
 Bryant, Robert L., XXXXXX
 Bryant, Vernon W., XXXXXX
 Buchanan, Crawford, XXXXXX
 Buchanan, John O., XXXXXX
 Buchanan, Thomas W., XXXXXX
 Buckingham, Clay T., XXXXXX
 Bulawsky, Lawrence H., Jr., XXXXXX
 Bunch, James E., XXXXXX
 Bundy, Richard N., XXXXXX
 Burke, Thomas P., XXXXXX
 Burks, John R., XXXXXX
 Burnett, Nell C., XXXXXX
 Burt, Thomas H., XXXXXX
 Busey, Matthew W., 3d, XXXXXX
 Bush, Louis S., XXXXXX
 Bushong, Charles R., XXXXXX
 Butler, James F., XXXXXX
 Butler, Jerome J., Jr., XXXXXX
 Butler, Millard J., XXXXXX
 Byers, Lex J., XXXXXX
 Cadenhead, Charles R., XXXXXX
 Caid, Larry A., XXXXXX
 Calenberg, Harry D., XXXXXX
 Calhoun, Leon J., XXXXXX
 Callero, Milton F., XXXXXX
 Calnan, Francis M., XXXXXX
 Campbell, James G., Jr., XXXXXX
 Campbell, Robert E., XXXXXX
 Campbell, Robert M., XXXXXX
 Caraccia, Marco J., XXXXXX
 Carlisle, Wilford B., XXXXXX
 Carlson, Robert E., XXXXXX
 Carney, Charles V., XXXXXX
 Carr, John E., 3d, XXXXXX
 Carr, John L., XXXXXX
 Carrell, Robert F., XXXXXX
 Carrigan, Mark C., XXXXXX
 Carroll, George F., XXXXXX
 Carroll, Murray L., XXXXXX
 Carroll, Robert M., XXXXXX
 Carswell, Bruce M., XXXXXX
 Carter, Robert P., XXXXXX
 Carty, Robert T., XXXXXX
 Catullo, Albert, XXXXXX
 Caulder, LeRoy W., XXXXXX
 Cerny, Edward V., XXXXXX
 Cerrone, Michael J., XXXXXX
 Chadbourne, James F., Jr., XXXXXX
 Chamberlain, Donald E., XXXXXX
 Chandler, David J., XXXXXX
 Chandler, John P., XXXXXX
 Chandler, Norman P., XXXXXX
 Chandler, William W., XXXXXX
 Chateau, Louis A., XXXXXX
 Chilcoat, William J., XXXXXX
 Chism, John W., XXXXXX
 Christ, Ernest W., XXXXXX
 Christensen, John F., XXXXXX
 Christianson, J. Milton, XXXXXX
 Church, Edward H., XXXXXX
 Church, William M., XXXXXX
 Clardy, Ray A., XXXXXX
 Clark, Chester M., 2d, XXXXXX
 Clark, Egbert B., 3d, XXXXXX
 Clark, Harry E., XXXXXX
 Clark, James M., XXXXXX
 Clark, Julius E., Jr., XXXXXX
 Clark, Richard W., XXXXXX
 Clark, Warren M., XXXXXX
 Clarke, Frank P., XXXXXX
 Clayton, Charles C., XXXXXX
 Clinedinst, Clinton R., XXXXXX
 Cloninger, Adrian S., XXXXXX
 Cloud, James C., XXXXXX
 Clouser, Maurice L., XXXXXX
 Coan, Bernard F., XXXXXX
 Coatney, Loren C., XXXXXX
 Coffey, Ray W., XXXXXX
 Coghlan, James J., Jr., XXXXXX
 Cohn, Frank, XXXXXX
 Cohn, Merrill R., XXXXXX
 Cole, Grady A., XXXXXX
 Cole, William M., XXXXXX
 Coleman, Rennie C., Jr., XXXXXX
 Collins, Philip R., XXXXXX
 Collins, Robert S., Jr., XXXXXX
 Collins, Thomas E., XXXXXX
 Compton, William I., XXXXXX
 Confer, Rodney R., XXXXXX
 Connaway, Charles E., XXXXXX
 Connell, Richard M., XXXXXX
 Connelly, John R., XXXXXX
 Conner, Judson J., XXXXXX
 Connolly, Richard J., XXXXXX
 Conrad, Herman A., XXXXXX
 Consolvo, John W., XXXXXX
 Converse, Stanley P., XXXXXX
 Cook, Charles W., XXXXXX
 Cook, Robert J., XXXXXX
 Cook, Sidney H., Jr., XXXXXX
 Cooley, Richard E., XXXXXX
 Cooper, Paul A., XXXXXX
 Corcoran, Edward F., XXXXXX
 Cordova, William R., XXXXXX
 Corkan, Lloyd A., Jr., XXXXXX
 Costa, John J., XXXXXX
 Costello, Thomas A., XXXXXX
 Costen, Charles B., XXXXXX
 Couch, Roy E., XXXXXX
 Coughlin, John T., 2d, XXXXXX
 Coughlin, Thomas B., XXXXXX
 Council, Ranald D., XXXXXX
 Covell, Charles R., XXXXXX
 Cox, Cleatus J., XXXXXX
 Craig, Richard S., XXXXXX
 Crane, Joe D., XXXXXX
 Crecellus, Richard A., XXXXXX
 Creel, Einomac V., XXXXXX
 Cribb, William J., Jr., XXXXXX
 Croonquist, Henry T., XXXXXX
 Crosby, Paul M., XXXXXX
 Crowell, Steven S., XXXXXX
 Crowley, Edwin K., Jr., XXXXXX
 Crozier, Ted A., XXXXXX
 Cubbison, Gordon R., XXXXXX
 Cummings, William J., XXXXXX
 Cunningham, Harold D., Jr., XXXXXX
 Curd, Vernon F., XXXXXX
 Cushing, Robert L., XXXXXX
 Custer, George A., XXXXXX
 Dabbs, Ralph T., XXXXXX
 Dahl, LaVerne H., XXXXXX
 Dahlquist, Frederick C., Jr., XXXXXX
 Dalusky, George A., XXXXXX
 Davidson, William C., XXXXXX
 Davis, Charles E., XXXXXX
 Davis, Harold O., XXXXXX
 Davis, Ovid M., XXXXXX
 Davis, Preston A., XXXXXX
 Davis, Ralph E., XXXXXX
 Day, Bartley E., XXXXXX
 Day, Seth S., XXXXXX
 DeBord, Norman D., XXXXXX
 de Correvont, Leon L., XXXXXX
 DeHaas, George D., XXXXXX
 DeHaven, Oren E., XXXXXX
 De La Mare, Wendell F., XXXXXX
 DeLoach, William M., XXXXXX
 DeLorimier, Charles T., XXXXXX
 DeMaria, John M., XXXXXX
 deMarsche, Joseph M., XXXXXX
 de Rusha, Richard A., XXXXXX
 Dearing, John W., XXXXXX
 Demory, Richard S., XXXXXX
 Dempsey, Albert P., Jr., XXXXXX
 Dempsey, Frederick G., XXXXXX
 Dempsey, James E., XXXXXX
 Denend, William L., XXXXXX
 Denham, Ernest W., Jr., XXXXXX
 Dennington, John F., XXXXXX
 Dews, Hampton, XXXXXX
 Dibella, Alfred L., XXXXXX
 Dibrell, Jack H., XXXXXX
 Dickerson, Harvey G., Jr., XXXXXX
 Dickerson, Paul J., XXXXXX
 Dickinson, Dean B., XXXXXX
 Dickinson, Hillman, XXXXXX
 Dill, Harold E., XXXXXX
 Dillinder, Jack P., XXXXXX
 Dittamore, Rex T., XXXXXX
 Dixon, Albert V., XXXXXX
 Dixon, Ralph R., Jr., XXXXXX
 Dixon, Roland M., Jr., XXXXXX
 D'Louhy, George J., XXXXXX
 Dodd, Stephen F., XXXXXX
 Doherty, Richard J., XXXXXX
 Dohleman, Kenneth E., XXXXXX
 Donoho, Louie W., XXXXXX
 Donohoe, Patrick J., XXXXXX
 Dorsey, Clifford R., XXXXXX
 Dorsey, Ralph M., XXXXXX
 Doster, Robert W., XXXXXX
 Doty, Otis J., XXXXXX
 Downes, Marlboro R., XXXXXX
 Drury, Clinton A., Jr., XXXXXX
 Dunks, Fred, XXXXXX
 Dunn, Clyde, XXXXXX
 Dunn, Harold R., XXXXXX
 Dunn, John M., XXXXXX
 Durant, Billy C., XXXXXX
 Duran, Joseph B., XXXXXX
 Durham, Howard W., XXXXXX
 Durr, Richard H., XXXXXX
 Durst, Harold E., XXXXXX
 Dutchak, Eugene M., XXXXXX
 Dye, Clarence C., XXXXXX
 Eagers, Joseph A., Jr., XXXXXX
 Early, Charles C., XXXXXX
 East, Charles M., Jr., XXXXXX
 Ebbs, Joseph M., XXXXXX
 Ednie, Robert L., XXXXXX
 Edwards, Grey H., XXXXXX
 Eggers, John F., XXXXXX
 Eichelsdoerfer, Howard H., XXXXXX
 Elliott, Harold N., XXXXXX
 Ellis, Thomas G., Jr., XXXXXX
 Emerson, Earl E., Jr., XXXXXX
 Emerson, Vaughn C., XXXXXX
 Emery, John R., XXXXXX
 Emery, Thomas D., XXXXXX
 Engberg, Robert W., XXXXXX
 English, Allan J., Jr., XXXXXX
 Erbe, Robert L., XXXXXX
 Esco, Oliver N., Jr., XXXXXX
 Escue, Hodges S., XXXXXX
 Estes, Robert K., XXXXXX
 Evans, Alexander E., XXXXXX
 Evans, Lloyd R., XXXXXX
 Evans, Thomas C., XXXXXX
 Everding, Francis R., XXXXXX
 Everett, George W., XXXXXX
 Ewing, Amos D., XXXXXX

Ezell, Bert P., XXXXXX
 Fairlamb, John C., XXXXXX
 Falk, Byron A., Jr., XXXXXX
 Falkenbury, Stephen B., Jr., XXXXXX
 Fancher, Paul T., XXXXXX
 Farnum, Lawrence B., XXXXXX
 Fatum, John J., XXXXXX
 Faul, Lloyd J., XXXXXX
 Feeney, Thomas J., XXXXXX
 Feir, Philip R., XXXXXX
 Fender, Louis H., XXXXXX
 Ferguson, James W., XXXXXX
 Ferguson, James W., XXXXXX
 Ferrer, Ferdinand, XXXXXX
 Flasca, Alfred M., XXXXXX
 Flinlayson, Hugh S., Jr., XXXXXX
 Fischman, Kurt, XXXXXX
 Fisher, Charles H., XXXXXX
 Fisher, Robert W., XXXXXX
 Fisk, Eugene N., XXXXXX
 Fitz, Harold C., Jr., XXXXXX
 Flagg, Austin T., XXXXXX
 Flaggert, James J., Jr., XXXXXX
 Fleeson, George S., XXXXXX
 Fleischman, Gordon K., XXXXXX
 Fleri, Paul C., Jr., XXXXXX
 Florio, John D., XXXXXX
 Fluckey, Wallace N., XXXXXX
 Foley, John J., Jr., XXXXXX
 Font, Joe A., XXXXXX
 Ford, Earl P., XXXXXX
 Ford, Edward A., XXXXXX
 Ford, George L., XXXXXX
 Ford, John O., XXXXXX
 Fordyce, John W., XXXXXX
 Foreman, William G., XXXXXX
 Forrest, John F., XXXXXX
 Forsthoff, Charles W., XXXXXX
 Foss, Romaine S., XXXXXX
 Fox, Charles C., XXXXXX
 Fox, Donald C., XXXXXX
 Frandsen, Donald P., XXXXXX
 Frandsen, Oscar R., XXXXXX
 Freeman, Arthur L., XXXXXX
 Freeman, David G., XXXXXX
 Freiman, William D., XXXXXX
 French, Daniel L., XXXXXX
 Frizzell, Harry P., XXXXXX
 Fry, Louis C., XXXXXX
 Frye, John W., XXXXXX
 Fullerton, Avery S., XXXXXX
 Fulton, Taylor R., XXXXXX
 Fulton, William S., XXXXXX
 Gaige, Delbert C., XXXXXX
 Gaines, James S., XXXXXX
 Gappa, Casimer S., XXXXXX
 Garcia, Oscar M., XXXXXX
 Gard, John D., XXXXXX
 Gardiner, William P., XXXXXX
 Garitty, Lyle J., Jr., XXXXXX
 Garner, Hugh M., XXXXXX
 Garofalo, William E., XXXXXX
 Garrett, John K., XXXXXX
 Garties, Richard G., XXXXXX
 Gentile, Paul J., XXXXXX
 George, Kenneth E., XXXXXX
 Geraci, John P., XXXXXX
 Gerardy, William L., XXXXXX
 Gershater, Ephraim M., XXXXXX
 Gibbons, Benjamin F., XXXXXX
 Gibbs, Marvin H., XXXXXX
 Giboney, Thomas B., XXXXXX
 Gibson, Floyd S., XXXXXX
 Gibson, Joseph T., XXXXXX
 Giglio, Rudolph F. L., XXXXXX
 Gillespie, Richard E., XXXXXX
 Gillis, William D., XXXXXX
 Gilman, John P., XXXXXX
 Gilmore, Robert L., XXXXXX
 Gilroy, Robert J., XXXXXX
 Giuffrida, Louis C., XXXXXX
 Glasser, Anthony P., XXXXXX
 Glunn, Franklin J., XXXXXX
 Goche, Leo N., XXXXXX
 Godfrey, Carl F., XXXXXX
 Godwin, Harold A., Jr., XXXXXX
 Goessling, Ward C., Jr., XXXXXX
 Golden, Alonzo J., XXXXXX
 Goodrich, John R., XXXXXX
 Goodwin, William H., XXXXXX
 Gordon, William T., XXXXXX
 Gorlinsky, Victor W., XXXXXX
 Gower, Donald N., XXXXXX
 Grabove, Maxwell, XXXXXX
 Graeser, Herbert O., XXXXXX
 Graham, Douglas M., XXXXXX
 Graham, Raymond E., XXXXXX
 Gray, Homer E., Jr., XXXXXX
 Gray, John E., XXXXXX
 Green, Charles E., XXXXXX
 Green, Charles E., XXXXXX
 Green, Warren L., XXXXXX
 Greenbaum, Bernard, XXXXXX
 Greene, Vernon E., XXXXXX
 Greer, Edward, XXXXXX
 Gretham, George A., XXXXXX
 Griffith, Girvan H., XXXXXX
 Griffith, Harry A., XXXXXX
 Grigsby, Alfred J., XXXXXX
 Grinnell, Douglas D., XXXXXX
 Groseclose, Tom S., XXXXXX
 Guelzo, Carl M., XXXXXX
 Gunn, Raymond McC., XXXXXX
 Guthrie, Sidney C., XXXXXX
 Haden, Clinton B., XXXXXX
 Hagadus, Raymond, XXXXXX
 Hahn, Eric L., XXXXXX
 Hale, Alfred B., XXXXXX
 Hale, Lindsey W., XXXXXX
 Hale, William B., XXXXXX
 Halgren, Spencer V., XXXXXX
 Hall, Allen K., XXXXXX
 Hall, Reginald W., XXXXXX
 Hall, Rupert P., XXXXXX
 Hall, Turner P., Jr., XXXXXX
 Halley, William F., XXXXXX
 Hammerquist, Robert E., XXXXXX
 Hammond, John B., XXXXXX
 Hammonds, Eugene, XXXXXX
 Hampton, Kenneth R., XXXXXX
 Haney, Leslie D., XXXXXX
 Hannon, Laurence K., XXXXXX
 Hannum, Clifford P., XXXXXX
 Hanrahan, William P., Jr., XXXXXX
 Hanson, James N., XXXXXX
 Harbin, Darwin D., XXXXXX
 Hardage, John M., XXXXXX
 Harger, Clyde J., XXXXXX
 Harkins, Donald E., XXXXXX
 Harlan, Lowell B., XXXXXX
 Harouff, Donald L., XXXXXX
 Harper, James C., XXXXXX
 Harper, William H., XXXXXX
 Harrington, James L., XXXXXX
 Harrington, Lonnie E., Jr., XXXXXX
 Harris, Richard E., XXXXXX
 Harris, Ronald V., XXXXXX
 Harrison, Oscar J., XXXXXX
 Harrison, Walter R., Jr., XXXXXX
 Hartman, William F., XXXXXX
 Harvey, James V., XXXXXX
 Harwood, Richard D., XXXXXX
 Hassell, John N., XXXXXX
 Hassin, Donald J., XXXXXX
 Hassman, Phillip E., XXXXXX
 Hathaway, Clyde T., XXXXXX
 Hathaway, Leander R., Jr., XXXXXX
 Hawthorne, Victor J., XXXXXX
 Hayes, Duane, XXXXXX
 Hayes, John G., XXXXXX
 Hayes, Joseph W., Jr., XXXXXX
 Haygood, Jack L., XXXXXX
 Haynes, Return C., XXXXXX
 Healy, Michael D., XXXXXX
 Heard, William C., XXXXXX
 Hearin, Joseph N., Jr., XXXXXX
 Heckendorf, Robert J., XXXXXX
 Heiden, Charles K., XXXXXX
 Heidenreich, Ellsworth W., XXXXXX
 Heller, Thomas J., XXXXXX
 Helton, Carl J., XXXXXX
 Hemmings, Haven H., XXXXXX
 Hemphill, James A., XXXXXX
 Hempling, Leonard J., XXXXXX
 Henderson, Hubert H., Jr., XXXXXX
 Henderson, Joseph E., XXXXXX
 Henderson, Joseph L., XXXXXX
 Hendricks, Meredith E., XXXXXX
 Henry, William H., Jr., XXXXXX
 Hensel, Raymond G., XXXXXX
 Hervey, Theodore E., XXXXXX
 Hess, Lewis E., XXXXXX
 Hetzel, Foster G., Jr., XXXXXX
 Hickey, Pennell J., XXXXXX
 Hicks, Joseph E., XXXXXX
 Hicks, Robert R., XXXXXX
 Hiestand, William C., XXXXXX
 Higginbotham, Travis L., XXXXXX
 Hilburn, Jack B., XXXXXX
 Hill, Glen A., XXXXXX
 Hill, James F., XXXXXX
 Hill, John P., XXXXXX
 Hill, Robert W., XXXXXX
 Hill, William B., XXXXXX
 Hillman, Lawson R., XXXXXX
 Hillmar, James E., XXXXXX
 Hindman, Edward R., XXXXXX
 Hinges, Norman P., XXXXXX
 Hirsch, Edward, XXXXXX
 Hjorth, George E., XXXXXX
 Hoddinott, George R., XXXXXX
 Hodes, John T., XXXXXX
 Hoffman, John J., Jr., XXXXXX
 Hoffmann, William H., XXXXXX
 Hoffmaster, George C., Jr., XXXXXX
 Hogan, John D. A., Jr., XXXXXX
 Holden, Needham C., Jr., XXXXXX
 Holloway, Kenneth H., XXXXXX
 Holt, James H., XXXXXX
 Hoot, Herbert L., Jr., XXXXXX
 Hopkins, Norman B., Jr., XXXXXX
 Horey, Robert L., XXXXXX
 Hornstein, David H., XXXXXX
 Horton, Max G., XXXXXX
 Hougen, John H., XXXXXX
 Howard, Charles F., XXXXXX
 Howard, Edward B., XXXXXX
 Howard, Harmon, XXXXXX
 Howard, Norman F., XXXXXX
 Howell, Fred F., XXXXXX
 Howell, Martin D., XXXXXX
 Huber, Leo K., XXXXXX
 Huber, William E., XXXXXX
 Hughes, Billy D., XXXXXX
 Hughes, Irving C., XXXXXX
 Hughes, James E., XXXXXX
 Hughes, James E., Jr., XXXXXX
 Hughes, Walter P., Jr., XXXXXX
 Huie, Douglas T., XXXXXX
 Hull, James M., XXXXXX
 Hunt, Alexander H., XXXXXX
 Huntzinger, Harvey W., XXXXXX
 Hurst, Cam J., Jr., XXXXXX
 Hurtt, Clarence M., XXXXXX
 Hutton, Robert B., XXXXXX
 Hynes, Joseph D., XXXXXX
 Iannamico, Lucky R., XXXXXX
 Insani, John L., XXXXXX
 Ivey, Benjamin F., Jr., XXXXXX
 Jackson, Hal G., Jr., XXXXXX
 Jackson, Kenneth F., XXXXXX
 Jacobs, Winston R., XXXXXX
 Jacques, Jasper P., XXXXXX
 Japinga, Robert M., XXXXXX
 Jaugstetter, Joseph P., XXXXXX
 Jeffery, Theron E., XXXXXX
 Jenkins, Donald L., XXXXXX
 Jenkins, Thomas F., XXXXXX
 Jenkins, W. Hugh, Jr., XXXXXX
 Jenkins, Wilbur G., XXXXXX
 Jenkinson, Robert C., XXXXXX
 Jennings, Richard M., XXXXXX
 Jensen, Reed G., XXXXXX
 Jenson, Lloyd K., XXXXXX
 Jessup, Maurice E., XXXXXX
 Johnson, Carlton S., XXXXXX
 Johnson, Charles McC., XXXXXX
 Johnson, Clayton E., XXXXXX
 Johnson, James A., XXXXXX
 Johnson, Lawrence H., Jr., XXXXXX
 Johnson, Robert J., XXXXXX
 Johnson, Ross LeR., XXXXXX
 Johnson, Thomas L., XXXXXX
 Jones, Chesley H., XXXXXX
 Jones, Clinton K., XXXXXX
 Jones, Douglas C., XXXXXX
 Jones, Frank P., XXXXXX
 Jones, George M. D., XXXXXX
 Jones, Harry T., XXXXXX
 Jones, Hugh H., Jr., XXXXXX
 Jones, John R., XXXXXX
 Jones, Norman G., XXXXXX
 Jones, Ogden S., Jr., XXXXXX

Jones, Paul E., XXXXXX
 Jones, Phillip D., XXXXXX
 Jones, Roy M., XXXXXX
 Jones, Walter F., XXXXXX
 Joosten, William J., XXXXXX
 Jordan, Jesse L., Jr., XXXXXX
 Jordan, William F., XXXXXX
 Jorgensen, Julius J., Jr., XXXXXX
 Junge, Edwin B., XXXXXX
 Junk, William P., Jr., XXXXXX
 Jurden, Delbert A., XXXXXX
 Kalagian, Samuel P., XXXXXX
 Kapec, Andrew J., XXXXXX
 Kast, Kenneth F., Jr., XXXXXX
 Kaster, Paul R., Jr., XXXXXX
 Katz, Phillip P., XXXXXX
 Kaufman, Phillip, XXXXXX
 Kavanaugh, Martin J., XXXXXX
 Kean, John J., XXXXXX
 Keebaugh, Harold G., XXXXXX
 Keegan, Thomas F., Jr., XXXXXX
 Keeling, William O., Jr., XXXXXX
 Kees, William G., XXXXXX
 Keith, Donald B., XXXXXX
 Kellam, Lawrence M., XXXXXX
 Kelley, Thomas W., XXXXXX
 Kemble, Charles R., XXXXXX
 Kendrick, Robert C., XXXXXX
 Kennedy, Robert W., XXXXXX
 Kennedy, William J., XXXXXX
 Key, Milton E., XXXXXX
 Klefe, Joseph C., Jr., XXXXXX
 Killam, Howard W., XXXXXX
 Kimmick, Leonard, Jr., XXXXXX
 King, Edward L., XXXXXX
 King, John E., XXXXXX
 King, Justice B., XXXXXX
 King, Lemuel G., XXXXXX
 King, Melvin E., XXXXXX
 King, Ward D., XXXXXX
 Kingdom, Arthur J., XXXXXX
 Kinghorn, Alan, XXXXXX
 Kingston, Joseph P., XXXXXX
 Kinnan, Floyd H., XXXXXX
 Kinne, Harold C., Jr., XXXXXX
 Kirby, Gilbert W., Jr., XXXXXX
 Kirk, Robert J., XXXXXX
 Kirkpatrick, Monroe, XXXXXX
 Kislring, Richard D., XXXXXX
 Kitlas, Albert C., XXXXXX
 Klein, John H., Jr., XXXXXX
 Klevesahl, Fred C., XXXXXX
 Knapp, Albert C., XXXXXX
 Knapp, Theron W., Jr., XXXXXX
 Knippling, Louis H., Jr., XXXXXX
 Kogan, Rudolf W., XXXXXX
 Konopnicki, Emil L., XXXXXX
 Koseki, Reginald W., XXXXXX
 Kostka, Bohuslav Z., XXXXXX
 Koziel, Richard J., XXXXXX
 Krakower, Albert M., XXXXXX
 Kreiner, Richard E., XXXXXX
 Kriwanek, Robert J., XXXXXX
 Kruger, Robert E., XXXXXX
 Kuefler, Kenneth T., XXXXXX
 Kuhlman, Arthur H., Jr., XXXXXX
 Kuntze, Robert A., XXXXXX
 Kurtz, Maurice K., Jr., XXXXXX
 La Bounta, Gerald C., Jr., XXXXXX
 LaPorte, Arthur E., Jr., XXXXXX
 Lamar, Henry C., Jr., XXXXXX
 Lamar, Kirby, XXXXXX
 Lamason, Jerry L., XXXXXX
 Lamb, Joe B., XXXXXX
 Lambert, John E., XXXXXX
 Lambert, Robert O., XXXXXX
 Lambourne, Robert D., XXXXXX
 Lamothe, Frank E., XXXXXX
 Lamp, Russell J., XXXXXX
 Lampros, James, XXXXXX
 Landau, Calvin J., XXXXXX
 Landis, Charles M., XXXXXX
 Landre, Lowell H., XXXXXX
 Landry, Edward L., XXXXXX
 Landry, Wilson A., Jr., XXXXXX
 Landseadel, Robert J., Jr., XXXXXX
 Lang, Jack B., XXXXXX
 Lang, Vincent W., XXXXXX
 Lansing, Ernest J., XXXXXX
 Larkin, Daniel T., XXXXXX
 Larsen, Edward D., XXXXXX
 Larsen, Narlon G., XXXXXX
 Larson, Gale L., XXXXXX
 Latham, Willard, XXXXXX
 Lauber, Robert W., XXXXXX
 Lauer, Jerry B., XXXXXX
 Lawlor, Thomas A., XXXXXX
 Lawrence, Renn M., XXXXXX
 Lawson, James E., XXXXXX
 Lay, James R., XXXXXX
 LeGro, William E., Jr., XXXXXX
 LePage, Julien H., XXXXXX
 LeVier, Earl R., XXXXXX
 Leahy, Thomas M., Jr., XXXXXX
 Leary, John R., XXXXXX
 Ledford, Gerald E., XXXXXX
 Lee, Charles B., XXXXXX
 Lee, Myron E., Jr., XXXXXX
 Legg, Elbert E., XXXXXX
 Lehner, Charles R., Jr., XXXX
 Leister, James W., XXXXXX
 Leneker, Herbert W., XXXXXX
 Leneten, Charles C., XXXXXX
 Lentini, Anthony R., XXXXXX
 Lewis, Addison L., XXXXXX
 Lewis, John D., XXXXXX
 Lewis, John L., XXXXXX
 Lewis, Mose E., 3d, XXXXXX
 Lewis, Samuel A., XXXXXX
 Liddle, John W., XXXXXX
 Lilchow, Robert E., XXXXXX
 Lind, Thomas D., XXXXXX
 Lindeman, Arthur H., Jr., XXXXXX
 Lindholm, James R., XXXXXX
 Lippincott, John C., XXXXXX
 Little, Robert F., Jr., XXXXXX
 Little, Robert A., XXXXXX
 Littlejohn, John C., XXXXXX
 Livingston, Hoyt R., XXXXXX
 Livingston, Leon R., Jr., XXXXXX
 Lober, William J., Jr., XXXXXX
 Lochhead, Earl J., XXXXXX
 Locke, Theodore F., Jr., XXXXXX
 Loe, Robert J., XXXXXX
 Lombard, Harold F., XXXXXX
 Lombardi, Arthur P., XXXXXX
 Long, Eldredge R., Jr., XXXXXX
 Long, Herlihy T., XXXXXX
 Long, Homer S., Jr., XXXXXX
 Longbottom, John H., XXXXXX
 Longstroth, Alma G., XXXXXX
 Lopez, Henry F., XXXXXX
 Love, John A., XXXXXX
 Lowden, Charles B., XXXXXX
 Lowrey, Willis H., XXXXXX
 Lowry, Phillip E., XXXXXX
 Loy, Albert, XXXXXX
 Luebbert, William F., XXXXXX
 Lumpkin, Benjamin E., Jr., XXXXXX
 Lynch, Robert E., XXXXXX
 Lynch, Robert O., XXXXXX
 Lynch, William D., XXXXXX
 Mac Neill, Francis W., XXXXXX
 Mace, John S., XXXXXX
 Mack, Richard E., XXXXXX
 Mackert, John R., XXXXXX
 Madigan, William P., XXXXXX
 Madison, John H., Jr., XXXXXX
 Maggio, Christopher S., XXXXXX
 Magnotti, John F., Jr., XXXXXX
 Mahone, Worthington M., XXXXXX
 Mailhafer, Harry J., XXXXXX
 Malinowski, Theodore B., XXXXXX
 Mallory, Phillip L., XXXXXX
 Maness, Harold M., XXXXXX
 Manifold, Max D., XXXXXX
 Manly, Clarence H., Jr., XXXXXX
 Mann, James W., XXXXXX
 Manning, John R., XXXXXX
 Maple, John C., XXXXXX
 Maranger, George J., XXXX
 Marcus, Gerald R., XXXXXX
 Marder, Eugene, XXXXXX
 Marks, Patrick W., XXXXXX
 Marley, John T., XXXXXX
 Marshall, Francis E., XXXXXX
 Marshall, Magness W., XXXXXX
 Martin, James S., XXXXXX
 Martin, Norman L., XXXXXX
 Martin, Robert J., XXXXXX
 Martin, Stuart F., XXXXXX
 Martinez de Andino, Jose A., XXXXXX
 Mason, Phillip L., XXXXXX
 Masters, John J., XXXXXX
 Mathern, Louis G., Jr., XXXXXX
 Mathews, Amos C., XXXXXX
 Mathews, Wayne C., XXXXXX
 Mathieu, Robert N., XXXXXX
 Mauderly, Allen J., XXXXXX
 Maughan, George E., XXXXXX
 Maughn, William, Jr., XXXXXX
 Maul, David D., XXXXXX
 Maurer, John A., XXXXXX
 Mautz, Wayne A., XXXXXX
 Maxwell, Lavern W., XXXXXX
 May, Roy R., Jr., XXXXXX
 Mayer, Arthur J., XXXXXX
 Mayer, Jack, XXXXXX
 Mayne, Robert K., XXXXXX
 Mazuchowski, John P., XXXXXX
 McAfee, Glen E., XXXXXX
 McAleer, John J., Jr., XXXXXX
 McArdie, John F., XXXXXX
 McBride, Richard M., XXXXXX
 McCabe, Jerome M., XXXXXX
 McCaig, Milton E., XXXXXX
 McCarron, Dean J., XXXXXX
 McCarthy, James L., XXXXXX
 McClaran, Jack L., XXXXXX
 McClure, Bruce, XXXXXX
 McClure, George W., Jr., XXXXXX
 McConaghy, David D., XXXXXX
 McConkey, Kernon M., XXXXXX
 McCracken, Walter S., XXXXXX
 McCrary, Charles E., XXXXXX
 McCravy, James L., XXXXXX
 McCulloch, Robert C., XXXXXX
 McCune, John R., XXXXXX
 McEntee, Francis A., XXXXXX
 McFadden, George L., Jr., XXXXXX
 McGarey, Richard V., XXXXXX
 McGinnis, Charles I., XXXXXX
 McGlone, James F., XXXXXX
 McGough, Gordon H., XXXXXX
 McGowan, Edgar, XXXXXX
 McGuinn, Michael E., 3d, XXXXXX
 McGuire, Robert D., XXXXXX
 McGurk, Jack B., XXXXXX
 McIntosh, James C., XXXXXX
 McIntosh, James F., XXXXXX
 McIntyre, Kenneth E., XXXXXX
 McKee, Charles F., XXXXXX
 McKelvey, Vincent T., XXXXXX
 McKenna, Edward C., XXXXXX
 McKiernan, Brian J., XXXXXX
 McKinsey, Ray A., XXXXXX
 McLaughlin, Robert L., XXXXXX
 McNeal, John L., XXXXXX
 McNeil, William R., XXXXXX
 McSwain, Richard G., XXXXXX
 McTaggart, Richard R., XXXXXX
 Mead, Chester R., XXXXXX
 Meadows, Byron D., XXXXXX
 Mears, Joe G., XXXXXX
 Medsger, Gerald W., XXXXXX
 Meek, Carroll S., XXXXXX
 Meek, John W., Jr., XXXXXX
 Mehosky, Edward S., XXXXXX
 Melcher, Ralph W., XXXXXX
 Melner, Sinclair L., XXXXXX
 Merck, Carl J., XXXXXX
 Meredith, Francis, Jr., XXXXXX
 Meritt, John F., XXXXXX
 Mesick, Robert A., XXXXXX
 Messinger, Lucien E., 3d, XXXXXX
 Metcalf, Donald J., XXXXXX
 Metz, Clarence E., XXXXXX
 Metzger, J. Hayes, XXXXXX
 Meyer, Harold J., XXXXXX
 Meyer, Robert J., XXXXXX
 Middleton, Harry F., XXXXXX
 Mihoch, John P., XXXXXX
 Miles, Edwin R., Sr., XXXXXX
 Millard, Richard C., XXXXXX
 Miller, Amory A., Jr., XXXXXX
 Miller, Charles F., XXXXXX
 Miller, Lewis, XXXXXX
 Miller, Robert C., XXXXXX
 Miller, Rowlan L., XXXXXX
 Miller, Russell J., XXXXXX
 Milton, Wilburn E., XXXXXX
 Minis, Carol E., XXXXXX
 Mirochna, Thaddeus M., XXXXXX

Mitchell, John D., Jr., XXXXXX
 Mitchell, Richard F., XXXXXX
 Mitchell, Terry C., XXXXXX
 Mitchem, Winfred E., XXXXXX
 Mize, Clifford E., XXXXXX
 Moe, Wayne J., XXXXXX
 Mohr, Phillip J., XXXXXX
 Moller, Andreas J., XXXXXX
 Mollison, Douglas A., XXXXXX
 Monahan, Lawrence P., Jr., XXXXXX
 Monk, Eugene E., XXXXXX
 Monroe, Howard E., XXXXXX
 Montgomery, Ernest G., XXXXXX
 Montgomery, George M., XXXXXX
 Montgomery, Hunter M., XXXXXX
 Monyhan, William J., XXXXXX
 Moore, Albert E., XXXXXX
 Moore, Donald G., XXXXXX
 Moore, Fred S., XXXXXX
 Moore, Herbert S., Jr., XXXXXX
 Moore, Howard McK., XXXXXX
 Moore, James E., XXXXXX
 Moore, James T., XXXXXX
 Moore, John H., XXXXXX
 Moore, Merl M., Jr., XXXXXX
 Moore, William T., XXXXXX
 Moran, Clayton L., XXXXXX
 Moreau, Donald W., XXXXXX
 Morris, Charles E., XXXXXX
 Morris, Davis O'N., XXXXXX
 Morrison, John H., Jr., XXXXXX
 Morrissey, John J., XXXXXX
 Morrow, Charles, Jr., XXXXXX
 Morrow, Jack G., XXXXXX
 Morton, Karl R., XXXXXX
 Morton, Langdon L., XXXXXX
 Morton, Richard L., XXXXXX
 Mortrude, James O., XXXXXX
 Moses, Albert R., XXXXXX
 Moses, Thomas L., XXXXXX
 Motola, Marlo, V., XXXXXX
 Muckerman, Joseph E., 2d, XXXXXX
 Mullens, Robert M., XXXXXX
 Mumma, Harry F., XXXXXX
 Munroe, Irving W., XXXXXX
 Murphy, Edward L., Jr., XXXXXX
 Murphy, Meredith E., XXXXXX
 Murphy, Powell D., XXXXXX
 Murray, Clive E., Jr., XXXXXX
 Myers, Allen L., Jr., XXXXXX
 Myers, Robert W., XXXXXX
 Myers, William G., XXXXXX
 Nash, Vernon L., Jr., XXXX
 Neil, James M., XXXXXX
 Nelson, Edwin B., XXXXXX
 Nelson, Knute R., XXXXXX
 Nelson, Loyal E., XXXXXX
 Nelson, Neil G., XXXXXX
 Nelson, Robert B., XXXXXX
 Nelson, Robert C., XXXXXX
 Nelson, Wallace W., XXXXXX
 Nelson, William J., XXXXXX
 Nevin, John I., XXXXXX
 New, William R., XXXXXX
 Newell, Arthur, XXXXXX
 Newport, Elswick, XXXXXX
 Nicholas, Billy B., XXXXXX
 Nielsen, Jack W., XXXXXX
 Nikas, Nick J., XXXXXX
 Noce, Robert W., XXXXXX
 Nolan, John M., XXXXXX
 Norcom, Henry C., XXXXXX
 Nordin, William H., XXXXXX
 Norman, William C., XXXXXX
 Norton, Doyt P., XXXXXX
 Norton, Dunbar S., XXXXXX
 Norwood, Wayne D., XXXXXX
 Notbohm, William R., XXXXXX
 Nowak, George A., XXXXXX
 Nulsen, Charles K., Jr., XXXXXX
 Nunnally, Stephens, W., XXXXXX
 Nyquist, Joel B., Jr., XXXXXX
 Oba, Juneus T., XXXXXX
 Oberley, Thomas E., XXXXXX
 Oberst, Tom C., XXXXXX
 O'Brien, Peter, XXXXXX
 O'Brien, Richard E., XXXXXX
 O'Brien, Robert T., XXXXXX
 Odum, Louie W., XXXXXX
 O'Donnell, Edward H., XXXXXX
 Ogden, Lawrence J., XXXXXX
 Ogilvy, Hubert W., XXXXXX
 Ohm, Herbert P., XXXXXX
 O'Kelley, William C., XXXXXX
 Olentine, Charles G., XXXXXX
 Oliver, Kenneth M., Jr., XXXXXX
 Olson, Robert E., XXXXXX
 Ondishko, Joseph J., Jr., XXXXXX
 Oravetz, Milan J., XXXXXX
 Ortega, George A., XXXXXX
 Osato, Timothy, XXXXXX
 Osick, John J., XXXXXX
 Osterhout, Fred A., Jr., XXXXXX
 Oswald, Donald C., XXXXXX
 Owsley, Homer, Jr., XXXXXX
 Padalino, Martin L., XXXXXX
 Page, James MacM., Jr., XXXXXX
 Page, Philip E., Jr., XXXXXX
 Palmer, Charles D., XXXXXX
 Palmer, Richard A., XXXXXX
 Panzer, Dwayne A., XXXXXX
 Paris, Edward J., XXXXXX
 Parish, Freddy B., XXXXXX
 Parker, Charles H., XXXXXX
 Parker, Joseph L., XXXXXX
 Parsons, George A., XXXXXX
 Patrick, Wayne A., XXXXXX
 Patterson, Clyde H., Jr., XXXXXX
 Patterson, Loren S., XXXXXX
 Patterson, William H., Jr., XXXXXX
 Patton, Teddy L., XXXXXX
 Patton, Thomas J., XXXXXX
 Paulson, Paul A., XXXXXX
 Payne, Bruce R., 2d, XXXXXX
 Peabody, Richard R., XXXXXX
 Pease, Quentin, XXXXXX
 Peck, George E., XXXXXX
 Peiker, Raymond J., XXXXXX
 Peixotto, Roland E., XXXXXX
 Pence, Edward W., XXXXXX
 Pendergrass, Alva W., Jr., XXXXXX
 Penfield, Walter A., XXXXXX
 Penny, Robert G., XXXXXX
 Perfect, Burns I., XXXXXX
 Perry, Raymond L., XXXXXX
 Peters, Elmer B., XXXXXX
 Peterson, Hartwin R., XXXXXX
 Petranck, John J., XXXXXX
 Petruzzi, Anthony B., XXXXXX
 Petty, Edgar L., Jr., XXXXXX
 Pfeffer, William J., XXXXXX
 Phelps, Franklin E., XXXXXX
 Phillips, Charles L., XXXXXX
 Phillips, Donald M., XXXXXX
 Phillips, Eugene, Jr., XXXXXX
 Phillips, William G., XXXXXX
 Piper, Harvey D., XXXXXX
 Piserchia, Joseph, XXXXXX
 Pizzi, Joseph E., XXXXXX
 Pleier, William F., XXXXXX
 Plummer, Frank S., Jr., XXXXXX
 Poe, James E., XXXXXX
 Poerner, Homer W., XXXXXX
 Pollin, George A., Jr., XXXXXX
 Ponder, Lewington S., XXXXXX
 Post, Sterling T., Jr., XXXXXX
 Powell, John C., Jr., XXXXXX
 Powell, Joseph L., XXXXXX
 Powell, Richard L., XXXXXX
 Powell, Roger D., XXXXXX
 Powers, George McL., XXXXXX
 Powers, Louis W., XXXXXX
 Powers, Terence A., XXXXXX
 Prather, Lewis D., XXXXXX
 Preuit, James V., XXXXXX
 Price, Wallace W., XXXXXX
 Price, William S., XXXXXX
 Prichard, Chesley D., XXXXXX
 Proctor, William B., Jr., XXXXXX
 Prout, William L., XXXXXX
 Puckett, Ralph, Jr., XXXXXX
 Pue, Eddie B., XXXXXX
 Pumphrey, Richard T., XXXXXX
 Quackenbush, Harold G., XXXXXX
 Quigley, Quentin D., XXXXXX
 Quinn, John D., XXXXXX
 Quinn, Thomas G., XXXXXX
 Rafferty, Arthur J., XXXXXX
 Rahmann, John C., XXXXXX
 Ramos, Rene, XXXXXX
 Rank, William A., XXXXXX
 Rankin, Edward, XXXXXX
 Ransier, John G., XXXXXX
 Rasmussen, John W., Jr., XXXXXX
 Rasmussen, Raymond J., XXXXXX
 Rathlev, Arnold, XXXXXX
 Rawls, Lucian R., Jr., XXXXXX
 Ray, John L., XXXXXX
 Raymond, William B., XXXXXX
 Ream, Forrest D., XXXXXX
 Redd, Milton LeR., XXXXXX
 Reed, George M., XXXXXX
 Reed, James B., XXXXXX
 Reese, Neil, XXXXXX
 Reid, Robert A., XXXXXX
 Reign, Lewis L., Jr., XXXXXX
 Rhine, Malcolm K., XXXXXX
 Rhodes, Clifford D., XXXXXX
 Rhodes, William H., XXXXXX
 Rice, Foy, XXXXXX
 Rich, Charles E., XXXXXX
 Richardson, George M., XXXXXX
 Richey, Thomas B., XXXXXX
 Richters, Robert L., XXXXXX
 Riddle, Hugh H., XXXXXX
 Rider, Vernon R., XXXXXX
 Ridlehoover, Edward M., XXXXXX
 Riggs, Noble L., XXXXXX
 Riggs, William G., XXXXXX
 Riley, Evan F., XXXXXX
 Ring, Alfred C., XXXXXX
 Ringenbach, Frank P., Jr., XXXXXX
 Riordan, John B., XXXXXX
 Rishell, Clair L., XXXXXX
 Rives, James C., XXXX
 Roach, Neal H., XXXXXX
 Robbins, Stephen L., XXXXXX
 Robert, John F., XXXXXX
 Roberts, Ernst E., XXXXXX
 Roberts, Wayne G., XXXXXX
 Robertson, Jack L., XXXXXX
 Robinson, Herbert A., XXXXXX
 Robinson, Robert H., XXXXXX
 Roby, Houston S., Jr., XXXXXX
 Roebuck, Charles G., XXXXXX
 Roegge, Alvin L., XXXXXX
 Rogers, David D., Jr., XXXXXX
 Rollier, Robert L., XXXXXX
 Rooks, David L., XXXXXX
 Rose, Robert M., XXXXXX
 Rosner, Albert A., XXXXXX
 Ross, Edgar B., Jr., XXXXXX
 Ross, Hugh A., 3d, XXXXXX
 Ross, Marion C., XXXXXX
 Rossman, Warren W., XXXXXX
 Roth, Theodore R., XXXXXX
 Rovegno, Lawton C., XXXXXX
 Rowe, Gordon D., XXXXXX
 Royal, Everett C., XXXXXX
 Rumore, Sam, XXXXXX
 Runkle, Robert L., XXXXXX
 Ruppert, John P., XXXXXX
 Rusche, Ralph R., XXXXXX
 Ruschmeyer, Gerald F., XXXXXX
 Rush, Donald P., XXXXXX
 Ruzich, Rudolph L., XXXXXX
 Ryan, Wendell J., XXXXXX
 Sadler, Jack R., XXXXXX
 Samuel, James E., XXXXXX
 Sanders, James H., XXXXXX
 Sanders, Paul, XXXXXX
 Sando, Raymond W., XXXXXX
 Sandrock, George W., XXXXXX
 Sanelli, Alfred A., XXXXXX
 Sargeant, Edward W., XXXXXX
 Sarsfield, Francis L., XXXXXX
 Savage, Paul L., XXXXXX
 Schaefer, Martin W., XXXXXX
 Schappaugh, George H., XXXXXX
 Scheib, Helmut V., XXXXXX
 Scheumann, Marcus C., Jr., XXXXXX
 Schiller, Melvin D., XXXXXX
 Schleh, Wittmer I., XXXXXX
 Schmalzel, Joseph L., Jr., XXXXXX
 Schmidt, Norbert O., XXXXXX
 Schoen, Harry P., Jr., XXXXXX
 Schulz, Gerhard W., XXXXXX
 Schulz, Theodore G., XXXXXX
 Schumacher, David J., XXXXXX
 Schwartz, Jack J., XXXXXX
 Schwarz, Robert H., XXXXXX
 Seibert, Donald A., XXXXXX
 Seibert, Donald W., XXXXXX

Selby, Lewis S., XXXXXX
 Selfe, John K., XXXXXX
 Sellers, Homer L., Jr., XXXXXX
 Semmens, Gervies L., XXXXXX
 Semple, Charles C., XXXXXX
 Semsch, Philip L., XXXXXX
 Shapira, Norman I., XXXXXX
 Sharpe, Edgar B., XXXXXX
 Sharpe, Melvin B., XXXXXX
 Shaw, Harold E., XXXXXX
 Sheets, Henry B., Jr., XXXXXX
 Shelnut, James E., XXXXXX
 Shelton, Louis H., XXXXXX
 Sheppard, Robert D., Jr., XXXXXX
 Sherman, Robert, XXXXXX
 Shields, Buren R., Jr., XXXXXX
 Shields, Lawrence D., XXXXXX
 Shiely, Thomas P., XXXXXX
 Shoemaker, Charles J., Jr., XXXXXX
 Sickafoose, Keith E., XXXXXX
 Siegrist, Raymond E., XXXXXX
 Sills, Charles W., XXXXXX
 Sills, Gerald H., XXXXXX
 Sims, Thomas A., XXXXXX
 Singletary, Albert W., XXXXXX
 Singleton, William T., XXXXXX
 Sizemore, Burley, XXXXXX
 Smith, Charles D., Jr., XXXXXX
 Smith, Charles L., XXXXXX
 Smith, Dale M., XXXXXX
 Smith, Donald E., XXXXXX
 Smith, Duane H., XXXXXX
 Smith, Harold F., Jr., XXXXXX
 Smith, John A., XXXXXX
 Smith, Lloyd D., XXXXXX
 Smith, Malcolm R., XXXXXX
 Smith, Paul T., XXXXXX
 Smith, Richard D., XXXXXX
 Smith, Robert L., XXXXXX
 Smith, Samuel L., XXXXXX
 Smith, Simeon M., Jr., XXXXXX
 Smith, Vance O., XXXXXX
 Smith, Wayne C., Jr., XXXXXX
 Smithey, Paul C., XXXXXX
 Smithson, Robert W., XXXXXX
 Smyth, Carl B., XXXXXX
 Snell, Dillon, XXXXXX
 Snipan, George, XXXXXX
 Snow, Morgan W., XXXXXX
 Soucek, Leo E., XXXXXX
 Soucy, Robert H., XXXXXX
 Southerland, John T., XXXXXX
 Speights, Duris, Jr., XXXXXX
 Spence, Ralph W., XXXXXX
 Spencer, Orton F., XXXXXX
 Spettel, Charles L., XXXXXX
 Spivey, Ray V., XXXXXX
 Spoede, Robert W., XXXXXX
 Springer, Robert M., Jr., XXXXXX
 Spruill, Victor F., XXXXXX
 Stalgers, James McC., XXXXXX
 Staley, J. Wayne, Jr., XXXXXX
 Stam, Charles W., XXXXXX
 Staples, Franklin E., XXXXXX
 Starkey, Posie L., Jr., XXXXXX
 Stauffer, Joseph R., XXXXXX
 Stedham, Dan D., XXXXXX
 Steele, Warren B., XXXXXX
 Steenburn, Donald H., XXXXXX
 Steinke, John E., XXXXXX
 Stelman, Chester R., XXXXXX
 Stephens, Rome O., XXXXXX
 Sterrett, John D., XXXXXX
 Stickney, Louis S., Jr., XXXXXX
 Stigall, Arthur D., XXXXXX
 Stivers, Fred, Jr., XXXXXX
 Stockell, Charles W., XXXXXX
 Stockton, Thomas W., XXXXXX
 Stoltenberg, Jack G., XXXXXX
 Stone, James L., XXXXXX
 Stone, Joel E., XXXXXX
 Stone, R. E., XXXXXX
 Stooke, Willard N., XXXXXX
 Story, Robert P., XXXXXX
 Strauss, George H., XXXXXX
 Strawn, Louis F., XXXXXX
 Strett, St. Clair, Jr., XXXXXX
 Strohecker, Howard L., XXXXXX
 Stukhart, George, Jr., XXXXXX
 Stump, Robert M., XXXXXX
 Sturdivant, Leslie W., XXXXXX
 Sugg, Leon H., Jr., XXXXXX
 Sugiyama, Shigeki J., XXXXXX
 Suglia, Anthony S., XXXXXX
 Sullivan, George A., XXXXXX
 Summers, Archie W., XXXXXX
 Sunski, Chester F., XXXXXX
 Surut, Lee E., XXXXXX
 Suther, Russell J., XXXXXX
 Suttle, Albert B., Jr., XXXXXX
 Sutton, John E., XXXXXX
 Swafford, Fred G., Jr., XXXXXX
 Swett, Trevor W., Jr., XXXXXX
 Sylvester, Loren H., XXXXXX
 Symmes, Kenneth R., XXXXXX
 Tallman, Richard J., XXXXXX
 Taylor, Charles E., XXXXXX
 Taylor, Donald L., XXXXXX
 Taylor, Mack, Jr., XXXXXX
 Taylor, Richard F., XXXXXX
 Taylor, Victor C., XXXXXX
 Teague, Phillip E., XXXXXX
 Teasdale, Robert D., XXXXXX
 Tedick, Eugene, XXXXXX
 Teel, Joseph F., XXXXXX
 Templeman, James M., XXXXXX
 Terry, Charles A., XXXXXX
 Tesko, Stanley, XXXXXX
 Thams, Robert W., XXXXXX
 Thayer, George E., Jr., XXXXXX
 Thoma, William C., XXXXXX
 Thomas, Charles M., XXXXXX
 Thomas, Jack D., XXXXXX
 Thomas, Wilson E., XXXXXX
 Thome, Matthew R., XXXXXX
 Thompson, Lawrence D., XXXXXX
 Thompson, Paul A., XXXXXX
 Thornton, Aubrey O., XXXXXX
 Thying, Lunsford, XXXXXX
 Tice, Raphael D., XXXXXX
 Tieman, Wilbert A., XXXXXX
 Tierney, William P., XXXXXX
 Timmerberg, Paul M., XXXXXX
 Tobin, Paul G., XXXXXX
 Tobin, Richard E., XXXXXX
 Topham, Everett G., XXXXXX
 Townes, James E., Jr., XXXXXX
 Townsley, Edwin S., XXXXXX
 Trabue, Earl N., XXXXXX
 Tracy, George W., XXXXXX
 Trask, Norman E., XXXXXX
 Travers, Francis A., Jr., XXXXXX
 Travis, William H., XXXXXX
 Trinkle, Frank W., XXXXXX
 Trost, Robert W., XXXXXX
 Tuberty, James T., XXXXXX
 Tucker, Harold, XXXXXX
 Tunnell, Teddy B., XXXXXX
 Turley, Joseph, McL., XXXXXX
 Turman, Robert L., XXXXXX
 Turnbull, Francis W., XXXXXX
 Turner, Albert F., XXXXXX
 Turner, Frederick C., XXXXXX
 Turner, Glenn E., Jr., XXXXXX
 Tussing, Austin F., XXXXXX
 Tutwiler, Guy I., XXXXXX
 Tyler, John E., XXXXXX
 Tyson, William P., Jr., XXXXXX
 Unger, Guinn E., XXXXXX
 Updike, Robert E., XXXXXX
 Upton, Clifford A., XXXXXX
 Urrutia, Carlos E., XXXXXX
 Utley, Jack C., XXXXXX
 Vail, William H., XXXXXX
 VanDyken, Harold B., XXXXXX
 Van Hook, James McN., XXXXXX
 Van Horn, Vannah E., XXXXXX
 Van Laethem, Fernand R., XXXXXX
 Van Meter, Jack D., XXXXXX
 Vargovick, William S., XXXXXX
 Vaughan, Miles C., Jr., XXXXXX
 Vaughn, James B., XXXXXX
 Vaughn, Robert D., XXXXXX
 Vincent, Caleb R., XXXXXX
 Vogt, Robert L., XXXXXX
 Vollmer, John P., XXXXXX
 Voseipka, John R., XXXXXX
 Waddell, Edward S., XXXXXX
 Waddell, Jack L., XXXXXX
 Wagner, Richard H., XXXXXX
 Wagonhurst, Arland H., XXXXXX
 Walden, John E. 2d, XXXXXX
 Waldrop, Andrew J., XXXXXX
 Walker, Albert L., XXXXXX
 Walker, John R., XXXXXX
 Walker, Robert G., XXXXXX
 Wallace, Bruce E., XXXXXX
 Wallis, Vernon V., XXXXXX
 Walsh, John J., Jr., XXXXXX
 Walters, Edwin S., XXXXXX
 Walton, John M., XXXXXX
 Wardle, Theron G., XXXXXX
 Warlick, William F., Jr., XXXXXX
 Warner, Walter J., XXXXXX
 Warnke, John J., Jr., XXXXXX
 Warren, Hancel L. E., XXXXXX
 Warrington, Robert O., XXXXXX
 Watling, Edward T., XXXXXX
 Watson, Henry, Jr., XXXXXX
 Watson, William R., XXXXXX
 Wayne, Norbert J., XXXXXX
 Weaver, Robert N., XXXXXX
 Webb, Roy L., XXXXXX
 Webel, Herman, Jr., XXXXXX
 Webster, Dobson L., XXXXXX
 Weissinger, Jack K., XXXXXX
 Welch, John M., XXXXXX
 Wendling, Donald E., XXXXXX
 Wenz, Albert L., XXXXXX
 Wesolowski, Stanley, XXXXXX
 West, Oliver I., XXXXXX
 West, William F., XXXXXX
 Westermann, Thomas R., XXXXXX
 Wheeler, Harold L., XXXXXX
 Wheeler, Neil W., XXXXXX
 Whelan, Raymond A., XXXXXX
 Whichard, William A., XXXXXX
 Whistler, Donald E., XXXXXX
 Whitaker, Bill, XXXXXX
 White, Charles E., XXXXXX
 White, Joseph F., XXXXXX
 White, Richard V., XXXXXX
 Whitelock, Thomas D., XXXXXX
 Wickham, Robert E., XXXXXX
 Wienecke, Herman E., XXXXXX
 Wieteki, Donald W., XXXXXX
 Wightman, John D., XXXXXX
 Wilcox, George L., XXXXXX
 Wild, Charles B., Jr., XXXXXX
 Wilkins, Frank E., XXXXXX
 Wilkinson, Edward S., Sr., XXXXXX
 Wilkinson, Harry W., XXXXXX
 Will, Clement H., XXXXXX
 Willet, Curtis L., Jr., XXXXXX
 Williams, Edwin J., Jr., XXXXXX
 Williams, Gordon E., XXXXXX
 Williams, Murray W., XXXXXX
 Williams, Robert W., XXXXXX
 Williams, Theodore, XXXXXX
 Williamson, Dan H., Jr., XXXXXX
 Williamson, Wade H., XXXXXX
 Wilmot, Fred W., XXXXXX
 Wilson, Calvin O., XXXXXX
 Wilson, Clifford C., XXXXXX
 Wilson, Edwin C., XXXXXX
 Wilson, Francis B., XXXXXX
 Wilson, J. Frank, XXXXXX
 Wilson, Jode R., XXXXXX
 Wilson, Leo L., XXXXXX
 Wilson, Planter M., XXXXXX
 Wilson, Robert B., XXXXXX
 Wilson, William V., XXXXXX
 Wilton, Clifford J., XXXXXX
 Winn, Charles C., XXXXXX
 Winslow, Francis J., XXXXXX
 Wintersteen, Joseph O., Jr., XXXXXX
 Withers, Langhorne P., XXXXXX
 Wolak, Francis A., XXXXXX
 Woltmon, Jack W., XXXXXX
 Womble, Phelps R., XXXXXX
 Wood, John F., Jr., XXXXXX
 Woodward, Dean R., XXXXXX
 Woolshlager, Richard J., XXXXXX
 Worth, William J., XXXXXX
 Wren, John J., XXXXXX
 Wright, Charles D., XXXXXX
 Wright, Lloyd G., XXXXXX
 Wyatt, Willard S., XXXXXX
 Wyruchowski, Edward P., Jr., XXXXXX
 Yadon, James C., XXXXXX
 Yaggi, Albert S., Jr., XXXXXX
 Yarbrough, John D., XXXXXX
 Yeats, Joseph J., Jr., XXXXXX

Yellman, Edward K., XXXXXX
 Yepsen, John H., XXXXXX
 Yerkes, Charles W., Jr., XXXXXX
 Yerkes, Walter E., XXXXXX
 Yost, DeVerne R., XXXXXX
 Young, David R., XXXXXX
 Young, William V., XXXXXX
 Youngblood, Lewis H., Jr., XXXXXX
 Younger, Ralph K., XXXXXX
 Zarnowski, Walter J., XXXXXX
 Zohn, Jerome, XXXXXX
 Zollicoffer, Marion B., XXXXXX
 Zumwalt, Charles B., XXXXXX

To be majors, Chaplain

Brady, John C., XXXX
 Dolan, Francis J., XXXX
 Eyer, Mervin S., XXXXXX
 Farrow, Alpha A., XXXXX
 Hutchins, Gordon E., XXXX
 Ketchersid, Corbin W., XXXXXX
 Kettler, Earl C., XXXXXX
 Killinger, Joseph G., XXXXXX
 Kittermann, Henry O., XXXXXX
 LeBlanc, Paul J., XXXXXX
 Ledebuhr, Albert F., XXXXXX
 Lewis, Francis R., XXXXXX
 MacGregor, John M., XXXXXX
 McNally, Carl P., XXXXXX
 Miller, Alfred A., XXXXXX
 Murray, Ralph J., XXXXXX
 Paznoskas, Leonard J., XXXXXX
 Reed, John E., XXXXXX
 Remark, Phillip B., XXXXXX
 Taylor, George O., XXXXXX
 Thompson, Parker C., XXXXXX
 Walter, Louie W., XXXXXX
 Williams, Robert W., XXXXXX
 Wilson, Robert D., XXXXXX

To be majors, Women's Army Corps

Bray, Lydia M., XXXXXX
 Buzzetti, Helen J., XXXXXX
 Eliker, Martha C., XXXXXX
 Hill, Georgia D., XXXXXX
 Leete, Alice W., XXXXXX
 Long, Alice A., XXXXXX
 Steir, Helen D., XXXXXX

To be majors, Medical Corps

Akers, William A., XXXXXX
 Austerman, Warrington, XXXXXX
 Baker, Floyd W., XXXXXX
 Barrett, O'Neill, Jr., XXXXXX
 Baugh, Joseph H., XXXXXX
 Barbary, Maurice S., XXXXXX
 Boyd, Howard A., XXXXXX
 Bridges, Berly E., Jr., XXXXXX
 Burkett, Harry E., XXXXXX
 Carey, Philip O., XXXXXX
 Ceccarelli, Frank E., XXXX
 Chamblin, Stuart A., Jr., XXXXXX
 Conrad, Marcel E., Jr., XXXXXX
 Cox, Dana D., XXXXXX
 Cox, Robert S., Jr., XXXXXX
 Crudo, Frank S., Jr., XXXXXX
 Dalton, James B., XXXXXX
 Dixon, Leon M., Jr., XXXXXX
 Edwards, Leon C., XXXXXX
 Fenstermacher, James M., XXXXXX
 Ford, George W., XXXXXX
 Fulton, Nolen W., Jr., XXXXXX
 Guenter, Kenneth E., XXXXXX
 Hanson, Thomas A., XXXXXX
 Herman, Robert H., XXXXXX
 Huycke, Edward J., XXXX
 Jefferson, Samuel C., XXXXXX
 Johnson, Cecil V., XXXXXX
 Johnson, Waine C., XXXXXX
 Kent, Alfred H., XXXXXX
 Kimbrough, Edward E., 3d, XXXXXX
 Kortis, Howard I., XXXXXX
 Longfellow, Don W., XXXXXX
 Louro, Jose M., XXXXXX
 MacNair, Donald S., XXXXXX
 Mansfield, John O., XXXXXX
 McFadden, Archibald W., XXXXXX
 McGregor, John G., XXXXXX
 Mendelson, Janice A., XXXXXX
 Moss, Dwight F., Jr., XXXXXX
 Murray, Thomas B., XXXXXX

Pearson, Jack W., XXXXX
 Plunket, Daniel C., XXXXXX
 Pogrebniak, Alexander, XXXX
 Potter, Stanley E., XXXXXX
 Powers, Joseph F., XXXX
 Rasmussen, Donald L., XXXXXX
 Shamburek, Roland H., XXXXXX
 Spontitz, Murray, XXXX
 Steuer, George Z., XXXXXX
 Thompson, James W., XXXXXX
 Turner, Guthrie L., Jr., XXXX
 Walton, Spencer, XXXXXX

To be majors, Dental Corps

Alderson, Thomas H., XXXX
 Alexander, William N., XXXXXX
 Andrews, James L., XXXXXX
 Bundt, Lyle D., XXXX
 Crowe, Patrick D., XXXXXX
 Davis, Quince B., XXXXXX
 Davis, Thomas H., XXXX
 Grisham, William K., XXXXXX
 Horkowitz, Gabriel W., XXXX
 Howe, Michael J., XXXXXX
 Jagers, Joe H., XXXXXX
 Jones, Rex D., XXXXXX
 Lee, Leslie M., XXXXXX
 Legg, William J., XXXXXX
 Morgan, Samuel C., XXXXXX
 Paul, Parks S., XXXXXX
 Seibert, Jay S., XXXXXX
 Smith, Duncan M., XXXXXX
 Steele, Richard A., XXXXXX

To be majors, Veterinary Corps

Brown, Heyward G., XXXXXX
 Crippen, James G., XXXXXX
 Fowler, James L., XXXXXX
 Hays, William L., XXXXXX
 Lorentzen, Kay W., XXXXXX
 Sheehy, Robert W., XXXXXX

To be majors, Medical Service Corps

Allen, Edward V., XXXXXX
 Arnberg, Wilber H., XXXXXX
 Baker, Eugene M., 3d, XXXXXX
 Barr, John W., XXXXXX
 Bentley, Richard E., XXXXXX
 Blakesley, Lyman, XXXXXX
 Blue, Jack T., XXXXXX
 Buker, Leland A., XXXXXX
 Bynum, Robert M., 3d, XXXXXX
 Camp, Frank R., Jr., XXXXXX
 Carroll, Nicholas V., XXXXXX
 Chadbourne, Ernest D., XXXXXX
 Cheek, Norfleet R., XXXXXX
 Clapp, Marshall W., XXXXXX
 Cohen, Milton, XXXXXX
 Cooper, Robert E., XXXXXX
 Crampton, George H., XXXXXX
 Crimen, John C., XXXXXX
 Crook, Samuel L., Sr., XXXXXX
 Cross, Jack, XXXXXX
 Cross, John R., XXXXXX
 Davenport, James D., Jr., XXXXXX
 Davidson, Louis F., XXXXXX
 Davis, William V., XXXXXX
 Downing, Jack W., XXXXXX
 Erne, Walter F., XXXXXX
 Ess, Earl D., XXXXXX
 Eveland, Charles L., XXXXXX
 Fleury, Thomas C., XXXXXX
 Gillespie, Harold S., XXXX
 Ginalick, Matthew, XXXXXX
 Marcus, Alan, XXXXXX
 Hayes, Cecil H., XXXXXX
 Hayes, William H., XXXXXX
 Hedlund, James L., XXXXXX
 Hino, Chester T., XXXXXX
 Huggins, Lewis H., XXXXXX
 Israeloff, Joseph, XXXXXX
 Janbaz, Edward H., XXXXXX
 Kerrigan, Robert J., XXXXXX
 Leifhelt, Howard C., XXXXXX
 Lindsay, Clyde J., XXXXXX
 Little, Roger W., XXXXXX
 Lord, Henry E., XXXXXX
 Lysak, William, XXXXXX
 Madere, Glenn W., Jr., XXXXXX
 Marquis, Charles E., XXXXXX
 McAleer, Charles F., Jr., XXXXXX
 McArthur, James E., XXXXXX

McMartin, George M., XXXX
 Mullins, William S., XXXXXX
 Norem, Leroy K., XXXXXX
 Pace, Erroll W., Jr., XXXXXX
 Parker, James W., XXXXXX
 Patrick, Darvin O., XXXXXX
 Pavlo, Michael J., Jr., XXXX
 Paxson, Earle A., XXXXXX
 Pendrak, Theodore S., XXXXXX
 Pezzulli, Frank, XXXXXX
 Porter, William R., XXXXXX
 Powell, Winston K., XXXX
 Prescott, William J., XXXXXX
 Ramshur, Loren C., XXXXXX
 Rooney, William S., XXXXXX
 Sauls, Wayne R., XXXX
 Shafer, Keith O., XXXXXX
 Simpson, Wayne, XXXXXX
 Smith, Grayson, XXXX
 Snyder, John S., XXXXXX
 Spencer, Ralph A., XXXXXX
 St. John, Frederick B., XXXX
 Stone, Robert A., XXXX
 Thomas, Charles A., Jr., XXXXXX
 Touchette, Norbert E., XXXXXX
 Turnbul, Samuel J., Jr., XXXXXX
 Tyndall, Arnold E., XXXXXX
 Wasson, Val J., XXXXXX
 Wegner, William M., XXXX
 White, Raymond H., XXXX
 Wittlif, Charles L., XXXXXX
 Wright, Dallas P., XXXX
 Wykoff, Dale E., XXXXXX
 Young, James J., XXXXXX
 Ziesenheim, Joseph C., XXXXXX

To be majors, Army Nurse Corps

Anderson, Marion V., XXXXX
 Bochman, Beverly E., XXXXX
 Bongiovanni, Esther T., XXXXX
 Bowman, Betty O., XXXXX
 Bradley, Mary L., XXXXX
 Brosmer, Margaret M., XXXXX
 Brown, Virginia L., XXXXX
 Bullock, Sarah C., XXXXX
 Chase, Dorothy L., XXXXX
 Christensen, Donna M., XXXXX
 Connolly, Margaret M., XXXXX
 Corbin, Mabel H., XXXXX
 DeLaney, Ramona E., XXXXX
 Dean, Martha, XXXXX
 Delaney, Marion P., XXXXX
 Donovan, Mary L., XXXXX
 Duncan, Mildred, XXXXX
 Eckhoff, Genevieve E., XXXXX
 Fairaizl, Berniece L., XXXX
 Farland, Vivian, XXXX
 Frazier, Doris S., XXXX
 Gerster, Dorothy C., XXXXX
 Glover, Mayme V., XXXX
 Grant, Helen E., XXXX
 Griffith, Margaret M., XXXX
 Haegle, Ida L., XXXXX
 Hambrick, Julia E., XXXX
 Hathaway, Edythe J., XXXXX
 Hill, Helen M., XXXXX
 Horton, Virginia A., XXXXX
 Hughes, Margaret E., XXXXX
 Jablunovsky, Anne C., XXXX
 Jacoby, Jane E., XXXXX
 Johnson, Elizabeth F., XXXX
 Jones, Mary A., XXXXX
 Kern, Marion L., XXXXX
 Knox, Grace E., XXXXX
 Krekel, Dorothy J., XXXXX
 Kropski, Lena S., XXXXX
 LeBlanc, Claire V., XXXXX
 Levangle, Catherine L., XXXX
 Lewis, Vivian B., XXXX
 Liebowitz, Ethel, XXXXX
 MacGarvie, Elizabeth E., XXXXX
 Mahar, Mary E., XXXXX
 Marta, Katherine M., XXXXX
 McCaleb, Lois M., XXXXX
 McConnell, Amy L., XXXXX
 Mead, Petrina M., XXXX
 Mooney, Sara C., XXXXX
 Moore, Dalsy E., XXXXX
 Mortensen, Louise L., XXXXX
 Neirby Gladys O., XXXXX
 Nichols, Barbara J., XXXXX

Painter, Mary E., XXXXX
 Paxton, Annie D., XXXXX
 Pilger, Marion H., XXXXX
 Pishak, Irene R., XXXXX
 Pillier, Vivian L., XXXXX
 Quesenberry, Esther M., XXXXX
 Quigley, Kathleen E., XXXXX
 Ramirez, Rosa J., XXXXX
 Renegar, Velma F., XXXXX
 Roberts, Lucile M., XXXXX
 Rolph, Marion L., XXXXX
 Schiffman, Regina H., XXXXX
 Senn, Minerva A., XXXXX
 Sidell, Norma A., XXXXX
 Sulpizio, Virginia M., XXXXX
 Tague, Lena M., XXXXX
 Traverse, Veronica R., XXXXX
 Twohey, Barbara J., XXXXX
 Tyarks, Margaret E., XXXXX
 Utt, Yvonne M., XXXXX
 Varner, Marjorie L., XXXXX
 Verhonick, Phyllis J., XXXXX
 Weeks, Nelda L., XXXXX
 Werick, Lenora B., XXXXX
 Wilson, Ruth A., XXXXX
 York, Elta R., XXXX
 York, Elva M., XXXX

To be majors, Army Medical Specialist Corp

Eason, Martha J., XXXX
 Fauble, Phyllis H., XXXX
 Kennon, Barbara L., XXXXX
 Perry, Joan H., XXXX
 Williams, June E., XXXX

The following-named persons for appointment in the Regular Army by transfer in the grade specified, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3283, 3284, 3285, 3286, 3287, and 3288:

To be major

Ginikowre, George J. (MSC), XXXXX

The following-named persons for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, in the grades specified under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3283, 3284, 3285, 3286, 3287, and 3288:

To be major

Vnencak, Paul A., XXXXXXXX

To be captains

DeLisle, Frederick C., XXXXXXXX
 Fendler, Donn C., XXXXXXXX
 Fuller, Richard G., XXXXXXXX
 Hall, John F., XXXXXXXX
 Hill, Robert A., Jr., XXXXXXXX
 Mode, Albert K., XXXXXXXX
 Rios-Matta, Luis R., XXXXXXXX
 Seale, Thomas A., XXXXXXXX
 Search, Charles T., XXXXXXXX
 Troknya, Robert J., XXXXXXXX
 Wang, Jesse, XXXXXXXX
 Webber, Herbert M., XXXXXXXX

To be first lieutenants

Blsch, Frederick R., XXXXXXXX
 Bunker, David L., XXXXXXXX
 Caruso, Michael L. A., XXXXXXXX
 Corns, Johnnie H., XXXXXXXX
 Crittenden, Oliver H., XXXXXXXX
 Dramis, George J., Jr., XXXXXXXX
 Gentile, Nicholas A., XXXXXXXX
 Lindstrom, Frank V., XXXXXXXX
 Nelson, Maynard L., XXXXXXXX
 Schiermeier, John J., XXXXXXXX
 Steinmetz, Charles P., XXXXXXXX
 Turner, James W., XXXXXXXX

To be second lieutenants

Anchor, Leonard J., XXXXXXXX
 Anderson, Jimmie M., XXXXXXXX
 Arthur, James F., Jr., XXXXXXXX
 Boyce, John P., XXXXXXXX
 Brown, John L., XXXXXXXX
 Caravana, Richard R., XXXXXXXX
 Cassada, Thomas W., XXXXXXXX
 Harrington, William B., XXXXXXXX
 Hosford, Larry D., XXXXXXXX
 Johnson, Victor V., Jr., XXXXXXXX
 Lemoine, Jarod J., XXXXXXXX
 Mills, David E., XXXXXXXX

Sims, Jackie D., XXXXXXXX
 Smallen, Ray H., XXXXXXXX
 Troche, Alfonso, XXXXXXXX
 Wild, Allan R., XXXXXXXX

The following-named persons for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, in the grades and corps specified, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3283, 3284, 3285, 3286, 3287, 3288, 3289, 3291, 3293, and 3294.

To be captain, Chaplain

Sather, Donald R., XXXXXXXX

To be captains, Dental Corps

Adams, Herbert F., Jr., XXXXXXXX
 Andrews, D. M., XXXXXXXX
 Beckelheimer, Robert G., XXXXXXXX
 Betts, Alan F., XXXXXXXX
 Call, Thomas, XXXXXXXX
 Linder, William E., Jr., XXXXXXXX
 McNeill, Thomas J., XXXXXXXX
 Morton, Charles B., XXXXXXXX
 Rice, Jack D., XXXXX
 Stegman, Donald D., XXXXXXXX
 Wallace, John R., XXXXXXXX
 Willenborg, George C., XXXXXXXX
 Zablutny, Florian H., XXXXXXXX

To be captains, Medical Corps

Ansbacher, Rudi, XXXXXXXX
 Blizard, Eugene B., XXXXXXXX
 Colletti, Paul R., XXXXXXXX
 Coyner, John L., XXXXXXXX
 Cullen, Stanley I., XXXXXXXX
 Dinapoli, Raphael J., Jr., XXXXXXXX
 Edgett, Joseph W., Jr., XXXXXXXX
 Coppola, Ralph J., XXXXXXXX
 Eller, Jimmie L., XXXXXXXX
 Fortiner, Robert H., XXXXXXXX
 Garcia, Luis F., XXXXXXXX
 Helmly, Robert B., XXXXXXXX
 Howland, Justin, XXXXXXXX
 Kisiel, John, Jr., XXXXXXXX
 Lowe, Reginald S., XXXXXXXX
 McDonald, Herbert L., XXXXXXXX
 McNaney, Joseph W., Jr., XXXXXXXX
 Mehr, Michael P., XXXXXXXX
 Miller, Dudley C., XXXXXXXX
 Olson, Elbert R., XXXXXXXX
 Pike, William B., XXXXXXXX
 Proctor, Robert F., XXXXXXXX
 Rave, Norman L., XXXXXXXX
 Rieaman, Raymond L., XXXXXXXX
 Stelter, Gerald P., XXXXXXXX
 Stoneback, Raymond D., XXXXXXXX
 Swartz, Harold M., XXXXXXXX
 Taber, Joseph W., Jr., XXXXXXXX
 Thoms, John M., XXXXXXXX
 Walter, Daniel L., XXXXXXXX
 Willi, Franz J. P., XXXXXXXX
 Wood, Laurence W., XXXXXXXX
 Yadon, Lowell G., XXXXXXXX

To be captains, Veterinary Corps

Schlinke, Orville C., Jr., XXXXXXXX
 Wyckoff, George H., Jr., XXXXXXXX

To be first lieutenants, Army Nurse Corps

Kaiser, Joan L., XXXXXXXX
 Lee, Linda, XXXXXXXX
 MacTaggart, Eunice, XXXXXXXX
 Scott, Roberta W., XXXXXXXX

To be first lieutenants, Chaplain

Beaver, Reinard W., XXXXXXXX
 Brereton, Thomas F., XXXXXXXX
 Clark, Donald D., XXXXXXXX
 Hilton, Gerald K., XXXXXXXX
 Matthias, Charles B., XXXXXXXX
 Rivers, Daniel L., XXXXXXXX
 Thomas, Everette J., XXXXXXXX

To be first lieutenants, Medical Corps

Ellison, Norig, XXXXXXXX
 Schaefer, Charles E., XXXXXXXX
 Sprengelmeyer, James T., XXXXXXXX
 Washburn, Kenneth B., XXXXXXXX
 Wagner, Clyde W., Jr., XXXXXXXX

To be second lieutenant, Army Medical Specialist Corps

Mitani, Norma, XXXX

To be second lieutenants, Army Nurse Corps

Marsh, Carolyn J., XXXXXXXX
 Schumacher, Carol Y., XXXXXXXX
 Scott, Carolyn M., XXXXXXXX

The following-named distinguished military students for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, in the grade and corps specified, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3283, 3284, 3285, 3286, 3287, 3288, and 3290:

To be second lieutenants, Medical Service Corps

Aulick, Louis H.
 Bell, George T.
 Bowman, Robert W., Jr.
 Brittain, Roy C., Jr.
 Clark, Thomas H.
 Colvin, John D., III
 Cunningham, Jerry A.
 Davis, Charles T.
 Ervin, Edward L.
 Fortune, Rex C., Jr.
 Grady, Milton
 Long, Freddie E.
 Lynch, Jeffrey G.
 McCullough, Jackson R.
 Murphy, William H.
 Nielsen, William W.
 Oliver, Gerald C.
 Pedersen, Carl E., Jr.
 Roberts, Daniel C.
 Rogers, Bobby E.
 Rose, Robert D.
 Thomas, Charles L.
 Thornton, Joseph A., Jr.
 Tolman, Joseph B.
 Troy, Milton W., Jr.
 Whitmore, Paul V., II
 Zimmerly, James G.

The following-named distinguished military students for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States in the grade of second lieutenant, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3283, 3284, 3285, 3286, 3287, and 3288:

Ackerman, Richard C.
 Adams, Bobby R.
 Adams, John E.
 Aitken, James J.
 Allgair, John A., Jr.
 Amos, William H. Jr.
 Arrington, Robert D.
 Baiden, Arthur H., III
 Baker, Ronald B.
 Banks, Gary G.
 Barker, Elvis G.
 Bartlett, Harvey S., II
 Beauford, Richard E.
 Bell, William P., II
 Benson, Phillip E.
 Bentley, James H.
 Benton, John G.
 Berg, James M.
 Black, Wendell W.
 Blackwood, William A., Jr.
 Blase, James W.
 Boggus, Carl A., Jr.
 Borner, Russell E., Jr.
 Bowling, Herbert E.
 Boyd, David S., Jr.
 Bray, Donald F.
 Bressi, James A.
 Brown, Thomas M.
 Brown, William L.
 Brown, William R.
 Bryson, Edward B., Jr.
 Burns, Samuel A., III
 Butts, Samuel J.
 Campbell, Winton G., Jr.
 Canatsey, John D.
 Carmack, Douglas W.
 Cassidy, John R., II
 Cassetty, Jimmy L.
 Caustic, Dennis M.
 Christensen, Christen A., Jr.
 Clark, Pat E.
 Clarke, Joseph W.
 Clary, Joe K.
 Clauss, Karl J.
 Conway, John L.
 Cooney, Joseph C.
 Crawford, Walter K., Jr.
 Creech, William R.
 Crockett, James R.
 Cropsey, Karl S.
 Crowe, Charles E.
 Dansby, Robert F., Jr.
 Davis, Hugh L.
 Davis, Motier D., Jr.
 Davis, Richard E.
 Dempster, Robert J., Jr.
 Deutsch, Henry A.
 Dill, Ernest W.
 Doenecke, William T.
 Dollhausen, Hans C.
 Draper, Shirley W., Jr.
 Eager, Benjamin F., III
 Earle, Richard H.
 Edgeworth, Charles A.
 Edwards, Thomas B.
 Elliott, Jackie R.
 Emge, William P.
 Farnsworth, Melvin R., Jr.
 Fillers, Donald J.
 Frankhouser, Lemar R.
 Gaglioti, John W.
 Gaines, Glenn T.
 Gaither, Thomas D.
 Gardner, Alan D.
 Garner, John E., Jr.
 Gayer, Barry F.
 Geary, Michael B.
 Geimer, William S.
 Gerhardt, William F.
 Gerst, Jackson C., Jr.
 Gillespie, Clarke M., Jr.
 Gittinger, Theodore D.
 Glenn, Thomas J.
 Gordon, Don E.
 Greene, Fred W., III
 Haigler, Thomas E., Jr.
 Hall, William A., III
 Harris, Dalrymple M., Jr.
 Hartman, Benjamin C.
 Hassell, Richard L.
 Hasty, Donald D.
 Haynes, Frank
 Heiser, Joel M. S.
 Heldstab, John C.
 Hendrickson, Gustav D.
 Henry, James J.
 Hensel, Mark C., Jr.
 Heyman, David L.
 Hidalgo, Richard L.
 Hightower, Dennis F.
 Hill, Thomas R., Jr.

Hogan, Thomas M., 2d.
 Holcomb, Cecil B., Jr.
 Holtzinger, Rollie
 Honaker, Errol K.
 Ingram, William L.
 Jackson, Murphy
 Jackson, Randall C.
 Jemison, Paul O.
 Jennings, Gordon L.
 Johnson, William L.
 Jones, Bobby A.
 Jones, James B.
 Jones, Lee M.
 Jordan, John T., Jr.
 Kaplan, Thomas J.
 Keisling, Harold G.
 Keller, David L.
 Kilgore, David M., 3d
 Kitchings, Phillip, Jr.
 Kobaly, George, Jr.
 Kolker, Edward F.
 Kunhart, Thomas J.
 LaFrangé, Joseph W.
 III
 LeGate, Richard E.
 Lemmer, John F.
 Lindseth, Marvin D.
 Lloyd, James W.
 Lowsley, James P., Jr.
 Lucas, Larry F.
 Malcor, Dennis P.
 Martin, Donald H.
 Mathern, Vernon J.
 Matthews, Daryl B.
 McAnany, Robert B.
 McClure, Donald L.
 McCotter, Orson L.
 McCoy, Ronald L.
 McCullough, Joe G.
 McDavitt, Gerald
 McDowell, Thomas D.
 McGee, Willie T.
 McLaughlin, William H.
 Mendicino, Vincent F.
 Miller, James W.
 Montgomery, William C.
 Mooney, Lowell T., Jr.
 Moore, Howard W., Jr.
 Moore, Robert A.
 Morgan, William H.
 Mount, Wallace K.
 Myers, William R.
 Navarro, Roberto, Jr.
 Neidlinger, Darryl M.
 Neilson, Robert S.
 Newman, Harold
 Nolen, William R.
 Noles, William O.
 O'Neal, Samuel K.
 Onley, Benjamin R.
 Osborne, John W.
 Ozment, Robert L.
 Page, David R.
 Pellegrino, Joseph P.
 Pelzl, Albert L.
 Peters, Frederick J.
 Phillips, Richard K.
 Pierce, Edward D.
 Piersol, Lawrence L.
 Pillow, William T.
 Pippin, James D.
 Poole, George E., Jr.
 Porterfield, Kenneth N.
 Power, Joseph W., III
 Prim, David F.
 Quigley, Ralph P.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate April 19, 1962:

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

J. Herbert Hollomon, of New York, to be an Assistant Secretary of Commerce.

U.S. COAST GUARD

The following-named persons to the grade indicated in the U.S. Coast Guard:

To be commanders

Jalmer O. Brown
 James Cavahaugh
 Rodman W. Vaughan
 Arnold J. Larsen
 Frederick B. Thatcher

To be lieutenant commander

Alvin J. Boxwell

To be lieutenant

Clement H. E. Kerans, Jr.

To be ensigns

Harry Andrew Allen
 John Knight Andrews
 George Eddings
 Archer, Jr.
 William Leon Avery
 Albert Frank Baker
 Clifford Eugene
 Banner
 Robert Andrew Bastek
 Peter Michael
 Bernstein
 Raymond Demetrius
 Bland
 Richard Carl Blaschke
 Robert Kent Blaschke
 Thomas Walter
 Boerger
 Harold Lance Bonnet
 William Andrew
 Borchers
 David Thomas Boyle
 Robert Frederick
 Boysen, Jr.
 John Wentworth
 Brittain
 Larry Dennis Brooks
 Phillip Jeffrey Bull
 Carl Henry Burkhardt
 David Kevin Carey
 Louis Michael Casale
 George Anthony
 Casimir
 David Raynor Coady
 Walter Melbourne
 Coburn
 Richard Vincent
 Consigli
 Joseph Lawrence
 Crowe, Jr.
 Laurence Joseph
 Dallaire, Jr.
 John George
 Denninger, Jr.
 Joseph Patrick Dibella
 Joseph Henry Dicenza
 Lance Arthur Eagan
 Joseph Robert Finelli
 Arthur Richard Gandt
 David Shaw Gemmell
 James Franklin
 Greene, Jr.
 Richmond Dean
 Greenough, Jr.
 William Scott Haight
 Glenn Edgar Haines
 David Wade Hastings
 William Colbert
 Heming
 Arthur Eugene Henn
 Peter Christian
 Hennings
 Stephen Henry Hines
 Eugene Hornstein
 Raymond Jerry
 Houttekier
 Kwang-Ping Hsu
 Norman Henry Huff
 Herbert Miller Hurst
 Harry Nelson
 Hutchins III
 Thomas Patrick
 Keane

Anthony John Soltys
 Theodore Arthur
 Elmer Sorensen, Jr.
 William Harry Spence
 Wayne Paul Stevens
 Hugh Lafayette
 Thomas, Jr.
 Henry Bradley Traver
 James Alexander Umberger
 Joseph Louis Valenti
 Harvey Landin Wahnquist, Jr.
 James Lee Walker

To be chief warrant officer, W-4

Joseph A Nartonis

To be chief warrant officers, W-2

Richard D. Borden
 Marlan H. Murphy
 Louis DeBernardi, Jr.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, APRIL 19, 1962

The House met at 12 o'clock noon. The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

John 15: 13: *Greater love hath no man than this, that a man lay down his life for his friends.*

Almighty God, in these closing days of Holy Week we are bowing unto Thee in penitence and praise as we think of the great High Priest who, on Good Friday, laid upon the altar the acceptable sacrifice of His own life for the salvation of the world.

Grant that on Easter Sunday, when we commemorate His glorious resurrection and victory over the grave, we may receive insight to see our own life in a new perspective and with more of radiance and light, triumph and hope.

May we hereafter rise to higher levels of character and conduct and be blessed with a new attitude of soul, whose music is set to a finer and firmer key.

Inspire us with such newness of life that when its eventide comes we may be ready and worthy to join our loved ones and the saints of all the ages in the communion and companionship of Thy nearer presence.

Hear us in the name of our risen Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

THE LATE HATTON SUMNERS

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, on this day, Maundy Thursday, it is with the deepest sorrow that I report to my colleagues what I learned only minutes ago of the passing of our dear former colleague, Hatton Sumners, Representative