

to curb the growing strength and activity of the Communist Party."

And more recently, a United States circuit court of appeals said that in view of the Yates decision it felt duty bound to free some more known Communists, who had been convicted under the Smith Act, but the court of appeals came right out and warned the people that the Yates decision "had made shambles of the Smith Act."

In another dissenting opinion in the Jencks case, to which I previously referred, Justice Clark said, "Unless the Congress changes the rule announced by the Court today, those intelligence agencies of our Government engaged in law enforcement may as well close up shop for the Court has opened their files to the criminal and thus afforded him a Roman holiday for rummaging through confidential information as well as vital national secrets."

When a justice uses such strong language in referring to the opinion of his brethren, and when a court of appeals feels compelled to abide by but expresses open hostility to a Supreme Court decision, don't you think it is time to sit up and take notice?

But let us move on to another case, this one involving States rights.

Raphael Konigsberg applied for admission to practice law in the State of California.

He related everything that was good and sad about his past but he simply refused to answer any questions or to talk about his past Communist activities. He made some pious reference to constitutional provisions protecting one's beliefs and associations. In the ultimate, he simply took the position that to inquire into his past Communist activities was none of the business of the bar examiners. The Supreme Court of California held that the State of California, in its sovereign capacity, had the right to decide who could practice law there. The court concluded that Konigsberg did not make out a case of good moral character and refused him a license to practice law.

The Supreme Court reversed the decision of the highest court of the State of California. Despite all the ramifications of the case, the net result is that the Supreme Court is now undertaking to regulate the legal profession in the several States. What next—the medical profession, the accounting profession, the engineering profession, and all others? Is it the business of the Federal Government to regulate the professions, or is this not a matter for the States? The question answers itself.

I think I have cited enough cases to show that we are drifting farther and farther away from the moorings of our Constitution. This is a challenge not only to Members of

Congress but to all men of goodwill who believe in our form of Government and democratic institutions. We must not only stem the tide of Federal supremacy. We must return to fundamental constitutional principles. We must repair whatever damage that has been done to the constitutional walls separating the powers of our Government into three dignified branches. And then we must restore to our people the system of government devised by our forefathers.

Those, I think were the mature and humble thoughts of Chief Justice Hughes on the occasion of the celebration of the 150th anniversary of the first meeting of the Congress, and whose words I quote in closing:

"We come from our district departments of government activity to our unity of aim in maintaining our form of Government in accordance with our common pledge. We are here not as masters, but as servants, not to glory in power, but to attest our loyalty to the commands and restrictions laid down by our sovereign, the people of the United States, in whose name and by whose will we exercise our brief authority."

Yes, we must win the cold war, but what will it profit the United States if we gain international prestige and suffer the loss of our fundamental rights? I hope I have made you think about it.

## SENATE

TUESDAY, JANUARY 28, 1958

(Legislative day of Monday, January 27, 1958)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

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

Lord of all being, throned afar, Thou who art the center and soul of every sphere, yet to each loving heart how near; nearer than the hands and feet that serve us, nearer than the problems that front us, nearer even than the comrades who walk beside us. In spite of our frailty and fallibility, speak to us and through us, that to this tangled world Thy kingdom may come and Thy will be done.

Grant us Thy truth to make us free,  
And kindling hearts that burn for Thee,  
Till all Thy living altars claim  
One holy light, one heavenly flame.

We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

### THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, January 27, 1958, was dispensed with.

### MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

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

### TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at

this time Senators may present petitions and memorials, introduce bills and joint resolutions, and transact other routine business, subject to a 3-minute limitation on statements.

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

### LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM—SESSION ON WEDNESDAY

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, for the information of the Senate, I should like to announce that we anticipate that there will be a session of the Senate tomorrow, if that is agreeable to the distinguished minority leader.

### EXECUTIVE SESSION

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

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

### EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

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

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

### EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. GREEN, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Karl L. Rankin, of Maine, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Yugoslavia;

Charles W. Yost, of New York, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador

Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to the Republic of Syria; and

Christopher H. Phillips, of Massachusetts, to be representative on the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations.

### EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. President, from the Committee on Armed Services, I report favorably a total of 29,083 nominations in the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Air Force, many of which are recess appointments. Included in this group are 144 promotions of flag and general officers. I ask that the names of the flag and general officers be printed on the Executive Calendar.

Included also are the names of 28,939 nominations for temporary and permanent appointment and promotion in the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Air Force. Of this number 2,229 are in the rank of colonel and below in the Army, 17,010 in the rank of major and below in the Air Force, 7,637 in the rank of captain and below in the Navy, and 2,063 in the rank of colonel and below in the Marine Corps. All of these names have already appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, so to save the expense of printing on the Executive Calendar, I ask unanimous consent that they be ordered to lie on the Vice President's desk for the information of any Senator.

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

The nominations, ordered to be placed on the Executive Calendar, are as follows:

Maj. Gen. Thomas John Hall Trapnell, United States Army, to be assigned to a position of importance and responsibility designated by the President, in the rank of lieutenant general;

Maj. Gen. Frank Schaffer Besson, Jr., Army of the United States (colonel, U. S. Army), for appointment as Chief of Transportation,

United States Army, and as major general in the Regular Army of the United States;

Brig. Gen. Charles Richard Hutchison, United States Army, and sundry other officers for temporary appointment as major general in the Army of the United States;

Maj. Gen. George W. Mundy, Regular Air Force, to be assigned to a position of importance and responsibility designated by the President, in the rank of lieutenant general;

Rear Adm. Eugene J. Peltier, Civil Engineer Corps, United States Navy, to be Chief of the Bureau of Yards and Docks in the Department of the Navy;

Edward C. Kenney, and sundry other officers of the Navy for temporary promotion to the grade of rear admiral;

Wayne R. Loud, and sundry other officers of the Navy for permanent promotion to the grade of rear admiral;

David M. Shoup, and sundry other officers of the Marine Corps for permanent appointment to the grade of major general;

Carson A. Roberts, and sundry other officers of the Marine Corps for temporary appointment to the grade of major general;

Randall M. Victory, and sundry other officers of the Marine Corps for permanent appointment to the grade of brigadier general;

John P. Condon, and sundry other officers of the Marine Corps for temporary appointment to the grade of brigadier general;

Bertrand T. Fay, Marine Corps Reserve, for temporary appointment to the grade of major general;

William W. Stickney, Marine Corps Reserve, for permanent appointment to the grade of brigadier general;

Carlton A. Fisher, Marine Corps Reserve, for temporary appointment to the grade of brigadier general;

Gen. Randolph McC. Pate, United States Marine Corps, to be Commandant of the Marine Corps with the rank of general;

Gen. Ray A. Robinson, United States Marine Corps, retired, to be placed on the retired list with the grade of lieutenant general;

Lt. Gen. Robert E. Hogaboom, United States Marine Corps, for commands and other duties determined by the President, to have the grade, rank, pay, and allowances of lieutenant general while so serving;

Vice Adm. James L. Holloway, Jr., United States Navy, and Vice Adm. Herbert G. Hopwood, United States Navy, for commands and other duties determined by the President, to have the grade, rank, pay, and allowances of admiral while so serving;

Vice Adm. Byron E. Hanlon, and sundry other officers of the United States Navy, for commands and other duties determined by the President, to have the grade, rank, pay, and allowances of vice admiral while so serving;

Vice Adm. Harold P. Smith, United States Navy, to be Chief of Naval Personnel and Chief of the Bureau of Naval Personnel in the Department of the Navy;

Vice Adm. Roscoe F. Good, United States Navy, when retired, to be placed on the retired list with the grade of vice admiral; and

Maj. Gen. Thomas Morgan Watlington, and sundry other officers for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States.

The nominations ordered to lie on the desk are as follows:

Margaret M. Fallon, and sundry other officers, for promotion in the Regular Air Force;

Lee B. James, and sundry other officers, for appointment and promotion in the Regular Army of the United States;

Theodore F. Beeman, and sundry other officers, for temporary appointment in the Marine Corps; and

Hershell L. Abbott, and sundry other persons, for appointment in the Regular Air Force.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If there be no further reports of committees, the nominations on the calendar will be stated.

#### NATIONAL MEDIATION BOARD

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Leverett Edwards, of Oklahoma, to be a member of the National Mediation Board for the term expiring February 1, 1961.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

#### PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Public Health Service.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that these nominations be confirmed en bloc.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed en bloc.

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

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

#### LEGISLATIVE SESSION

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

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

#### ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, it is my intention that all Senators who care to submit insertions for the Record may do so; but thereafter, before the Senate proceeds with further business, I shall suggest the absence of a quorum.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

PROPOSED TRANSFER BY NAVY DEPARTMENT OF MOTORBOAT TO LAKE SINCLAIR POWER SQUADRON, MILLEDGEVILLE, GA.

A letter from the Under Secretary of the Navy, reporting, pursuant to law, that the Navy Department proposed to transfer a 40-foot motorboat, located at the Norfolk Naval Shipyard, Portsmouth, Va., to the Lake Sinclair Power Squadron of Milledgeville, Ga.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

USE OF NAVAL VESSELS TO DETERMINE EFFECT OF NEWLY DEVELOPED WEAPONS

A letter from the Under Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the use of naval vessels to determine the effect of newly developed weapons upon such vessels (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON CONTRACTS NEGOTIATED FOR EXPERIMENTAL OR RESEARCH WORK

A letter from the Acting Executive Secretary, National Advisory Committee for Aero-

nautics, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on contracts negotiated for experimental or research work, for the period July 1 to December 31, 1957 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT OF NATIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL ON INTERNATIONAL MONETARY AND FINANCIAL PROBLEMS

A letter from the Chairman, National Advisory Council on International Monetary and Financial Problems, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Council, for the period January 1-June 30, 1957 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORT OF UNITED STATES ADVISORY COMMISSION ON EDUCATIONAL EXCHANGE

A letter from the Chairman, United States Advisory Commission on Educational Exchange, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Commission, for the period July 1-December 31, 1957 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

PROPOSED CONCESSION PERMIT, MUIR WOODS NATIONAL MONUMENT, CALIF.

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a proposed concession permit at Muir Woods National Monument, Calif. (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

AMENDMENT OF ATOMIC ENERGY ACT OF 1954

A letter from the Chairman, United States Atomic Energy Commission, Washington, D. C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended (with accompanying papers); to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

AMENDMENT OF SECTION 2734, TITLE 10, UNITED STATES CODE, RELATING TO SETTLEMENT OF CERTAIN CLAIMS

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 2734 of title 10, United States Code, so as to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to settle claims arising in foreign countries incident to non-combat activities of the Coast Guard (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PROPOSED TRAINING SCHOOL FOR IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION SERVICE

A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for the acquisition of sites and the construction of buildings for a training school and other facilities for the Immigration and Naturalization Service, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

AMENDMENT OF CODE RELATING TO CONCEALMENT OF ASSETS IN CONTEMPLATION OF BANKRUPTCY

A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 152, title 18, United States Code, with respect to the concealment of assets in contemplation of bankruptcy (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT OF NATIONAL MEDIATION BOARD

A letter from the Chairman, National Mediation Board, Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Board, including the report of the National Railroad Adjustment Board, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1957 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.



# PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

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

## By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A resolution adopted by the Small Craft Harbors Commission, State of California, favoring the enactment of legislation to provide sufficient funds to permit a final survey report of Port San Luis Harbor by the Corps of Army Engineers; to the Committee on Appropriations.

The petition of L. M. Ellithorpe, of Long Beach, Calif., relating to increased deductions in certain income taxes for the benefit of the unemployed; to the Committee on Finance.

A resolution adopted by the Council of the City of Newport Beach, Calif., favoring the recognition of Orange County, Calif., as a metropolitan area; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

A letter in the nature of a petition from Hugh Wilson, of Port Arthur, Tex., relating to a new system of public transportation in the United States (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. GOLDWATER (for himself and Mr. HAYDEN):

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Arizona; to the Committee on Finance:

## "Senate Joint Memorial 1

"Joint memorial requesting the maintenance of adequate tariff rates on copper

"To the President, Congress, and the Departments of State and Interior of the United States:

"Your memorialist respectfully represents:

"The mining of copper is one of Arizona's chief industries, an industry so great that in point of copper production Arizona leads all of the States of the United States, and, in fact, is responsible for approximately 50 percent of all copper mined in the Nation.

"The copper mining industry gives employment to many thousands of miners, artisans, mechanics and craftsmen, whose welfare and prosperity is in very large measure dependent upon this major activity; indeed, the economic welfare of the State is vitally affected by the status of the mining industry.

"There are, in addition to the properties now being worked, great areas and bodies of copper ore in the State which are susceptible of development, to the enrichment of the State and the Nation.

"Should the price of copper be allowed to be determined by foreign countries with low-wage standards and high-grade deposits, the result would be a general shutdown of our mines, and a consequent deterioration of the industry both by the heavy damage to the mines and disbandment of working organizations.

"Should the Nation suddenly be caught without the foreign supply, and should atomic warfare break out overnight, as indeed may well be the case, the copper shortage and the disbandment of the skilled labor and management so necessary to produce copper might well mean the ultimate defeat of our Armed Forces.

"The possibility of the collapse of the copper mining industry is not a remote circumstance since, with the high cost of labor, increased taxes, higher freight rates and other cost handicaps, domestic producers cannot stay in business competition with the low-wage production from foreign countries.

"It is therefore of major importance, not only from the standpoint of simple economics, but from the standpoint of survival, that the price of copper be maintained on a basis which will insure an active industry with normal production, fair profits, steady employment and a good standard of living

for workers in the industry, and from which would result a continuation of the benefits which accrue to the national security and the State's economy by reason of the industry.

"This can only be insured through the medium of an adequate import tax on raw copper to equalize the difference between the cost of producing the metal in this country and in the copper producing countries of South America, Africa, and elsewhere.

"Wherefore your memorialist, the Senate of the State of Arizona (the House of Representatives concurring), urgently requests:

"1. That a 4-cent-per-pound tariff be re-instated on all foreign copper.

"2. That the peril point per pound of copper produced be set at 30 cents and the 4-cent-per-pound tariff be maintained until such time as the price of copper reaches or exceeds 30 cents."

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Arizona, identical with the foregoing, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

## CONCURRENT RESOLUTION OF WEST VIRGINIA LEGISLATURE

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, by request I present, for appropriate reference, House Concurrent Resolution 3, adopted by the Legislature of the State of West Virginia, relating to the importation of foreign commodities to the detriment of numerous small industries in West Virginia.

This is a question of concern, not only to my own State, but also to many other sections of the country. I ask unanimous consent that the concurrent resolution be printed in the RECORD.

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

## To Whom It May Concern:

This is to certify that the following house concurrent resolution was regularly adopted by the Legislature of West Virginia on January 15, 1958:

## "House Concurrent Resolution 3

"Resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to take action so as to afford protection to certain small industries of West Virginia;

"Whereas West Virginia manufacturers of pottery, glass, ceramics, and cloths, and numerous other small industries are competing constantly with imports of foreign commodities; and

"Whereas said foreign commodities, because of the low cost of foreign labor and the use of inferior material, are sold at such low prices that the aforesaid West Virginia manufacturers are unable to compete with them without some means of protection; and

"Whereas the import of said foreign commodities is presently permitted virtually without restriction and without protection to the aforesaid small industries; and

"Whereas the present influx of foreign commodities is causing irreparable damage to the aforesaid small industries and can only result in their eventually being driven out of business which would foster increased and widespread unemployment in West Virginia: Therefore be it

"Resolved by the house of delegates (the senate concurring therein), That the Congress of the United States is hereby requested to take immediate action to afford relief and protection to the aforesaid small industries of West Virginia, through regulation by

tariffs and through such other means as are available to the Congress for the accomplishment of said end; and, be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of state is hereby directed to forward attested copies of this concurrent resolution to the President of the United States Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each member of the West Virginia delegation in the Congress of the United States."

Given under my hand, this the 15th day of January 1958.

C. A. BLANKENSHIP,  
Clerk, West Virginia House of Delegates.

## EQUAL RIGHTS—RESOLUTION

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I present a resolution adopted by the board of directors of the Business and Professional Women's Clubs of New York State, Inc., favoring an amendment to the Constitution, relating to equal rights. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution may be printed in the RECORD.

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

Whereas it has long been a stated policy of the National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs, Inc., and of its component State federations to lend their efforts toward bringing about the enactment of an equal rights amendment to the Federal Constitution; and

Whereas such an amendment, titled "Senate Joint Resolution 80," was presented to the 1st session of the 85th Congress, subsequently received a favorable report from the Senate Judiciary Committee, and is now on the Senate Calendar to be called up for a vote, but has not yet been reported on by the House Judiciary Committee: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the board of directors of the Business and Professional Women's Clubs of New York State, Inc., assembled in Utica, N. Y., January 18, 1958, for its regularly scheduled semiannual meeting, reaffirm its approval of and support for this amendment, and express its sincere commendation to the sponsors of Senate Joint Resolution 80, and to the members of the Senate Judiciary Committee for their efforts in behalf of this legislation; be it further

Resolved, That said board of directors strongly urge the leaders of both Houses of Congress to lend their efforts toward the passage of this amendment, without qualifications, restrictions, or amendments; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the sponsors of Senate Joint Resolution 80, to the chairmen of both Senate and House Judiciary Committees, to the majority and minority leaders of both Houses of Congress, and to the Senators and Representatives from New York State.

Presented by the State resolutions committee:

MILDRED E. HOOVER,  
Chairman.  
DOROTHY B. WELLS,  
Vice Chairman.  
LUCILLE BARRY.  
EVELYN HARRINGTON.  
MARY J. MULE.  
LENA RUPPERT.  
LENORE TRAVER.

Approved by board action at Utica, N. Y., January 18, 1958.

## AMENDMENT OF IMMIGRATION LAWS—RESOLUTION

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I present, for appropriate reference, a resolution adopted by the Federation of

Jewish Women's Organizations, Inc., of New York, N. Y., favoring the enactment of legislation to revise the immigration and nationality laws. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution may be printed in the RECORD.

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

FEDERATION OF JEWISH  
WOMEN'S ORGANIZATIONS, INC.,  
New York, N. Y.

RESOLUTION ON IMMIGRATION

Whereas the provisions in the immigration laws continue to operate inequitably and the basic inadequacies remain unaltered; and

Whereas we fervently hope that our country will adhere to our tradition of granting asylum and giving hospitality to a just share of those unfortunate, despairing, homeless people who need a haven from oppression and who want their children to grow up in a freedom-loving country; and

Whereas the revision of this law will bring hope to thousands of refugees, expellees, escapees, and other homeless persons: Therefore be it

*Resolved*, That the Federation of Jewish Women's Organizations, in convention assembled on the 15th day of January 1958, urges its legislators to support vital changes in our immigration and nationality laws, to achieve the elimination of discriminatory quotas; provide a realistic, humane and flexible admission policy; and provide equal protection under the law to native born and naturalized citizens except where immigration or naturalization was secured through actual fraud: Therefore be it

*Resolved*, That copies of this resolution be sent to the proper Government authorities.

MRS. IDA COOK FARBER,  
President.

SUPPORT PRICE ON MILK PRODUCTS—RESOLUTION

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I present a resolution adopted by the Ellensburg local of the Dairymen's League, Ellensburg, N. Y., favoring the continuation of dairy price supports. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be printed in the RECORD, and appropriately referred.

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

ELLENSBURG LOCAL OF  
DAIRYMEN'S LEAGUE,  
January 20, 1958.

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D. C.:

Whereas the Secretary of Agriculture has announced plans to reduce the support price on milk products to 75 percent; and

Whereas no such announcement has been made for other farm products; and

Whereas the dairy interest is developing a self-help plan to relieve burdensome surpluses: Therefore be it

*Resolved*, That the Ellensburg local go on record as favoring the continuance of dairy supports at present levels until the dairy industry has time to put its self-help program in effect.

ROY BELLINGER.  
HARRY EASTMAN.  
KENNETH M. OTIS.  
G. M. EASTMAN,  
Secretary.

ELLENSBURG, N. Y.

CONTROL OF ANIMAL DISEASES—  
RESOLUTIONS

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, during the first session of this Congress, I introduced Senate bill 2192, a comprehensive animal disease control bill, the purpose of which is to improve the joint livestock disease prevention, control, and eradication program. This bill serves the need for clarification and extension of the authority vested in the Department of Agriculture in its working relationship with the several States in the control of animal diseases. My proposal is now pending before the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and I ask unanimous consent that resolutions in support of S. 2192 adopted by the American National Cattlemen's Association and the National Association of State Departments of Agriculture be printed in the RECORD as part of my remarks and that they be referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry for consideration.

There being no objection, the resolutions were referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXCERPT OF MINUTES OF EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING, AUGUST 5 AND 6, 1957, OF  
NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF COMMISSIONERS,  
SECRETARIES, AND DIRECTORS OF AGRICULTURE

The several States are responsible for the prevention, control, and eradication of livestock diseases at the State level. There is a close working relationship between the States and the United States Department of Agriculture. There is also need for clarification and extension of authority to be granted to the United States Department of Agriculture.

The executive committee of the National Association of Commissioners, Secretaries, and Directors of Agriculture, at its meeting held August 5, 1957, carefully reviewed Senate bill 2192 and believes its enactment would improve the joint livestock disease prevention, control, and eradication program: Therefore be it

*Resolved by the executive committee of the National Association of State Commissioners, Secretaries, and Directors of Agriculture*, That we recommend the passage of Senate bill 2192.

Motion carried unanimously.

GEORGE S. MCINTYRE,  
Secretary.

RESOLUTION ADOPTED AT THE 61ST ANNUAL  
CONVENTION, AMERICAN NATIONAL CATTLE-  
MEN'S ASSOCIATION, OKLAHOMA CITY, JAN-  
UARY 6-8, 1958—ACTION ON PENDING LEG-  
ISLATION BILL S. 2192 (THYE)

Whereas because of the enormous trade and travel with foreign countries where dangerous animal disease, not found in this country, abounds; and

Whereas the problem of rabies in livestock is a matter of increasing concern of livestock men because of danger of spread from wildlife: Be it

*Resolved*, That this association recommend enactment of bill S. 2192, which would give the Secretary of Agriculture authority to (1) protect against importation of foreign animal diseases, (2) take immediate action for the eradication of dangerous diseases, such as foot-and-mouth disease, in case of an extraordinary emergency, and (3) cooperate with the States in the control and eradication of communicable diseases such as rabies of livestock.

FEDERAL PROGRAMS FOR CON-  
TROLLING STREAM POLLUTION—  
RESOLUTION

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, in December I received a copy of a resolution which has been adopted by the Common Council of the City of Ontario, Oreg. This resolution is an affirmation supporting the provisions of section 6 of Public Law 660, 84th Congress, by which "the Surgeon General is authorized to make grants to any State, municipality, or intermunicipal or interstate agency for the construction of necessary treatment works to prevent the discharge of untreated or inadequately treated sewage or other waste into any waters and for the purpose of reports, plans and specifications in connection therewith." The United States Chamber of Commerce and the National Association of Manufacturers oppose these grants, and now the President has yielded to this opinion and his recommendation, if followed, would substantially reduce the assistance contemplated when the President originally signed Public Law 660.

I am sure the members of the Ontario Council are just as strong advocates of self-reliance and local resourcefulness as are those who would eliminate Federal assistance for construction of sewage disposal plants and similar municipal projects. However, as the city fathers of Ontario, Oreg., are the ones at the point of need, they have the practical aspect of the problem to solve—actually providing the projects and facilities that residents of a community must have. As they have pointed out in their resolution, the Federal grants received by municipalities for assisting in the construction of sewage-disposal works further the public interest by reducing, if not eliminating, stream pollution. Controlling stream pollution is equally a matter of importance to all levels of government—municipal, county, State, and Federal.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the excellent resolution of the Common Council of the City of Ontario, Oreg., printed in the RECORD.

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

On motion of Don Benson, city councilman, seconded by C. R. Van Patten, the following resolution was adopted, to wit:

"Whereas the Common Council of the City of Ontario, Malheur County, Oreg., a municipal corporation of approximately 4,700 persons, has learned of the efforts of the United States Chamber of Commerce and the National Association of Manufacturers to limit or do away with the Federal assistance and benefits to municipalities in financing sewage disposal works under the provisions of Public Law 660; and

"Whereas the said common council feels that said Public Law 660 is a good law which has been of great benefit, not only to cities in assisting with their sewage disposal problems, but also to the general public in controlling stream and river pollution, and that said law should not be restricted or done away with, and that the 10-year period contemplated by the law is an appropriate length of time, and that the Congress of the United States should implement said law by annual appropriations and should extend the benefits of said law rather than to restrict the same: Now, therefore, be it



"Resolved by the Common Council of the City of Ontario, That it be noted of record as supporting Public Law 660 and opposing any legislation which would restrict or eliminate any of the beneficial provisions of said law. That said common council is in favor of continued appropriations by the Congress of the United States to make possible further financial assistance to cities in the field of sewage disposal; be it further

"Resolved, That a certified copy of this resolution be sent by the city recorder to the Senators and Congressmen from the State of Oregon and to the various committees in the Congress of the United States before which any legislation may be considered with reference to sewage disposal or stream pollution."

Passed and adopted by the Common Council of the City of Ontario on the 2d day of December 1957.

Approved by the mayor of the city of Ontario this 2d day of December 1957.

EARL BOPP, Mayor.

Attest:

ELDON S. MILLS,  
City Recorder.

#### RESOLUTIONS OF OREGON DIVISION OF IZAAK WALTON LEAGUE

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, many of the major achievements in conservation of natural resources in the State of Oregon are due to the leadership and foresight of the members of the Oregon division of the Izaak Walton League of America. This group was one of the first to undertake the Red Hat Day program as a means of calling attention to safe handling of firearms by hunters. The program of the Oregon division was eventually adopted on a national basis.

I cite this example of the work done by the Oregon Izaak Walton League members because it shows the effectiveness of their undertakings. The league has also played a leading role in establishing sound conservation policies. The official viewpoint of the Oregon league is developed at annual conventions where policy matters are thoroughly discussed and studied. As a result of these discussions the league is able to develop a surprising degree of unanimity on many of the complex problems connected with management and use of land, water, and wildlife resources. I support the league's present opposition to Nez Perce Dam.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD some of the resolutions adopted at the November 1957 convention of the Oregon division of the Izaak Walton League.

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

##### RESOLUTION OF OREGON DIVISION, IZAAK WALTON LEAGUE

##### KLAMATH INDIAN RESERVATION LAND DISPOSAL

Whereas the Congress of the United States has enacted Public Law 587 which provides for the termination of Federal control and supervision over the trust and restricted properties of the Klamath, Modoc, and Yahooskin Band of Indians; and

Whereas the Oregon division of the Izaak Walton League of America, Inc., is of the opinion that Public Law 587, dealing with the Klamath Indian Reservation, is so worded as to jeopardize orderly distribution and continued sustained-yield management as

well as other factors of multiple use of these lands and waters despite the intent of Congress as expressed in Report No. 248 of the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs; Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Oregon division of the Izaak Walton League of America in convention assembled at Eugene, Oreg., this 30th day of November 1957, recommends to the Congress of the United States that section 5 of Public Law 587 be amended to assure continued sustained-yield management and multiple use, including retention of the marshland as is for use of migratory waterfowl on the Pacific Flyway, for maximum public benefit of the lands and waters contained in the Klamath Forest property; be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of the Oregon division of the Izaak Walton League of America send copies of this resolution to the director of the Oregon Game Commission, the Secretary of the Interior, the Secretary of Agriculture, and to the members of the Oregon Congressional delegation.

##### NEZ PERCE DAM

Whereas certain interests advocate the construction of a dam in excess of 700 feet in height on the Snake River immediately below the mouth of the Salmon River, to be known as the Nez Perce Dam; and

Whereas other interests advocate the construction of a dam about 675 feet high on the Salmon River about one-half mile above the mouth, to be known as Lower Canyon Dam, and another dam on the Salmon River 660 feet high about 100 miles above the mouth, to be known as Crevice Dam; and

Whereas other interests advocate the construction of a dam about 580 feet high on the Grande Ronde River, a tributary of the Snake River in Washington State, to be known as Wenaha Dam; and

Whereas a significant portion of the salmon run of the Columbia River enters the Snake and spawn in the Salmon River in Idaho, and the Grande Ronde River also supports anadromous fish; and

Whereas dams of such heights across streams present an impassable block to anadromous fish, and there is no way at the present time of passing anadromous fish up and down stream by structures of such heights; and

Whereas the Federal Power Commission has authority to license power projects on the Snake River, the Salmon River and certain tributaries of both, and has indicated in the licensing of dams on the Cowlitz River in Washington State and in other ways that the commission will license projects in advance of the determination of ways of successfully passing anadromous fish up and down streams by high structures: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Oregon division of the Izaak Walton League of America, in convention assembled at Eugene, Oreg., this 30th day of November 1957, That this convention express its opposition to authorization or licensing for construction of Nez Perce Dam on the Snake River, of Lower Canyon and Crevice Dams on the Salmon River, and of Wenaha Dam on the Grande Ronde River, unless it can be shown that the salmon runs entering the Salmon and Grande Ronde Rivers will not be injured, or that other structures in the Columbia and Snake Rivers have eliminated the runs of salmon entering the Salmon and Grande Ronde Rivers, or unless it can be shown that other methods can successfully sustain the volume of anadromous fish necessary to the commercial and sports fishery below the Salmon and Grande Ronde Rivers; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the Federal Power Commission; the North Pacific division of the Corps of Engineers, United States Army; the Chief of Engi-

neers, Corps of Engineers, Department of Defense; the Oregon Congressional delegation; the Washington State Congressional delegation; the Idaho Congressional delegation; the Oregon Water Resources Board; the Washington State Game and Fish Commissions; and to the Oregon Game and Fish Commissions; and be it further

Resolved, That the Oregon, Washington and Idaho State Congressional delegations are hereby requested to seek legislation that will defer authorization of any projects affecting the anadromous fish runs on the Salmon and Grande Ronde Rivers and will suspend the licensing authority of the Federal Power Commission over dams affecting the anadromous fish runs on the Salmon and Grande Ronde Rivers until it is shown that the volume of anadromous fish can be sustained either by passage past high dams or by other methods, or the anadromous fish runs have ceased due to other causes.

##### NATIONAL YOUTH CONSERVATION LEAGUE

Whereas in our country there are 52 million nonproductive acres of forest land as a result of fire, poor cutting practices, natural catastrophes and abandonment of land cleared for agriculture; and

Whereas there are additional millions of acres of watershed, range, and other lands upon which many types of conservation practices are needed to increase forage, wildlife and water production as well as to improve their value for recreational purposes; and

Whereas there is a vast storehouse of unused human energy in the form of teen-age boys suitable for employment in these productive, useful conservation tasks: Now therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Oregon division of the Izaak Walton League of America in convention assembled at Eugene, Oreg., this 30th day of November 1957, recommends to the Oregon Congressional delegation the enactment of appropriate legislation establishing a National Youth Conservation League for the employment of youths in tasks designed to improve and develop all the natural and human resources of the United States, its Territories and insular possessions; and be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of the Oregon division of the Izaak Walton League of America send copies of the resolution to the members of the Oregon delegation in Congress.

##### RECREATIONAL USES OF NATIONAL FORESTS

Whereas the recreational use of the national forests of the West continues to grow; and

Whereas the national forests are becoming increasingly important in the West from the standpoint of providing recreational facilities, including camping and hunting and fishing; and

Whereas there is a definite need for the repair and maintenance of existing recreational facilities and a growing need for additional camping and recreational areas: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Oregon division of the Izaak Walton League of America in convention assembled at Eugene, Oreg., this 30th day of November 1957 does hereby commend the Department of Agriculture and the Congress of the United States for their appropriation of over \$7,500,000 for recreational needs on national forests; and be it further

Resolved, That the Oregon division urges the enactment of legislation which would assure sufficient moneys each year to maintain, carry on, and expand the recreational and wildlife habitat needs within the national forests; and be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of the Oregon division of the Izaak Walton League of America send copies of this resolution to the Secretary of Agriculture, the Oregon Congressional delegation, the chairman of the House

Committee on Appropriations, and the Senate Committee on Appropriations.

#### WENATCHEE RIVER DAM (WASHINGTON)

Whereas according to information and belief, the proposed Wenatchee River Dam, Washington, will be used to produce electrical energy for peaking purposes, and that there is no present need for such electric peaking plant; and

Whereas at the time of construction of the Grand Coulee Dam, it was found not feasible to provide fish passage facilities over the Grand Coulee Dam, which resulted in permanent destruction of large spawning areas above the Grand Coulee Dam; and

Whereas the Federal Government, acting through the United States Fish and Wildlife Service, in cooperation with the Department of Fisheries and Game of the State of Washington, transferred the fish runs from the Columbia River at Grand Coulee Dam to the Entiat, Wenatchee, Methow, and Okanogan Rivers, and that hatcheries were built at Leavenworth, on the Wenatchee River, and on the Entiat and Methow Rivers to supplement the runs in the area of the proposed Wenatchee project. That all of these fish conservation measures were done at the expense of the Federal Government to repair damage done to the Columbia River fishery by construction of the Grand Coulee Dam. That construction of the proposed Wenatchee project would severely damage or destroy this conservation program and that licensing of the proposed project would be in direct conflict with the previous intent of the Federal Government to maintain the affected area as a spawning and rearing area; and

Whereas the anadromous fish populations of the State of Washington constitute its second most valuable natural resource and source of natural food supply. That the fresh water spawning and rearing areas within the State which are suitable for the production and propagation of anadromous fish have been reduced to a critical point by past and current construction of dams and other factors, and that continued encroachment upon these natural spawning and rearing areas will endanger the commercial fishing industry and sports fishing in the State of Washington; and

Whereas the spawning and rearing areas upstream of the proposed dam are extremely important for the production of chinook salmon, sockeye salmon, and steelhead; that Lake Wenatchee, which is upstream of the proposed dam, is the major sockeye producer in the United States; that the dam as proposed by applicant will result in total destruction or serious impairment of approximately 20 miles of spawning area from the dam to the confluence of the Wenatchee River with the Columbia River and seriously impair or destroy all spawning and rearing areas upstream of the dam site; and

Whereas the area above the proposed project has steadily increased in production since the time of transplanting when Grand Coulee Dam was being constructed; that it is anticipated that the proposed means of handling upstream migrants submitted by applicant will result in nearly a total of the chinook run and as much as two-thirds loss of the sockeye run in this area; that no suitable means of transporting downstream migrants has been tested and found to be satisfactory; and that applicant has not proposed any known satisfactory means of transporting the downstream migrants past this dam; if no successful means of passing downstream migrants is provided, a 90-percent fatality of all downstream migrants passing through the proposed tunnel can be anticipated; and

Whereas the proposed dam is contemplated as peaking plant, which will result in large flows of water from the powerhouse to the confluence of the Wenatchee River with the Columbia River, alternating with a drastic reduction in flow of water; that this extreme peaking condition will result in a mortality

of eggs in the spawning area from the powerhouse to the mouth of the Wenatchee River and in entrapment of spawning and rearing salmon: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That in view of the foregoing, the Oregon division of the Izaak Walton League of America, in convention assembled at Eugene, Oreg., this 30th day of November 1957, finds that the proposed project is not in the public interest in that any anticipated benefits from the building of this peaking plant will be far outweighed by damage to the natural resources of the State of Washington, and that the State division is opposed to the project; and be it further

*Resolved*, That the Federal Power Commission be so advised.

#### SALMON RIVER WITHDRAWAL

Whereas the Oregon division of the Izaak Walton League of America is vitally interested in the proper protection, utilization, and conservation of our natural resources; and

Whereas the chinook salmon and steelhead trout resource of the Pacific Northwest forms one of our principal recreational and commercial sources of natural foods and economic wealth; and

Whereas more than 50 percent of the spring chinook in the Columbia River system spawn within the proposed withdrawal area; and

Whereas the commercial fishery and the sport fishery of the Pacific Northwest are vitally dependent upon the protection of the salmon and trout spawning, incubation, and rearing areas in the Columbia Basin and other regional stream systems; and

Whereas considerable sums of money have already been expended in protecting and assisting the anadromous fish runs at various dams and water-development projects; and

Whereas the perpetuation of our fishery resources in the Pacific Northwest must be maintained at their highest sustained yield of productivity: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved* by the Oregon division of the Izaak Walton League of America in convention assembled at Eugene, Oreg., this 30th day of November 1957, Do find that the request by the United States Fish and Wildlife Service for the withdrawal of some 31,000 acres of land in the upper reaches of the Salmon River area in Idaho is in the public interest and should be granted in behalf of protection for the anadromous fish runs of the Columbia River; and be it further

*Resolved*, That copies of this resolution be furnished to the United States Fish and Wildlife Service, the Secretary of Interior, the Secretary of Agriculture, and the members of the Oregon Congressional delegation.

#### AMENDMENT OF COORDINATION ACT

Whereas the Coordination Act of 1946 (Public Law 732) provides for the evaluation of effects of planned water development projects upon fish and wildlife resources and public recreation; and

Whereas, opportunities to enhance wildlife and recreational values or mitigate losses thereof are not adequately practiced by constructing agencies for want of authority or directive, and

Whereas, the many public and private water development projects in the northwest are seriously jeopardizing fish and wildlife resources and recreational values: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved* by the Oregon division of the Izaak Walton League of America in convention assembled at Eugene, Oreg., this 30th day of November 1957, That the Congress of the United States amend the Coordination Act in a manner that will assure protection of wildlife and recreational values affected by water development projects; and be it further

*Resolved*, That copies of this resolution be furnished to the Oregon Water Resources Board, the Secretary of Agriculture and the members of the Oregon Congressional delegation.

#### KLAMATH BASIN WATERFOWL REFUGE

Whereas the present status of public lands within the lower Klamath and Tule Lake National Wildlife Refuges is insecure, and

Whereas this lack of security precludes maximum development and utilization of the wildlife and recreational potentials of said lands, and

Whereas the Oregon division of the Izaak Walton League and other conservation organizations have repeatedly urged the Secretary of Interior to secure those values by delegating responsibility for the development and administration of those lands to the United States Fish and Wildlife Service and permanently withdrawing them from entry, and

Whereas the Secretary of Interior has caused thorough studies of the Klamath Basin to be made and has that information available as a basis for a decision: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the Oregon division of the Izaak Walton League of America in convention at Eugene, Oreg., this 30th day of November 1957, respectively urges the Secretary of Interior to render a decision without further delay that will fully meet the requirement of the Pacific Flyway waterfowl resource as it currently uses the Klamath Basin and provide security for future development and use of the wildlife and recreational potentials of the public lands in the Klamath Basin; and be it further

*Resolved*, That copies of this resolution be furnished to the regional director of the Fish and Wildlife Service in Portland, Oreg., the State game commission, and the Secretary of Interior.

#### MAINTENANCE OF FISH STRUCTURES ON COLUMBIA RIVER DAMS

Whereas the United States Government, through the Bureau of Reclamation and Corps of Engineers, has constructed more than 40 dams on the Columbia River watershed; and

Whereas an agreement has been entered into between the United States and the several States concerned in the Columbia Basin regarding the construction of fishways, salmon hatcheries, and other facilities to provide for the passage of fish, resulting in the completion of many of these projects and the planning of others; and

Whereas the maintenance of these structures will result in a continuing cost that has not been provided for in the original agreement; and

Whereas the several States concerned, through their legislatures, have petitioned the President and Congress of the United States to recognize the permanent maintenance of these structures as a Federal responsibility: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the Oregon division of the Izaak Walton League of America in convention assembled at Eugene, Oreg., this 30th day of November 1957, does hereby urge the Congress of the United States to recognize the permanent maintenance and operation of these facilities as Federal responsibility and to appropriate moneys for their continued operation and maintenance on a permanent basis; and be it further

*Resolved*, That copies of this resolution be furnished to the Secretary of the Interior and to the Idaho Congressional delegation.

#### BILLBOARDS

Whereas the new Federal freeway program brings into focus a highway hazard and nuisance which has long vexed the American public—namely billboards along our highways. The motorists whose gas taxes pay for these highways are entitled to protection from the annoyance, exploitation, and hazard from this form of advertising. Permitting them to be made a captive audience is contrary to the principles of free American democracy. Billboards frequently obstruct and disfigure the view of our fair land, and



deprive the motorist of his right to an unobstructed view of the natural scene; and

Whereas action should be taken at once before billboards are erected on new freeways. It will never again be as easy to protect our freeways and the motoring public from this growing nuisance as it is now. Legislators should not be deceived by the persuasive propaganda of high-priced lobbyists interested only in exploiting the rich gold mine presented gratis to the billboard industry, unless Congress and motorists whose money builds the freeways gives the protection to which they are entitled: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved* by the Oregon division of the Izaak Walton League of America in convention assembled at Eugene, Oreg., this 30th day of November 1957, That it urge Congress to keep all freeways in the Nation free of billboards of every kind. (Save only signs necessary for roadside business, and these to be within 1 mile of the entrance of such business and to conform to standard highway sign pattern and size): Now, therefore, be it further

*Resolved*, That copies of this resolution be furnished to the Chief of the Bureau of Public Roads and to the members of the Oregon delegation in Congress.

STANLEY JEWETT

Whereas the Oregon division of the Izaak Walton League of America has in the past honored some of its outstanding deceased members; and

Whereas the late Stanley Jewett was not only a longstanding and loyal member of the Izaak Walton League but one of the recognized authorities in conservation work and many of the bounties that we enjoy today are the result of Stanley Jewett's dedicated work of the past: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved* by the Oregon division of the Izaak Walton League of America in convention assembled at Eugene, Oreg., this 30th day of November 1957, That funds be appropriated sufficient to provide a suitable plaque in memory of the greatest contributions made to our organization and to wildlife resources in general by the late Stanley Jewett, and that said plaque be erected and dedicated by the Oregon division at a suitable and proper place, preferably in the wildlife refuge.

## REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. SALTONSTALL, from the Committee on Armed Services, without amendment:

H. R. 5809. An act to authorize construction of a United States Ship Arizona Memorial at Pearl Harbor (Rept. No. 1229).

By Mr. BUSH, from the Committee on Armed Services, without amendment:

H. R. 6078. An act to provide for the erection of suitable markers at Fort Myer, Va., to commemorate the first flight of an airplane on an Army installation, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1228).

By Mr. STENNIS, from the Committee on Armed Services, with amendments:

H. R. 9739. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Air Force to establish and develop certain installations for the national security, and to confer certain authority on the Secretary of Defense, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1231).

## REPORT ENTITLED "GROWTH AND EXPANSION OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA AND ITS METROPOLITAN AREA" (S. REPT. NO. 1230)

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, pursuant to House Concurrent Resolution 172,

85th Congress, from the Joint Committee on Washington Metropolitan Problems, I submit a report entitled "Growth and Expansion of the District of Columbia and Its Metropolitan Area." I ask unanimous consent that the report be printed, with illustrations.

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

## BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey (for himself, Mr. ALLOTT, Mr. BUSH, Mr. CASE of New Jersey, Mr. COOPER, Mr. IVES, Mr. PAYNE, and Mr. PURTELL):

S. 3163. A bill to encourage and assist in the expansion and improvement of educational programs to meet critical national needs through the early identification of student aptitudes, strengthening and counseling and guidance services in public high schools, provision of scholarships for able students needing assistance to continue their education beyond high school; strengthening of science and mathematics instruction in the public schools; expansion of graduate programs in colleges and universities, including fellowships; improvement and expansion of modern foreign language teaching; improving State educational records and statistics; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

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

By Mr. PROXMIER:

S. 3164. A bill to amend the public assistance provisions of the Social Security Act to provide that a bona fide resident of a State may not be denied assistance under the applicable State plan solely because of his failure to complete a minimum period of residence in such State; to the Committee on Finance.

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

By Mr. PASTORE (by request):

S. 3165. A bill to amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

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

By Mr. JAVITS (for himself and Mr. IVES):

S. 3166. A bill to provide for exclusion from the mails of mail violating certain State laws dealing with improper solicitations of contributions by charitable organizations and to forbid the payment of money orders therefor; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

S. 3167. A bill providing for the Surgeon General of the United States to establish a hospital in the State of New York especially equipped for the treatment of persons addicted to the use of habit-forming drugs; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

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

By Mr. KEFAUVER:

S. 3168. A bill for the relief of John Haskell Chesshir; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EASTLAND:

S. 3169. A bill to amend section 552 of title 28 of the United States Code, as amended,

relating to the salaries of United States marshals; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THYE:

S. 3170. A bill for the relief of Paul Christian Davidson and Timothy John Davidson; and

S. 3171. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act so as to permit certain adopted children to be naturalized without complying with the residence and physical presence requirements of such act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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

By Mr. KENNEDY:

S. 3172. A bill for the relief of Ryfka Bergmann;

S. 3173. A bill for the relief of Frisco Di Flumeri;

S. 3174. A bill for the relief of Ilva Ghilioni;

S. 3175. A bill for the relief of Gluseppina Fazio; and

S. 3176. A bill for the relief of Teofilo M. Palaganas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BEALL:

S. 3177. A bill authorizing the modification of the Crisfield Harbor, Md., project in the interest of navigation; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. DOUGLAS:

S. 3178. A bill for the relief of Johann Baptist Krebs; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KENNEDY:

S. 3179. A bill to authorize Federal assistance to the States and local communities in financing an expanded program of school construction so as to eliminate the national shortage of classrooms; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

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

By Mr. KEFAUVER:

S. 3180. A bill to establish a United States Department of Science and to prescribe the functions thereof; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. EASTLAND (for himself, Mr. STENNIS, Mr. SPARKMAN, and Mr. WILEY):

S. J. Res. 147. Joint resolution to designate the first day of May of each year as Loyalty Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## IMPLEMENTATION OF THE PRESIDENT'S EDUCATION PROPOSALS

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER], the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES], the Senator from Maine [Mr. PAYNE], and the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. PURTELL], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill implementing the education proposals made by President Eisenhower in his special message of yesterday.

This is one of the most important pieces of proposed legislation to come before the Congress at this session. The time has now come to remedy certain deficiencies in education which can no longer be ignored without seriously jeopardizing our national security. Prompt action must be taken if the schools are to provide the Nation with the technical, intellectual, and moral resources needed to meet the Communist challenge in the years ahead.

The President's program is a sound, realistic plan for action. It would mobilize our national brainpower more effectively, stimulate more talented students to become scientists, and alleviate the critical shortage of college teachers and language experts.

These steps are clearly in the interest of national security, and it is my hope that the bill carrying out the President's program will receive strong bipartisan support. For this reason, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be permitted to lie at the desk through Monday of next week, in order that other Senators may have an opportunity to join in sponsoring it.

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

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, it is not my purpose here to give a detailed description of the bill. Instead, I wish to call attention to a thorough analysis which has been prepared by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare; and I ask unanimous consent that the analysis be printed in the RECORD, at the conclusion of these remarks.

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

#### SUMMARY OF EDUCATION PROPOSALS

The bill, entitled the "Educational Development Act of 1958," is divided into five titles.

Title I would provide assistance to the States in the early discovery of student aptitudes and the maximum development of these aptitudes during high school through improved counseling and guidance services. It would also provide an incentive to able students in need of financial assistance therefor to continue their education at institutions of higher education through provision of a limited number of undergraduate scholarships.

Title II would provide assistance to State educational agencies to strengthen their supervisory, teacher-training, and related activities in support of science or mathematics instruction in public elementary or secondary schools. It would also provide, through grants to the States, assistance to local educational agencies to expand and improve science or mathematics instruction in their public secondary schools.

Title III would authorize assistance in the expansion and improvement of the teaching of modern foreign languages through arrangements with institutions of higher education to establish institutes for advanced training of foreign language teachers and through assistance to institutions of higher education to establish centers for teaching rare foreign languages.

Title IV would provide assistance to institutions of higher education for the establishment of new programs of graduate education and for expansion of existing programs, including fellowships, with preference for individuals interested in teaching at institutions of higher education.

Title V contains definitions and other general provisions. It would also authorize grants to assist State educational agencies in improving and strengthening State educational statistics and information.

The programs authorized by the bill would be for a period of 4 years beginning July 1, 1958, except that scholarships awarded under title I and graduate fellowships awarded pursuant to title IV during the 4-year period would continue beyond that period to permit completion of the undergraduate or graduate training.

The programs authorized by the bill would be applicable to the 48 States, the District of Columbia, Alaska, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, Guam, and the Virgin Islands.

The bill would be administered at the Federal level by the Commissioner of Education.

#### TITLE I—IDENTIFICATION OF APTITUDES AND ENCOURAGEMENT OF ABLE STUDENTS

##### Part A—Testing and counseling and guidance

###### Allotments

The appropriations for each of the 4 years of this program would be allotted among the States in two ways:

1. Each State would first be allotted an amount equal to \$1.25 multiplied by the total enrollment in grades 9 to 12, inclusive, in public and private nonprofit schools in the State.

2. The balance of the appropriation each year would be allotted among the States on the basis of their relative public school enrollments in grades 9 to 12, inclusive, but with a minimum of \$5,000.

###### Matching and Expenditures Covered

A State's allotment for each year would be available for paying one-half of the expenditures (under the State's approved plan) for—

(a) Testing of students in public or private nonprofit elementary or secondary schools and maintenance of cumulative test and other pertinent educational progress records for public-school students.

(b) Salaries of additional supervisors of counseling and guidance personnel and salaries of additional counseling and guidance personnel, and training of counseling and guidance personnel and of teachers who engage part time in counseling and guidance work (including those who are preparing for employment in counseling and guidance).

Payment of salaries under item (b) above would be available only for personnel who are engaged exclusively or primarily in counseling and guidance of students in public secondary schools (and their supervisors) and who are fully certified for such work by the State.

###### State Administration

The administration of this program in the States would be by the State educational agencies under plans approved by the Commissioner. However, in any State in which the State educational agency could not lawfully make payments to cover the cost of testing in private schools, the Commissioner would reserve from the State's allotment an amount equal to \$1.25 multiplied by the enrollments in such private schools in grades 9 to 12, inclusive. The amount reserved would be available for payment of one-half of the expenditures incurred under arrangements made by the Commissioner for testing of the students in the private schools, up to a maximum Federal payment of \$1.25 multiplied by the number of students enrolled in such private schools in such grades.

A State plan for testing and for counseling and guidance of high school students would be approved by the Commissioner if it met certain conditions set forth in the bill. One of these is provision for administration of the plan by the State educational agency. Also, a State must have some programs for the testing of students, for the maintenance of testing and other student records, and for strengthening counseling and guidance of students; and these are to be set forth in the State plan, along with the methods of doing the testing, maintaining the records, and strengthening the counseling and guidance. The testing program so included must provide for testing during each year of at least all students in grade 9 or all students in a lower grade and all students in grade 11

or all students in grade 12. The plan also must set forth the minimum qualifications for counseling and guidance personnel. Finally the plan would have to include provision for adequate accounting, budgeting, and other fiscal methods and procedures and for the making of necessary reports to the Commissioner.

#### Counseling and Guidance Training Institutes

The Commissioner would be authorized to make grants to or contracts with institutions of higher education for operation by them of short term and regular training institutes to improve the qualifications for counseling and guidance work of personnel in the public or other nonprofit secondary schools engaged in such work (full time or part time). Personnel attending such institutions would receive stipends, including allowances for their dependents and for travel to and from their places of residence.

#### Appropriations

While no specific sum is authorized to be appropriated, the order of magnitude of program costs which the Department believes to be necessary is reflected in the cost table accompanying this submission and goes from an estimate of \$17,275,000 in the first year to \$26,300,000 in the fourth year.

##### Part B—Undergraduate scholarships

###### Appropriation Ceilings

The appropriations for carrying out this program would be limited to \$7,500,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, \$15 million for the next fiscal year, \$22,500,000 for the third year, and \$30 million for the fourth year.

For the fifth, sixth, and seventh years appropriations would be authorized to cover the cost of scholarships to enable recipients selected during one of the first 4 years to complete their course of study.

###### Allotments

The appropriations for the first fiscal year of the program would be allotted among the States on the basis of their relative numbers of public or private nonprofit high school graduates.

For the next 3 years the Commissioner would first allot funds among the States for continuing payments to scholarship recipients during the preceding year. The remainder of the appropriations would be allotted among the States on the same basis as is provided for the first fiscal year of the program.

The appropriations for each of the last 3 years of the program would be allotted among the States for continuing payments to scholarship recipients during the preceding year.

###### State Administration

A State desiring to participate in the scholarship program could do so by establishing a State commission on Federal scholarships (or designating an existing agency to serve as its commission) and submitting a State plan complying with the requirements described below.

The selection of individuals for scholarships under this program would be made by State commissions on Federal scholarships in accordance with the approved State plans.

In connection with his review and approval of a State plan, the Commissioner would provide technical assistance and advice to promote effective coordination between a State's scholarship program and its testing and counseling and guidance programs.

The Commissioner would approve, for purposes of participation in the scholarship program, any State plan which—

(a) Provides for administration by the State commission;

(b) Provides for selection of scholarship recipients and determination of the amount



of scholarships in accordance with standards, procedures, and criteria, established by the State commission and found by the Commissioner to provide reasonable assurance of selection on the basis of ability to pursue a college course of study successfully, but with preference being given to those with good preparation in or high aptitude for mathematics or science, as well as reasonable assurance that only individuals in need of financial assistance to continue their education at institutions of higher education will be selected, that the amount of the scholarship for those selected will be based on financial need, that the maximum scholarship allowable under the plan will be \$1,000, and that reasonable opportunity for selection will be afforded eligible applicants in foreign countries. The existence and extent of an applicant's need for financial assistance would be determined without regard to the expenses of attendance at the college chosen by him.

A State's plan would also have to provide for certification of new recipients and of the continued need of individuals previously selected from that State, for adequate accounting, budgeting, and other fiscal methods and procedures, and for making necessary reports to the Commissioner.

Federal funds to pay one-half the necessary cost of administration of the State plans approved under this part of the bill would be authorized.

#### Eligibility for and Award of Scholarships

An individual would be eligible to apply for a scholarship in any State if (a) he is living in the State (or, if not living in any of the States is domiciled in such State), and (b) he has a certificate of graduation from a secondary school meeting State requirements or has attained an equivalent level of educational advancement.

The Commissioner would, within a State's allotment available for the purpose, award scholarships to individuals certified to him by the State commission. Applicants who were rated, on the basis of ability, above the last applicant receiving a scholarship and who failed to receive one solely because of lack of financial need would be awarded appropriate certificates by the Commissioner.

#### Duration of Scholarships

A scholarship awarded under this program would be for the period necessary to complete the recipient's work for his first bachelor's degree. No scholarship, however, could extend for more than 4 academic years.

Continued eligibility of an individual awarded a scholarship would depend on his continued financial need, determined annually by the State commission, and his continued full-time enrollment at an institution of higher education and maintenance of satisfactory standing there, although certain absences for vacations, military service, or other good and sufficient reasons would not disqualify him.

#### Courses of Study Covered

Scholarships awarded under this program could be for any course of study leading to an undergraduate degree at any institution of higher education, selected by the recipient in any of the States or in a foreign country. Institutions of higher education in a foreign country would, however, have to be approved by the Commissioner.

#### Adjustment for Other Federal Educational Assistance

The Commissioner would, by regulations prescribed after consultation with the other Federal agencies concerned, provide for adjustment (including complete withholding where appropriate) of scholarship payments to avoid duplication of educational assistance available under programs administered by such other Federal agencies.

### TITLE II—GRANTS TO STATES FOR STRENGTHENING SCIENCE OR MATHEMATICS INSTRUCTION IN PUBLIC SCHOOLS

#### Part A—Strengthening supervisory, teacher-training, and related activities of State educational agencies

##### Appropriation Ceilings

Appropriations authorized to carry out the purposes of this part would be limited to \$15 million annually for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, and the 3 succeeding fiscal years.

##### Allotments

Allotments of the appropriations among the States would be based on their relative public school enrollments in grades 1 to 12, inclusive, but with a minimum of \$5,000.

##### Matching and Expenditures Covered

A State's allotment would be available for paying one-half of the expenditures under expansion and improvement programs (included in the approved State plan) and one-half of the necessary cost of administration of the State's approved plan.

##### State Plans

The Commissioner would approve, for purposes of this title, any State plan which—

(a) provides for administration by the State educational agency;

(b) sets forth the expansion and improvement programs to be carried out under the State plan. These programs must include programs for expansion or improvement of (i) supervision by the State agency of public school science or mathematics instruction, (ii) studies and demonstrations to modernize public school science or mathematics curricula, instructional materials, and equipment, and (iii) preservice undergraduate teacher-training and training to improve qualifications of science or mathematics teachers. The State may also include programs for expansion or improvement of other activities of the State agency in support of science or mathematics instruction in public schools.

The State plan must also show the methods for carrying out programs under it and provide for adequate accounting, budgeting, and other fiscal procedures and for the making of necessary reports to the Commissioner.

In the case of existing programs carried on by a State educational agency only the portion of the program which the Commissioner of Education finds is an addition to or an expansion of that program will be deemed to be an "expansion or improvement program" that may be included under the State plan.

#### Part B—Strengthening science or mathematics instruction in public secondary schools

##### Appropriation Ceilings

The amounts authorized to be appropriated for purposes of this part (for grants to States to assist local educational agencies to expand and improve science or mathematics instruction in public secondary schools), would be limited to \$150 million annually for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1959, and the 3 succeeding fiscal years.

##### Allotments

The appropriations for each fiscal year would be allotted among the States on the basis of their relative public school enrollments in grades 9 to 12, inclusive.

##### Matching and Expenditures Covered

The State's allotment would be available for paying one-half of the expenditures under local educational agency programs approved by the State agency under its approved State plan.

Federal payments under this part, however, could be made with respect to local educational agency programs in any State only if the State has a plan approved under part A of this title of the bill and such plan—

(a) Sets forth minimum qualifications for science or mathematics teachers which are required to be met by teachers whose compensation is paid or increased under such a local educational agency program;

(b) Sets forth criteria, standards, and procedures to be followed by the State educational agency in approving programs of local educational agencies. Such programs may be for (i) employment of additional qualified science or mathematics teachers, (ii) increasing the rate of pay of science or mathematics teachers or increasing the amount of their pay to reflect additional work (increases pursuant to laws passed prior to July 1, 1958, would not be counted), (iii) science or mathematics laboratory and related special equipment and minor remodeling of space used for such equipment, or (iv) expanding or improving science or mathematics teaching in public secondary schools through any activities or expenditures not involving the salaries of science or mathematics teachers, the provision of equipment, or capital outlay. Only that portion of an existing program which the State educational agency finds is an addition to or an expansion of such program could be considered a program for "expanding or improving science or mathematics teaching in public secondary schools."

Science or mathematics teachers whose compensation could be paid or increased under programs approved by the State educational agency for purposes of this part would be only those engaged exclusively or principally in teaching science in public secondary schools or in supervising such teachers in public elementary or secondary schools. Secondary schools, for purposes of this program, would not include any education beyond grade 12.

### TITLE III—FOREIGN LANGUAGE DEVELOPMENT

#### Foreign Language Institutes

The Commissioner of Education would be authorized to arrange for the establishment and operation by institutions of higher education of short-term and regular-session institutes for modern foreign language teachers, supervisors, and teacher-trainers, who are in service or preparing for service in public or private nonprofit elementary or secondary schools or institutions of higher education. The institutes would provide advanced training, with special emphasis on the use of new teaching methods and instructional materials.

The Commissioner could also pay stipends, including allowances for dependents and travel, to individuals attending any such institute.

#### Foreign Language Centers

The Commissioner of Education would also be authorized to make grants to or contracts with institutions of higher education covering one-half of the cost of establishment and operation by them of centers for teaching rare foreign languages—foreign languages which are needed by Government, business, or industry, or education and for which adequate instruction is not readily available.

The Commissioner would also be authorized to pay stipends, including allowances for dependents and for travel, to persons taking advanced training, at short-term or regular sessions of domestic or foreign institutions of higher education, in a foreign language needed by Government, business, or industry, or education, but only upon reasonable assurance that the recipients will be available for employment for teaching a foreign language at an institution of higher education.

#### Research and Studies

The Commissioner of Education would be authorized, directly or by contract, to study the need for increased or improved foreign language training, conduct research on more effective foreign language teaching methods,

and develop specialized foreign language teaching methods.

#### Advisory Committee

The Commissioner of Education would be authorized, with the approval of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, to appoint a twelve-member National Advisory Committee on Foreign Languages to advise on matters of policy or general administration under the title.

#### Duration

As in the case of the other programs authorized by the bill, the programs under this title would be authorized for the 4-year period ending June 30, 1962.

#### Appropriations

While no specific sum is authorized to be appropriated, the order of magnitude of program costs which the Department believes to be necessary is reflected in the cost table accompanying this submission and goes from an estimate of \$1,284,000 in the first year to \$2,514,900 in the fourth year.

#### TITLE IV—EXPANSION OF GRADUATE EDUCATION

##### Eligible Programs

Grants would be authorized to institutions of higher education with respect to programs of graduate education which require for admission a bachelor's, master's, or professional degree, and which lead to a Ph. D. or equivalent degree.

##### Amount of Payments

The annual grant to an institution could not exceed 50 percent of the costs of expanding old or instituting new graduate programs, including additional or increased faculty salaries, and other costs (including overhead and equipment) attributable to establishing new programs or expanding existing programs, although an institution could, instead of receiving such grants, elect to receive not to exceed \$500 per fellow awarded a fellowship pursuant to this title of the bill. The payments for these costs for new or expanded programs to any institution for any fiscal year could not, however, exceed \$125,000; nor could they (or the alternative grants of \$500 per fellow) be made for any period after June 30, 1962.

Grants to institutions under this title would also be available for costs of fellowships for students enrolled in new graduate programs or whose enrollment in a graduate program constitutes an increase in enrollment.

##### Fellowships

Fellowships paid for from grants to institutions under this title would be awarded by the institutions under approved criteria providing a preference for individuals interested in teaching in institutions of higher education. The amount of the fellowships would be set in accordance with regulations.

A fellowship would be for the length of time required to complete the graduate course of study involved, but with a limit of 3 academic years.

##### Advisory Committee

The Commissioner of Education would be authorized, with the approval of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, to appoint a 12-member National Advisory Committee on Graduate Education to advise on matters of policy or general administration under the title.

##### Duration

As in the case of other programs under the bill, a 4-year program would be authorized by this title although fellowships awarded during the 4 years could extend to June 30, 1964 (subject to the 3-academic-year limitation).

##### Appropriations

While no specific sum is authorized to be appropriated, the order of magnitude of pro-

gram costs which the Department believes to be necessary is reflected in the cost table accompanying this submission and goes from an estimate of \$7,800,000 in the first year to \$21,600,000 in the fourth year.

#### TITLE V—GENERAL PROVISIONS

##### Improvement of Statistical Services of State Educational Agencies

The Commissioner of Education would be authorized to make grants covering one-half of the cost of State educational agency programs to improve and strengthen the adequacy and reliability of State and local educational statistical data and the methods and techniques for collecting and processing such data and disseminating information about the condition and progress of education in the State.<sup>1</sup>

The total of the payments to any State for these purposes for any fiscal year would be limited to \$50,000.

These grants could be made to the States only for new programs or additions to or expansions of existing programs.

##### Withholding of Funds and Judicial Review

Notice and opportunity for hearing would be required before grants to a State could be withheld under title I or title II of the bill for failure to comply with the required provisions of approved State plans under those titles. Any State dissatisfied with such withholding action could obtain judicial review thereof in the Federal circuit court of appeals.

##### Cooperation Between Federal Agencies

Provision has also been included in the bill for consultation and cooperation with other Federal agencies having educational programs, with a view to better interchange of information and development of policies and procedures which will strengthen the programs and objectives of the educational institutions involved. In addition, the existing authority of other Federal agencies would be preserved, but they would be directed to exercise their existing functions in a manner which will assist in carrying out the bill's objectives.

##### Exemption From Conflict-of-Interest Laws of Members of Advisory Committees

The bill would exempt any member of the two advisory committees provided for under the bill (titles III and IV) from operation of the conflict-of-interest laws, except for prohibition against participation, within 2 years after his appointment ends, in prosecution of any claim against the United States on any matter with which he had any responsibility as such a member.

##### Additional Professional Positions

Ten additional positions in grades 16, 17, and 18 would be authorized.

##### Studies and Technical Assistance

The Commissioner of Education would be authorized to make studies and reports, disseminate information, and render technical assistance to States and public or other nonprofit organizations and institutions in matters related to the purposes of the bill.

##### Definitions

Definitions of a number of terms used in the bill are included. These terms are Commissioner, State, State educational agency, local educational agency, institution of higher education, the number of individuals enrolled in grades or schools, elementary school, secondary school, nonprofit, and public school.

<sup>1</sup> While no specific sum is authorized to be appropriated, the order of magnitude of program costs which the Department believes to be necessary is reflected in the cost table accompanying this submission and goes from an estimate of \$1 million in the first year, to \$2 million in the fourth year.

#### Miscellaneous

The Commissioner of Education would also be authorized to utilize (and pay for) the services or facilities of other Federal or non-Federal agencies and institutions and to delegate any of his functions under the bill (except making regulations) to any officer or employee of the Office of Education.

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

The bill (S. 3163) to encourage and assist in the expansion and improvement of educational programs to meet critical national needs through the early identification of student aptitudes, strengthening of counseling and guidance services in public high schools, provision of scholarships for able students needing assistance to continue their education beyond high school; strengthening of science and mathematics instruction in the public schools; expansion of graduate programs in colleges and universities, including fellowships; improvement and expansion of modern foreign language teaching; improving State educational records and statistics; and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. SMITH of New Jersey (for himself, Mr. ALLOTT, Mr. BUSH, Mr. CASE of New Jersey, Mr. COOPER, Mr. IVES, Mr. PAYNE, and Mr. PURTELL), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

Mr. SALTONSTALL subsequently said: Mr. President, I am sorry I was not present in the Chamber when the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] made his remarks upon introducing the bill relating to education. I ask that these very brief remarks be printed after his remarks in the Record.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Massachusetts? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I simply wish to commend the Senator for introducing the bill relating to education. I hope the bill will have the very careful consideration of the present Congress. I understand the bill is not necessarily in final form and that amendments or suggestions for improvement can be made at any time.

I make these remarks because I have sat through long hearings on military preparedness, under the chairmanship of our able majority leader, during the months of December and January. Many, many witnesses who testified emphasized the necessity for increased opportunities for our young people in this country to obtain a better scientific education, a better mathematical education, and a better education in physics. They stressed the point that our security in the days to come will depend upon our obtaining a greater number of people educated in the sciences. I understand that is the purpose of the Senator's bill. I am glad he has introduced it. I hope it may be favorably acted upon in some form before Congress adjourns.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Massachusetts for his words in support of the proposed legislation which I have introduced, in the light of the President's message on the subject of education yesterday.



# ABOLISHMENT OF STATE RESIDENCY REQUIREMENTS AS A CONDITION FOR THE RECEIPT OF FEDERALLY SUPPORTED PUBLIC ASSISTANCE PAYMENTS

Mr. PROXMIER. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to put a stop to State requirements as to residency as a condition of extending federally supported public assistance payments to persons who have newly taken up residence in any State. Such requirements, Mr. President, have proved to be a literal death sentence in the case of at least one helpless little child in my home State of Wisconsin. They have certainly inflicted senseless and cruel hardship upon many others throughout those States which mistakenly establish such heartless barriers to our mercy and our compassion.

This bill is a companion to H. R. 9832, which was introduced in the House of Representatives on January 8, 1958, by the Honorable HENRY REUSS, the brilliant and conscientious Representative of the Fifth Wisconsin District. I warmly commend Mr. REUSS for his prompt action to correct the hardship imposed by such residency requirements upon some of our most needy and unfortunate citizens. I am most happy to join and support him in this move to correct this situation.

Mr. President, at the present time, the Federal social-security law allows the States to impose residence requirements in administering old-age assistance, aid to the blind, aid to the disabled, and aid to dependent children. These are the programs which receive the major portion of all Federal funds for public assistance.

The present law allows the various States to discriminate against certain citizens and residents of the United States, in the granting of Federal funds. This is as unsound legally as it is improper morally. Very substantially as a result of such discrimination against 1 unfortunate family in Wisconsin, a 1-year-old baby girl died of pneumonia recently in a cold, unheated flat in Milwaukee. The child's death was attributed to malnutrition and neglect. Although her family's condition was known to welfare officials, nothing was done in time to save this child's life, because the family had resided in Wisconsin for less than the year's time required under the residency law enacted by the State government in 1957.

Mr. President, the case against residence laws is stated ably and eloquently by Mr. Wilbert Walter, director of community services of the Wisconsin State Industrial Union Council. I ask unanimous consent to have this brief statement printed at this point in the Record.

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

## THE CASE AGAINST RESIDENCE LAWS

(By Wilbert Walter, director of community services, Wisconsin State Industrial Union Council)

It has been frequently said that money has no heart. The recent death from pneumonia of a 1-year-old girl in an unheated flat in Milwaukee is a good example of this theory.

The cost of welfare for nonresidents of Wisconsin last year on a per capita basis was less than a penny a person to the citizens of this State; yet the argument of higher taxes caused by outsiders coming to our State was used to ram this harsh, restrictive, un-American law through the last regular session of our legislature.

Ours is a dynamic, expanding economy. New plants are built on land that only yesterday grew corn or potatoes. Other plants move to get closer to their raw materials or their markets. Plant dispersion and decentralization are commonplace today in industry. The resultant movement of workers to new job locations is a natural consequence of the relocation of industry. Unfortunately, every worker who comes seeking a job does not find one. That's when the talk starts about the outsiders who are coming into a community to get on relief.

Let's be clear about one thing—people just don't go where they don't think they will be better off. Nor do they come to get on relief. They come to work. They uproot themselves, leaving behind friends, relatives, and a place in the scheme of things in the hope that in another community they will find employment at decent wages and working conditions. Frequently, the specific cause of their migration is a poster or a handbill or a newspaper ad telling in glowing terms of the job opportunities in a given place and with a given company. Frequently, representatives of industry and employment agencies encourage the migration of workers from rural to industrial communities. Once the worker and his family arrive in the new community they are on their own. If the breadwinner is lucky enough to land a job, everything is fine. If he does not, then he is among the dispossessed of the land. He frequently has no legal settlement and therefore is ineligible for even a meager public-assistance grant. In a word, the worker is frequently made to shoulder the total cost of industry's irresponsibility in recruiting its manpower.

The residence laws are odious to organized labor for another compelling reason. Workers, like all others in America, have always felt free to move on to some new place. This is part of the drama of our not-too-distant past. This is part of our democratic heritage. The restrictions on free movement inherent in residence laws are harmful both to the individual and to society. Moreover, they create a distinction among citizens which is biased against the economically disadvantaged. Our concept of democracy has room for only one class of citizenship—first-class citizenship.

It might be well for us to restate in broad terms some objectives of the American labor movement.

First, labor wants gainful and full employment. There is no substitute for steady work at a living, saving wage under safe and human working conditions.

Second, we believe that underpinning our efforts for full employment must be a broad social-insurance system which will offer protection to the aged, the widow, the dependent child, the disabled, the sick, and the unemployed. This is the Government's responsibility to those who are unable, for whatever reason, to provide for themselves a decent standard of living.

Third, we will support those voluntary and public-welfare services that serve human need, and we will join with other citizens' groups toward making these services fulfill their functions more adequately.

Fourth, we believe that public-welfare services should be available on the basis of need. There should be no arbitrary restrictions based on race, creed, residence, or citizenship.

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

The bill (S. 3164) to amend the public-assistance provisions of the Social Security Act to provide that a bona fide resident of a State may not be denied assistance under the applicable State plan solely because of his failure to complete a minimum period of residence in such State, introduced by Mr. PROXMIER, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

# AMENDMENT OF ATOMIC ENERGY ACT OF 1954, AS AMENDED

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, to permit greater exchange of military information and materials with our allies.

This bill has been drafted and is being proposed by the administration, and was forwarded by a letter dated yesterday, January 27, 1958, from Mr. Strauss, Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, to the Honorable CARL T. DURHAM, chairman of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. Mr. DURHAM has announced that he is referring the matter to the Subcommittee on Agreements for Cooperation, of which I am chairman, for appropriate hearings and recommendations to the full committee.

In his state of the Union address, President Eisenhower asked for prompt action by the Congress in considering these amendments. I think it is clear that the Joint Committee and the Congress are acting promptly.

As chairman of the Subcommittee on Agreements for Cooperation, I have requested representatives of the following agencies to testify before the subcommittee in executive session, as follows:

Wednesday, January 29, 1958, 2 p. m., Atomic Energy Commission; Thursday, January 30, 1958, 10 a. m., Department of State; 2 p. m., Department of Defense and CIA.

If necessary, further meetings of the subcommittee will be held in executive session on Friday to consider the bill further.

I plan to schedule and announce public hearings also on this bill sometime within the next 2 or 3 weeks.

Mr. President, the amendments proposed by this bill are far reaching and are directly related to the security and welfare of our country and the free world. Since the proposed bill was received by the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy late yesterday afternoon, I have not had sufficient time to review it in detail. I introduce it at this time in order that it may receive early consideration. I can assure my colleagues in the Senate that my subcommittee, and all the members of the full Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, will study all the matters raised by this bill very carefully and will make a full report to the Congress prior to floor debate. In order that all Members of Congress and the public may know the purpose of the bill, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record at this point a copy of the letter dated January 27, 1958, from Mr. Strauss to Mr. DURHAM together with annex A and annex B to the letter.

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

The bill (S. 3165) to amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, introduced by Mr. PASTORE, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

The letter and attachments presented by Mr. PASTORE are as follows:

UNITED STATES  
ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION,  
Washington, D. C., January 27, 1958.  
HON. CARL T. DURHAM,  
Chairman, Joint Committee on Atomic  
Energy.

DEAR MR. DURHAM: In the President's meeting with Congressional leaders on December 3, 1957, the major aspects of the President's proposed legislative program for the forthcoming session of Congress were outlined. During this meeting, it was pointed out that certain changes were necessary in the Atomic Energy Act to achieve desired national objectives. In his message on the state of the Union, the President said that a most significant aspect in our strength lies in the fact that we are not acting alone but in concert with a worldwide community of friendly and peaceful nations. He emphasized as one major action item, the necessity that Congress enact legislation to enable us to exchange appropriate scientific and technical information with friendly countries.

The current Atomic Energy statute, enacted on August 30, 1954, carried authority for certain military cooperation with friendly nations and regional defense organizations. The statute, drafted at a time when atomic development of other nations was not as far advanced as at present, wisely set forth certain restrictions on the degree of cooperation permissible.

Since enactment of the 1954 statute the world situation has changed materially. We have been made increasingly aware of the fact that the Soviet Union and the United Kingdom have achieved a significant nuclear military capability. Therefore, the restrictive provisions of the act, though appropriate at the time of their enactment, are now unduly restrictive in the face of the present world situation.

The Atomic Energy Act of 1954 permits the communication of information relative to atomic energy in the fields of planning, training in the employment of and defense against atomic weapons, and in the evaluation of the atomic weapon capabilities of potential enemies, but with the proviso that such cooperation "will not reveal important information concerning the design or fabrication of the nuclear components of an atomic weapon." Under this authority agreements for cooperation have been negotiated with three nations \* \* \* the United Kingdom, Canada, and Australia, as well as with NATO. The act also permits the communication of information concerning military submarine propulsion reactors and military power reactors and appropriate agreements have been negotiated with the United Kingdom and Canada. However, no special nuclear material may be furnished another nation for military purposes because the statute requires a guaranty that any material furnished under an agreement for cooperation not be used for any military purpose.

The cooperation which could be achieved under the provisions of the present statute, though limited, has benefited the over-all defense posture of the free world. There is now a need for broader exchange of information on the part of the United States and its allies than is possible under the present act. Such broadening of the pres-

ent authority would permit more beneficial use of, and development of, our military nuclear capabilities. It would permit over-all more economical use of scientific and engineering talent and funds. It would serve to increase the collective preparedness of the United States and its allies.

In summary:

A. It is recommended that the Atomic Energy Act be amended to permit the following additional military cooperation when the President determines that the actions concerned will promote and will not constitute an unreasonable risk to the common defense and security:

1. In the field of information:

(a) The communication to friendly nations or defense organizations of additional design information necessary to permit essential training and planning by our allies.

(b) The communication to friendly nations or defense organizations of additional atomic weapons design information necessary to make any delivery systems manufactured by our allies fully compatible with our atomic weapons.

(c) The exchange with friendly nations of information that will improve the receiving nation's atomic weapon design, development, or production capability.

(d) The communication to friendly nations or defense organizations of information necessary to military applications of atomic energy in addition to weapons or military reactors.

2. In the field of materials and equipment:

(a) The transfer to friendly nations of special nuclear material for manufacture into atomic weapons or for other military uses by the receiving nation.

(b) The transfer to friendly nations for military applications of utilization facilities (such as nuclear propulsion and powerplants) and necessary nuclear fuels.

(c) The transfer to friendly nations of nonnuclear parts of atomic weapons to improve the receiving nation's state of training and operational readiness.

B. In addition, modification of the current Atomic Energy Act is recommended to permit the purchase of special nuclear materials, particularly plutonium, under long-term contractual commitments.

C. Further, it is recommended that sections 142c and 142d be amended so that the Department of Defense must participate in the declassification or removal from the restricted data category information which relates primarily to military applications of atomic energy.

The recommended amendments to the Atomic Energy Act are attached as annex A. The principal amendments to each section are mentioned below and all amendments are identical in annex B.

A. Amendments to section 144:

With respect to increased cooperation with our allies in the field of information, it is recommended that section 144b of the act be amended and new sections 144c and 144d be enacted.

1. The amendment to section 144b would expand the areas in which cooperation by the Department of Defense with another nation or regional defense organization may be authorized by the President to include specifically: (a) training of personnel in the employment of and defense against other military applications of atomic energy in addition to atomic weapons; (b) evaluation of the capabilities of potential enemies in the employment of other military applications of atomic energy in addition to atomic weapons; (c) development of compatible delivery systems for atomic weapons; and (d) other military application of atomic energy. Military reactor research, development, or design and atomic weapons research, design, development, or production information are excepted from area (d).

2. The recommended new section 144c would permit the Commission, when authorized by the President, to exchange any atomic weapon information with an ally provided that any information communicated is necessary to improve that nation's design or production capability while that nation is making substantial and material contributions to the national defense and security. It is not the intent of this new section to promote the entry of additional nations into the atomic weapons field. Authority would be provided, however, if any ally had made substantial progress in the development of nuclear weapons and met the other requirements of the act, to make unnecessary a wasting of precious scientific talent and funds by such an ally to duplicate weapons achievements already available to the United States. It is intended by the use of the word "exchange" that there be an exchange of information but that the exchange need not be equivalent in amount or value, or that it take place simultaneously with the receipt of information.

Section 144c also specifically provides for communicating design information concerning military reactors to our allies. In the future, information on military reactors normally would be communicated under this new section rather than under section 144a.

3. It is recommended that the first proviso of section 144b be deleted. This proviso prohibits communication of atomic weapons design and fabrication information except in certain specified areas and then only if "in the joint judgment of the Commission and the Department of Defense such data will not reveal important information concerning the design or fabrication of the nuclear components of an atomic weapon." In lieu of that proviso, the amendments to section 144b and the new section 144c provide that the cooperation and communication could take place whenever the President determines that the proposed cooperation and the communication of the proposed restricted data will promote and will not constitute an unreasonable risk to the common defense and security. In implementation of this provision it is not expected that the President personally will consider each proposed action under an agreement for cooperation. Instead, an Executive order will be recommended to the President establishing procedures whereby the President would authorize proposed communications only after joint review by the Department of Defense, the Commission, and other interested agencies, and would authorize such communications in the absence of the President's personal approval only where the Department of Defense and the Commission agree that the proposed cooperation and the communication of the proposed restricted data will promote and will not constitute an unreasonable risk to the common defense and security.

4. The recommended new section 144d would make it possible for the President to authorize agencies and persons other than the Department of Defense and the Commission to communicate restricted data under any agreement for cooperation provided the restricted data has been determined to be proper for communication under an agreement for cooperation made pursuant to sections 144a, b, or c. This new section would expressly authorize the President to designate another Government agency to communicate restricted data in the performance of its duties. It is the intent that information transmissible under this subsection would be only that specific information determined as transmissible under sections 144a, b, or c.

B. Amendments to section 91 (sections 92 and 123):

With respect to increased cooperation with our allies in the field of materials, it is recommended that a new section 91c be added



to the act and that sections 92 and 123 be amended.

1. Under the recommended new section 91c, the President may authorize the transfer, by sale, lease, loan or donation to a friendly nation of: (1) non-nuclear parts of atomic weapons to improve that nation's state of training or operational readiness; (2) utilization facilities for military applications; and (3) nuclear materials for military utilization facilities or atomic weapons.

Under this section non-nuclear parts of atomic weapons, military reactors and nuclear materials could be furnished to our allies when in accordance with the terms and conditions of a program approved by the President. It is anticipated that under this authority non-nuclear parts of atomic weapons might be furnished to selected allies where such transfer was necessary to improve their state of training and operational readiness. Nuclear components would be retained in the custody of the United States. Military reactors could be made available to our allies for both military propulsion and power purposes. In addition, materials for military reactors and for manufacture into atomic weapons could be made available to our allies. It is not intended that manufactured nuclear components of weapons could be transferred under this amendment, nor that we promote the entry of additional nations into the field of production of nuclear weapons.

2. The amendment to section 123 removes the requirement (with respect to transfers under section 91c) that the receiving nation guarantee that materials furnished not be used for weapons or other military purposes. However, a safeguard in connection with transfers of materials is provided in that portion of the recommended section 91c which states "whenever the President determines that the proposed cooperation and the transfer of the proposed non-nuclear parts of atomic weapons, utilization facilities, or source, byproduct, or special nuclear material will promote and will not constitute an unreasonable risk to the common defense and security." In implementation of this provision it is not expected that the President personally will consider each proposed action under an agreement for cooperation. Instead, an executive order will be recommended to the President establishing procedures whereby the President would authorize proposed transfers only after joint review by the Department of Defense, the Commission, and other interested agencies, and would authorize such transfers in the absence of the President's personal approval only where the Department of Defense and the Commission agree that the proposed cooperation and the transfer of the proposed non-nuclear parts of atomic weapons, utilization facilities, or source, byproduct, or special nuclear material will promote and will not constitute an unreasonable risk to the common defense and security.

3. The amendment to section 92 is technical and is designed to exclude actions taken by the Department of Defense under section 91, as amended, from the prohibitions in section 92.

#### C. Amendment to section 55:

The amendment to section 55, which supercedes legislation proposed to Congress last summer, would authorize the Commission to enter into contracts for terms up to 15 years for the procurement of special nuclear material, particularly plutonium, from sources outside the United States, provided that the President had approved a program for such purchases. Plutonium obtained by the United States from foreign sources without limitation on its use would be utilized to the military advantage of the United States and could contribute to the stockpile of nuclear weapons in United States custody in allied countries. This amendment would also provide a means for the United States

to encourage the development, construction, and operation of nuclear powerplants abroad and it is necessary to accomplish the Commission's objectives with respect to purchases of foreign reactor products. This amendment would authorize entering into purchase contracts in excess of appropriations or funds currently available only when it is estimated that payments under a contract to be executed would not exceed the amounts received or to be received from existing arrangements for foreign distributions of source and special nuclear material under the act plus \$200 million. Receipts would be placed in a separate fund and remain available for purchase commitments. Such appropriations as may be required, within the authorization provided, would be requested from time to time if this becomes necessary to meet disbursements.

#### D. Amendments to section 142:

The recommended amendments include expanding sections 142c and 142d so that restricted data relating primarily to the military application of atomic energy, rather than primarily to the military utilization of atomic weapons, may be declassified only by joint action of AEC and DOD, or may be removed from the restricted data category and safeguarded as defense information only by joint action of the AEC and DOD. These amendments are consistent with the increased military usage of atomic energy for purposes other than weapons and with the action taken in the 1954 act to give the DOD a voice in control over some weapon information that is primarily of military importance. Any additional information that may be removed from the restricted data category and safeguarded as defense information will continue to be subject to the same restrictions that are applicable to restricted data in connection with foreign transmission.

I believe the amendments to the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 recommended herewith would make possible the increased cooperation with our allies that is now essential to our collective security. In view of the importance of this legislation I recommend its early consideration by the Congress.

We are advised by the Bureau of the Budget that this proposed legislation is in accord with the program of the President.

Sincerely yours,

LEWIS L. STRAUSS,  
Chairman.

(Enclosures: 1. A bill; 2. Proposed amendments to Atomic Energy Act of 1954.)

#### ANNEX A

A bill to amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That section 55 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 55. Acquisition: The Commission is authorized to purchase or otherwise acquire any special nuclear material or any interest therein outside the United States.

"(a) Any purchase contract made under the provisions of this section may be made for such period of time as the Commission may deem necessary: *Provided*, That a program for purchases of such special nuclear material or any interest therein is approved by the President: *And provided further*, That no contract for the purchase of such material or any interest therein, other than uranium enriched in the isotope U-235, shall be made for a period in excess of 15 years.

"(b) Any purchase contract under subsection (a) may be made in excess of appropriations or funds currently available where it is estimated by the Commission, at the time any purchase contracts are executed, that amounts paid and to be paid under purchase contracts will not exceed \$200 million plus the amounts received and to be received from then existing arrangements for distribution or transfer of source and special nu-

clear material pursuant to sections 64, 54, or 91c (3); all receipts from the distribution or transfer of source and special nuclear material shall be placed in a separate fund, which is hereby established and which shall remain available without fiscal year limitation, for purchases under this subsection.

"(c) Any contract made under this section may be made without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes as amended, upon certification by the Commission that such action is necessary in the interest of the common defense and security, or upon a showing by the Commission that advertising is not reasonably practicable.

"(d) Partial and advance payments may be made under contracts authorized under this section."

Sec. 2. Section 91 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(c) The President may authorize the Commission or the Department of Defense, with the assistance of the other, to cooperate with another nation and, notwithstanding the provisions of sections 57, 62, or 81, to transfer by sale, lease, loan, or donation to that nation, in accordance with terms and conditions of a program approved by the President—

"(1) nonnuclear parts of atomic weapons to improve that nation's state of training and operational readiness;

"(2) utilization facilities for military applications; and

"(3) source, byproduct, or special nuclear material for research on, development of, production of, or use in atomic weapons or utilization facilities for military applications,

whenever the President determines that the proposed communication and the transfer of the proposed nonnuclear parts of atomic weapons, utilization facilities or source, byproduct, or special nuclear material will promote and will not constitute an unreasonable risk to the common defense and security, while such other nation is participating with the United States pursuant to an international arrangement by substantial and material contributions to the mutual defense and security: *Provided, however*, That the cooperation is undertaken pursuant to an agreement entered into in accordance with section 123."

Sec. 3. Section 92 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 92. Prohibition: It shall be unlawful, except as provided in section 91, for any person to transfer or receive in interstate commerce, manufacture, produce, transfer, acquire, possess, import, or export any atomic weapon. Nothing in this section shall be deemed to modify the provisions of subsection 31a or section 101."

Sec. 4. Section 123a of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 123. Cooperation with other nations.—No cooperation with any nation or regional defense organization pursuant to sections 54, 57, 64, 82, 91, 103, 104, or 144 shall be undertaken until—

"(a) the Commission or, in the case of those agreements for cooperation arranged pursuant to subsection 91c or 144b and to be implemented by the Department of Defense, the Department of Defense has submitted to the President the proposed agreement for cooperation, together with its recommendations thereon, which proposed agreement shall include (1) the terms, conditions, duration, nature, and scope of the cooperation; (2) a guaranty by the cooperating party that security safeguards and standards as set forth in the agreement for cooperation will be maintained; (3) except in the case of those agreements for cooperation arranged pursuant to subsection 91c a guaranty by the



cooperating party that any material to be transferred pursuant to such agreement will not be used for atomic weapons, or for research on or development of atomic weapons or for any other military purpose; and (4) a guaranty by the cooperating party that any material or any restricted data to be transferred pursuant to the agreement for cooperation will not be transferred to unauthorized persons or beyond the jurisdiction of the cooperating party, except as specified in the agreement for cooperation."

Sec. 5. Section 142c of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"(c) In the case of restricted data which the Commission and the Department of Defense jointly determine to relate primarily to the military application of atomic energy, the determination that such data may be published without constituting an unreasonable risk to the common defense and security shall be made by the Commission and the Department of Defense jointly, and if the Commission and the Department of Defense do not agree, the determination shall be made by the President."

Sec. 6. Section 142d of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"(d) The Commission shall remove from the restricted data category such data as the Commission and the Department of Defense jointly determine relates primarily to the military applications of atomic energy and which the Commission and Department of Defense jointly determine can be adequately safeguarded as defense information: *Provided, however,* That no such data so removed from the restricted data category shall be transmitted or otherwise made available to any nation or regional defense organization, while such data remains defense information, except pursuant to an agreement for cooperation entered into in accordance with section 144."

Sec. 7. Section 144b of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"(b) The President may authorize the Department of Defense, with the assistance of the Commission, to cooperate with another nation or with a regional defense organization to which the United States is a party, and to communicate to that nation or organization such restricted data (including design information) as is necessary to—

"(1) The development of defense plans;

"(2) The training of personnel in the employment of and defense against atomic weapons and other military applications of atomic energy;

"(3) The evaluation of the capabilities of potential enemies in the employment of atomic weapons and other military applications of atomic energy;

"(4) The development of compatible delivery systems for atomic weapons; and

"(5) Other military applications of atomic energy, except that with respect to this subcategory, restricted data concerning research, development, design, or production of atomic weapons or concerning research, development, or design of military reactors shall not be communicated,

whenever the President determines that the proposed cooperation and the communication of the proposed restricted data will promote and will not constitute an unreasonable risk to the common defense and security, while such other nation or organization is participating with the United States pursuant to an international arrangement by substantial and material contributions to the mutual defense and security: *Provided, however,* That the cooperation is undertaken pursuant to an agreement entered into in accordance with section 123."

Sec. 8. Section 144 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(c) In addition to the cooperation authorized in subsections 144a and 144b, the President may authorize the Commission, with the assistance of the Department of Defense, to cooperate with another nation and—

"(1) to exchange with that nation restricted data concerning atomic weapons: *Provided,* Communication of such restricted data to that nation is necessary to improve its atomic-weapon design, development, or production capability; and

"(2) to communicate to that nation restricted data concerning research, development, or design of military reactors, whenever the President determines that the proposed cooperation and the communication of the proposed restricted data will promote and will not constitute an unreasonable risk to the common defense and security, while such other nation is participating with the United States pursuant to an international arrangement by substantial and material contributions to the mutual defense and security: *Provided, however,* That the cooperation is undertaken pursuant to an agreement entered into in accordance with section 123."

Sec. 9. Section 144 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(d) The President may authorize any agency of the United States or person to communicate in accordance with the terms and conditions of an agreement for cooperation arranged pursuant to subsections 144a, b, or c, such restricted data as is determined to be transmissible under the agreement for cooperation involved."

#### ANNEX B

#### PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO ATOMIC ENERGY ACT OF 1954, AS AMENDED

(Deletions are enclosed in black brackets, additions are indicated by italics.)

Sec. 55. Acquisition: The Commission is authorized to purchase or otherwise acquire any special nuclear material or any interest therein outside the United States [without regard to the provisions of section 3709 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, upon certification by the Commission that such action is necessary in the interest of the common defense and security, or upon a showing by the Commission that advertising is not reasonably practicable. Partial and advance payments may be made under contracts for such purposes].

(a) Any purchase contract made under the provisions of this section may be made for such period of time as the Commission may deem necessary: *Provided,* That a program for purchases of such special nuclear material or any interest therein is approved by the President: *And provided further,* That no contract for the purchase of such material or any interest therein, other than uranium enriched in the isotope U-235, shall be made for a period in excess of 15 years.

(b) Any purchase contract under subsection (a) may be made in excess of appropriations or funds currently available where it is estimated by the Commission, at the time any purchase contracts are executed, that amounts paid and to be paid under purchase contracts will not exceed \$200 million plus the amounts received and to be received from then existing arrangements for distribution or transfer of source and special nuclear material pursuant to sections 64, 54, or 91c (3); all receipts from the distribution or transfer of source and special nuclear material shall be placed in a separate fund, which is hereby established and which shall remain available without fiscal year limitation, for purchases under this subsection.

(c) Any contract made under this section may be made without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, upon certification by the Commission that such action is necessary in the interest of the common defense and security, or upon a showing by the Commission that advertising is not reasonably practicable.

(d) Partial and advance payments may be made under contracts authorized under this section.

#### SEC. 91. Authority:

"(c) The President may authorize the Commission or the Department of Defense, with the assistance of the other, to cooperate with another nation and, notwithstanding the provisions of section 57, 62, or 81, to transfer by sale, lease, loan, or donation to that nation, in accordance with terms and conditions of a program approved by the President—

(1) nonnuclear parts of atomic weapons to improve that nation's state of training and operational readiness;

(2) utilization of facilities for military applications; and

(3) source, byproduct, or special nuclear material for research on, development of, production of, or use in atomic weapons or utilization facilities for military applications,

whenever the President determines that the proposed communication and the transfer of the proposed nonnuclear parts of atomic weapons, utilization facilities or source, byproduct, or special nuclear material will promote and will not constitute an unreasonable risk to the common defense and security, while such other nation is participating with the United States pursuant to an international arrangement by substantial and material contributions to the mutual defense and security: *Provided, however,* That the cooperation is undertaken pursuant to an agreement entered into in accordance with section 123.

Sec. 92. Prohibition: It shall be unlawful, except as provided in section 91, for any person to transfer or receive in interstate commerce, manufacture, produce, transfer, acquire, possess, import, or export any atomic weapons [except as may be authorized by the Commission pursuant to the provisions of section 91]. Nothing in this section shall be deemed to modify the provisions of subsection 31 a. or section 101.

Sec. 123. Cooperation with other nations: No cooperation with any nation or regional defense organization pursuant to sections 54, 57, 64, 82, 91, 103, 104, or 144 shall be undertaken until—

(a) the Commission or, in the case of those agreements for cooperation arranged pursuant to subsection 91c or 144b and to be implemented by the Department of Defense, the Department of Defense has submitted to the President the proposed agreement for cooperation, together with its recommendations thereon, which proposed agreement shall include (1) the terms, conditions, duration, nature, and scope of the cooperation; (2) a guaranty by the cooperating party that security safeguards and standards as set forth in the agreement for cooperation will be maintained; (3) except in the case of those agreements for cooperation arranged pursuant to subsection 91c a guaranty by the cooperating party that any material to be transferred pursuant to such agreement will not be used for atomic weapons, or for research on or development of atomic weapons or for any other military purpose; and (4) a guaranty by the cooperating party that any material or any restricted data to be transferred pursuant to the agreement for cooperation will not be transferred to unauthorized persons or beyond the jurisdiction of the cooperating party, except as specified in the agreement for cooperation;



# SEC. 142. Classification and declassification of restricted data:

(c) In the case of restricted data which the Commission and the Department of Defense jointly determine to relate primarily to the military [utilization] application of atomic [weapons] energy, the determination that such data may be published without constituting an unreasonable risk to the common defense and security shall be made by the Commission and the Department of Defense jointly, and if the Commission and the Department of Defense do not agree, the determination shall be made by the President.

(d) The Commission shall remove from the restricted data category such data as the Commission and the Department of Defense jointly determine relates primarily to the military [utilization] applications of atomic [weapons] energy and which the Commission and Department of Defense jointly determine can be adequately safeguarded as defense information: *Provided, however, That no such data so removed from the restricted data category shall be transmitted or otherwise made available to any nation or regional defense organization, while such data remains defense information, except pursuant to an agreement for cooperation entered into in accordance with [Subsection 144(b)].*

## SEC. 144. International cooperation:

(b) The President may authorize the Department of Defense, with the assistance of the Commission, to cooperate with another nation or with a regional defense organization to which the United States is a party, and to communicate to that nation or organization such restricted data (including design information) as is necessary to—

- (1) The development of defense plans;
- (2) The training of personnel in the employment of and defense against atomic weapons and other military applications of atomic energy; and
- (3) The evaluation of the capabilities of potential enemies in the employment of atomic weapons and other military applications of atomic energy; [.]
- (4) The development of compatible delivery systems for atomic weapons; and
- (5) Other military applications of atomic energy, except that with respect to this subcategory, restricted data concerning research, development, design, or production of atomic weapons or concerning research, development, or design of military reactors shall not be communicated,

*whenever the President determines that the proposed cooperation and the communication of the proposed restricted data will promote and will not constitute an unreasonable risk to the common defense and security, while such other nation or organization is participating with the United States pursuant to an international arrangement by substantial and material contributions to the mutual defense and security: [Provided, however, That no such cooperation shall involve communication of Restricted Data relating to the design or fabrication of atomic weapons except with regard to external characteristics, including size, weight, and shape, yields and effects, and systems employed in the delivery or use thereof but not including any data in these categories unless in the joint judgment of the Commission and the Department of Defense such data will not reveal important information concerning the design or fabrication of the nuclear components of an atomic weapon. And] Provided [further] however, That the cooperation is undertaken pursuant to an agreement entered into in accordance with section 123.*

(c) In addition to the cooperation authorized in subsections 144a and 144b, the President may authorize the Commission, with

the assistance of the Department of Defense, to cooperate with another nation and—

(1) To exchange with that nation restricted data concerning atomic weapons, provided communication of such restricted data to that nation is necessary to improve its atomic weapon design, development, or production capability; and

(2) To communicate to that nation restricted data concerning research, development, or design of military reactors, whenever the President determines that the proposed cooperation and the communication of the proposed restricted data will promote and will not constitute an unreasonable risk to the common defense and security, while such other nation is participating with the United States pursuant to an international arrangement by substantial and material contributions to the mutual defense and security: *Provided, however, That the cooperation is undertaken pursuant to an agreement entered into in accordance with section 123.*

(d) The President may authorize any agency of the United States or person to communicate in accordance with the terms and conditions of an agreement for cooperation arranged pursuant to subsections 144 (a), (b), or (c), such restricted data as is determined to be transmissible under the agreement for cooperation involved.

## IMPROPER SOLICITATION OF CONTRIBUTIONS FOR CHARITABLE ORGANIZATIONS

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and my colleague, the senior Senator from New York [Mr. Ives], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to backstop State laws dealing with improper solicitation of contributions for charitable organizations.

Many States, notably New York, have made great strides ahead in protecting their citizens against victimization from unscrupulous charity solicitors. However, the States themselves are impotent to guard against charity "boilerrooms" operating by mail who move from State to State with their operators.

Philanthropy has been ranked the Nation's fourth largest industry, following manufacturing, agriculture, and wholesale and retail trade. Americans contribute between four and five billion dollars annually for charitable purposes. Yet, in the State of New York alone, I found as attorney general that more than \$25 million a year is estimated to be siphoned off by out-and-out charity rackets. On this basis, charity rackets may well take as much as \$250 million a year from the public. It is very much in our national interest to encourage charitable contributions, and our Federal tax laws rightly favor it as one of the fine expressions of a free society. The way to encourage contributions is to give the utmost protection against fraud and sharp practices in solicitations.

The bill provides that once a person or organization has been convicted within the past 5 years and subsequent to passage of the legislation of fraudulent charitable solicitation under any one of the existing laws in 26 States and the District of Columbia, the Postmaster General may stamp "fraudulent" on mail addressed to the violator from any point within the United States and return it

to the sender, and may also stop payment of postal money orders to the convicted charity racketeer.

The Congress late last year enacted charity legislation to apply to the District of Columbia, the District of Columbia Charitable Solicitation Act—Public Law 85-87. This bill is a further step in the protection of the individual citizen and in Federal recognition of the fraud in charity solicitations.

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

The bill (S. 3166) to provide for exclusion from the mails of mail violating certain State laws dealing with improper solicitations of contributions by charitable organizations and to forbid the payment of money orders therefor, introduced by Mr. JAVITS (for himself and Mr. Ives), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

## PROPOSED HOSPITAL ON ELLIS ISLAND, N. Y., FOR TREATMENT OF DRUG ADDICTS

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and my colleague, the senior Senator from New York [Mr. Ives], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill authorizing the Surgeon General of the United States to establish a hospital on Ellis Island, in New York Harbor, especially equipped for the treatment of persons addicted to narcotics.

Then senior Senator from New York [Mr. Ives] and I, joined by our colleague in the other body, Representative ANFUSO, of New York, are urging the mayor of the city of New York and the Governor of the State of New York to make such agreements as are practicable for all parties with the authorities of the United States in order to bring about this highly desirable reform.

We point out in our communication to the mayor and Governor that it is possible to devote to 100-percent public benefit this very valuable facility, provided suitable arrangements are made for its operation.

We also point out other States in the Northeast are similarly interested with us in New York, and that this represents an interesting opportunity for an interstate compact.

We have an estimated 20,000 reported addicts in the New York area—that is, in the whole complex of States which represent that area—in addition to thousands of unknown narcotics victims. We feel the establishment of a narcotics hospital on Ellis Island would be extremely humanitarian and would present a very useful opportunity to utilize this very valuable piece of real estate to the greatest advantage.

I emphasize that nobody knows better than the senior Senator from New York [Mr. Ives] and I the practical problems which are involved, the expense, and other arrangements which need to be made. We only lend our aid to those problems. We wish now to make it very clear that we think everyone is acting in the desire to do the greatest good, in terms of our city and State of New York,

in this whole matter; but we point out that our desires and our willingness to do the right thing in this regard will not be enough, because we have certain deadlines to meet with respect to the sale of the property under the law. Therefore, we must activate ourselves to make the best financial proposals we possibly can make on that subject.

I hope this may prove to be a model of unpartisan cooperation in the way we work out a use for Ellis Island in New York Harbor.

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

The bill (S. 3167) providing for the Surgeon General of the United States to establish a hospital in the State of New York especially equipped for the treatment of persons addicted to the use of habit-forming drugs, introduced by Mr. JAVITS (for himself and Mr. IVES), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

#### NATURALIZATION OF CERTAIN ADOPTED ALIEN CHILDREN

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, according to the Immigration and Naturalization Act, as amended in the first session of this Congress, certain specified citizens of the United States are declared exempt from the normal rule requiring 2 years' residence for an adopted child in this country in order that the adopted child gain full citizenship. The adoptive parents exempted by the amendment adopted last year are: First, members of the Armed Forces; second, persons in the employ of the United States or of an American institution of research recognized as such by the Attorney General, or of an American firm or corporation engaged in the development of foreign trade or commerce of the United States; third, employees of a public international organization in which the United States participates by treaty or statute.

These categories of individuals were provided an exemption from the normal 2-year residence requirement because it is often not possible for them to provide legal custody of an adopted child while resident in the United States for a full 2-year period. The nature of their employment dictated that they be given special consideration.

I would like to point out at this time that there is another category of individuals who should have been included in this amendment to the Immigration and Naturalization Act. I refer to the missionaries who are sent by our churches to bring American culture to foreign lands. It is quite common practice to provide these missionaries with a 1-year furlough period in the United States from time to time. Because of this reason they are unable to complete citizenship requirements for adopted children in accordance with the general 2-year residence rule.

Mr. President, these people are cultural ambassadors of the United States as well as being spiritual ambassadors of their church organizations. It is fitting that they should be included in the exemption from the 2-year rule. I introduce for appropriate reference, a bill to

allow adopted children of our missionaries to be naturalized in accordance with the amendment adopted in the first session of this Congress.

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

The bill (S. 3171) to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act so as to permit certain adopted children to be naturalized without complying with the residence and physical presence requirements of such act, introduced by Mr. THYE, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

#### ASSISTANCE FOR SCHOOL CONSTRUCTION

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I am introducing today a bill to authorize Federal assistance to the States and local communities in the financing of public-school construction. I am hopeful that the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee, of which I am a member, will consider this measure and the growing problem it is designed to meet. This committee is under the leadership of the able Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL].

This bill, which is modeled to a large extent after the bill reported by the House Committee on Education and Labor last session, emphasizes the traditional concept of State and local responsibility, strongly forbids any Federal control, requires maximum effort on the part of the States and local school districts and recognizes that the emergency role of the Federal Government is a temporary one. It provides for a minimum program designed to give assistance to those areas in most critical need of help, through matching grants totaling \$300 million a year for 5 years, allocated according to the size of each State's school-age population, and supplemented by Federal purchase of school bonds and loans to State school-financing agencies. The \$300 million figure is a rockbottom minimum, which is set that low only on the assumption that other pending measures will make additional funds available to our hard-pressed schools.

Three hundred million dollars is, quite obviously, the minimum figure. I believe it should be more. But I am introducing the bill as reported by the House, in the hope that in our concentration today on scholarships, which I do not really think represent the primary need in education, we will not lose sight of the necessity for developing facilities on the public school and college levels, which I believe in the next 10 years will be the major crisis facing education.

#### THE NEED

Since the school construction bill failed in the other House last year, we have had additional opportunities to realize the urgent need for this program. In September, when school opened, the classroom shortage was obvious to even the most doubtful. Enrollment in our already overcrowded schools had increased by 1.5 million, to a level of well over 33.5 million boys and girls. Official Office of Education figures, which most experts deem to be on the conservative side, showed our Nation's schools to be

short 140,400 classrooms now—that another 44,000 will be needed next year to take care of still higher enrollments—and that another 14,000 to 20,000 are needed each year to replace outmoded and obsolete buildings, firetraps, and health hazards. School enrollment having already increased some 50 percent in the last decade, it is significant to note that the largest increase this year was concentrated in the elementary schools, a warning to the Nation that this need must be met for many years to come. Already, nearly a million boys and girls are being deprived by the classroom shortage of full-time schooling, and hundreds of thousands more held back in classes of unwieldy size.

In October, the advent of the space age awakened all Americans to the critical importance of improving our educational system from the bottom up. And at year's end, the difficult fiscal position of the State and local authorities—who are spending at the rate of nearly \$3 billion a year constructing some 70,800 classrooms without eliminating the shortage—made it clear that the Federal Government, with its far greater as well as more effective means of raising public revenues, could not avoid its responsibility to meet this nationwide problem.

I am aware of the fact that Massachusetts does not need this program so much as some other States. But I am also keenly aware that Massachusetts is not an island unto itself, and that its progress, its peace, its prosperity, and ultimately its survival depend upon the wisdom and enlightenment of the public-school graduates in every part of the country. Similarly, those who do not send children to public schools have a direct stake in and a responsibility for improving the educational opportunities and standards of all citizens.

#### CAN THE PROBLEM BE DEFERRED?

The President, who together with other administration spokesmen thoroughly documented 1 year ago the urgent need for Federal action on the growing classroom shortage, has decided this year to abandon the school construction program. It is, he asserts, merely being deferred in favor of a new postspatnik emphasis on educating scientists.

But how can the solution to a critical problem which increases in magnitude each year be deferred, as though the overflow children could stay at home until their case comes up for consideration again? The school population 1 year from now will be even greater; more old schools will be condemned, obsolete, or rendered unusable; and State and local authorities will be even more hard pressed to finance additional classrooms. Congress cannot ignore or forget the classroom shortage by deferring action on it. We can only worsen it.

#### MORE SCHOLARSHIPS OR MORE CLASSROOMS?

The administration's program and other new proposals in the field of education are intended to increase the production of American scientists to offset the Russian lead in this area. I welcome these proposals and share their objective. But scientifically inclined students do not spring up overnight to apply for



special college scholarships or even to receive improved high-school instruction. Additional aptitude tests may identify more such students but they will not produce them. The real shaping of the scientific mind, as Dr. Teller and others have emphasized, begins on the grade-school and junior high-school level—before the student is 12 years old, according to Dr. Teller. Yet this is the very kind of careful, thorough instruction that suffers most in an overcrowded classroom too jammed to permit any individual assistance. It is necessarily neglected in schools operating on a part-time shift that permits no extra effort for talented pupils. It is the kind of instruction that is not usually available to students collected in outmoded, unequipped, or dangerous classrooms. It is not enough merely to increase through scholarships and fellowships the number of poorly trained high-school graduates who go on to our already overcrowded colleges. We shall not measurably improve the production of scientists at the college level, in short, unless we begin at the bottom instead of the top.

Moreover, even in the high schools, the improved teaching of science and mathematics expected to result from the new administration proposals will not fulfill its goals without additional classroom construction. Of what avail are new techniques and better materials in a classroom too crowded to enable concentration, too unsafe to permit various experiments, too unsightly to attract good teachers? We shall compete with the Russians in science education at the graduate level only when we solve the classroom shortage at every public-school level.

Finally, are we concerned only with the production of scientists, mathematicians, engineers, and foreign-language specialists? Recognizing our serious handicaps in those areas, are we not in equally urgent need of improving the education of all Americans—the diplomats and politicians who must make the hard decisions of the cold war, the judges and educators and writers who must carry on the American way in its hour of greatest challenge, the citizens of every occupation and status who will decide, in the last analysis, whether we stand or fall as a nation? More and better educated scientists cannot alone save the United States today. All American education is in crisis. This bill is aimed at attacking that crisis at its roots. Let us hope it is not already too late.

I think it is high time, after almost 10 years of consideration of this vital matter by the Senate and the House, that we enact at this session of Congress a bill which will not only direct immediate attention to the production of scientists, engineers, and mathematicians, but also will improve the educational standard of all Americans. This is vitally important for the successful operation of a democratic state.

I introduce the bill for appropriate reference.

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

The bill (S. 3179) to authorize Federal assistance to the States and local com-

munities in financing an expanded program of school construction so as to eliminate the national shortage of classrooms, introduced by Mr. KENNEDY, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

#### SPECIAL MILK PROGRAM FOR CHILDREN—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILL

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, on January 23, 1958, I introduced, for myself and other Senators, the bill (S. 3070) to continue the special milk program for children in the interest of improved nutrition by fostering the consumption of fluid milk in the schools. I ask unanimous consent that the names of the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIER] may be added as additional cosponsors of the bill the next time it is printed.

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

#### COMMITTEE SERVICE

On motion of Mr. KNOWLAND, and by unanimous consent, it was

Ordered, That Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania be, and he is hereby, excused from further service as a member of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

That Mr. HOBLITZELL be, and he is hereby, assigned to service on the Committee on the District of Columbia and to service on the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

#### THE STATE OF THE UNION

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, recently I received from the Advocate, the official publication of the archdiocese of Newark, N. J., and the diocese of Paterson, an editorial entitled "The State of the Union," which appeared in that publication under date of January 18. It is a very fine analysis of the President's state of the Union address, and I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be published in the body of the RECORD, at the conclusion of my remarks.

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

#### THE STATE OF THE UNION

Thursday, January 9, was a day of great personal triumph for Dwight D. Eisenhower. By his fine appearance, by his forceful, alert delivery of his address to the Congress, by his easy, confident manner, he gave evidence to a questioning Nation and world of his physical fitness, of his recovery from the illnesses that have recently interfered with his normal routine. For that answer to a question that was real, though rarely asked outright, we congratulate him, and join in the deep satisfaction that must be his.

Far more, however, than the state of a man's health was at stake on that Thursday. For the man who spoke was not simply Dwight D. Eisenhower, but the President of the United States, delivering his state of the Union message. It was a message upon which a great deal depended, because it was

a message given in a time of doubt, of fear, even of panic on the part of some faint hearts. It was a message which, in the circumstances, had to replace doubt with knowledge, fear with confidence, panic with courage.

This, we believe, the President did, and did well. It was a message which created confidence in the ability of our Nation to meet the dangers of the present time; it was a message which provided the Nation with the inspiring leadership of a Chief Executive who knew well the problems of the day and was prepared to cope with them.

A study of the message reveals its outstanding characteristic to be balance. It recognized, for instance, the threat posed by Soviet military and scientific advances, but did not ignore the equal—perhaps even the greater—danger raised against us by Communist economic penetration into many areas of the globe.

While the President realistically assessed the Soviet threat as "total cold war," he recognized that we must in return "wage total peace," utilizing to the utmost "the spiritual, military, and economic strength" of the free world.

Mr. Eisenhower did not minimize the Soviet military threat; neither did he underestimate our own military situation, with powerful armaments still capable of deterring Soviet aggression, and soon to be augmented with still more advanced weapons; with friendly nations of free men as our allies, as against the captive and sullen nations that make up the Soviet system of alliances.

The President's message, while asserting the present adequacy of our military forces, emphasized the urgent need of increased defense efforts, including the elimination of "harmful rivalries" among the branches of our Military Establishment, and making the fullest use of the versatility and intelligence of our free workers, the imaginativeness and resourcefulness of our businessmen, the adaptability of our economic system.

In urging the necessity of a billion dollar Federal expenditure for improvements in education and scientific research, Mr. Eisenhower gave assurance of concern for the maintenance of local control of education, and for the avoidance of undue stress on the physical sciences at the expense of other branches of learning. He bespoke the importance of the role of private industry, schools, and colleges—and resurrected from the dim past the figure of the student with his bag of books and his homework.

While assuring the Nation that all necessary military, educational, mutual aid, and other expenditures will be made, the President pledged reduction of all nonessential spending. Only thus can our economy survive; only thus can we frustrate the oft-repeated prophecy of the Communists that America will be led to spend itself into ruin.

In his call to all other people, especially those of the Soviet Union, to unite in the performance of great works for peace, the President was looking beyond the purely military or economic; he was opening up the happy vista of a future in which all men of all nations will work together to conquer war, hunger, disease, and thus to improve the earthly lot of all men of all nations.

One sad feature of imbalance marked the President's address, an imbalance quite unexpected in a message of such importance. Far too much space was devoted to what we, our people and our allies, can do; far too little reference was made to our need of the guidance and power of Almighty God. Let this be our role now—to make up for this neglect by our prayers and sacrifices, to assist our President by bringing God into our every enterprise as we buckle down to the defense of our way (may it always be God's way) of life.

# ECONOMIC PROBLEMS FACING BIDEFORD AND SACO, MAINE

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. President, the January 1958 issue of Textile Labor contains an excellent article entitled "A Tale of Two Cities," written by Burt Beck. The article describes the economic problems facing the twin cities of Biddeford and Saco, in the State of Maine, and presents one of the best cases I know for speedy enactment of area-assistance legislation to help economically distressed areas which cannot solve their own chronic unemployment problems. The need for enactment of an area-assistance program is urgent. I should like particularly to call this article to the attention of my colleagues on the Senate Banking and Currency Committee who are members of the Production and Stabilization Subcommittee, which currently has all of the area-assistance bills pending before it.

I ask unanimous consent that the article may be printed at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, along with a copy of a letter which I wrote to the chairman of the Production and Stabilization Subcommittee on January 22, 1958, urging early action on area-assistance legislation.

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

## A TALE OF TWO CITIES (By Burt Beck)

This is a story of economic disaster in one American community. It happens to be about the twin towns of Biddeford and Saco, in Maine, but it could be about any one of the hundreds of textile towns, mining villages, or farm-machinery and ordnance centers that have been left stranded when their prime industries gradually or suddenly collapsed.

The twin cities sit astride the Saco River, and the historic falls of that river provide the power that initiated the area's industrial development more than 3 centuries ago. One of the prime industries was cotton textiles.

When Admiral Perry sailed to Japan in 1854 to open the doors of that country to foreign trade, he carried, as samples of America's finest products, textiles made in Biddeford. From this famous textile area have poured uncounted millions of yards of textile fabrics, to all corners of the world.

Textile machinery, shoes, ships, sewing machines, machineguns, bricks, nails, airplane parts, men's collars—all of these have been turned out by the skilled craftsmen of Biddeford and Saco.

Today the area is rapidly becoming a deserted village. A typical headline in the Biddeford Journal proclaims: "Unemployment in Biddeford-Saco Area Takes Jump."

Michael Schoonjans, TWUA's international representative in the Biddeford-Saco area, is understandably concerned about the situation. To Mike, the unemployment figures are not statistics; behind each number is an unemployed worker, in most cases the chief breadwinner of the family.

"A few years ago," said Mike, "we had 7,000 members in the Biddeford-Saco joint board. Today, we have less than 3,500. The decline in textile manufacturing also hits all the other workers in town."

For concrete evidence of this, it took only a visit to the Biddeford office of the Maine employment security commission and a talk with Manager Francis M. Coughlin.

The last week for which he had figures at the time of this interview, was the week ending December 14, 1957. The report showed

that there were 1,252 claims for unemployment benefits, and what was even more alarming, 561 people had already exhausted their benefits and were consequently ineligible for further compensation until April.

Unemployment in Biddeford-Saco has not increased gradually. Only a few years ago, practically the entire labor force was employed. In 1953, a survey of 10 of the larger employers showed that 9,616 men and women had gainful employment. By 1956 the figure was down to 7,836, but the bottom really dropped out in 1957, when unemployment rose 22.2 percent. For one thing, the Bates Mill closed up and over 1,400 jobs were lost. One of the large shoe companies shut its doors and another 325 jobs went down the drain. These plants did not move away, they shut up shop. Only one new industry has moved in—a cabinet manufacturer employing 30 workers.

Biddeford and Saco, instead of the bustling communities they were until recently, have started to take on the characteristics of a ghost town. You see as many men and women on the business streets—and mostly middle-aged and older men and women. The younger people have left to find jobs elsewhere.

Arthur Maxwell, president of one of the largest banks in the area, is confident about the future. He thinks that the bottom has been reached and, although it may take a few years, things will pick up.

"If some sort of plan can be drafted to redevelop depressed areas we can come through this with flying colors. It will take hard work," he maintained, "and we'll need help in attracting other industry, but we can do it."

Most of the civic authorities share Maxwell's cautious optimism. The mayor of Saco, Peter A. Garland, is of the opinion that something must be done along the line of encouraging new industry.

"We've laid the groundwork by starting an industrial development committee," he declared. "Now we need help. We're contacting certain manufacturers, but until these things bear fruit some of the assistance contained in the area redevelopment bill would give us a terrific boost."

The outgoing mayor of Biddeford, Albert C. Lambert, and Carl Swanson, secretary of the Biddeford Industrial Development Commission, were also confident that the Biddeford-Saco area could make a comeback.

"We've got the skilled manpower," said Mayor Lambert, "and we've got wonderful industrial sites. All we need now is the third ingredient—industry."

"Our citizens have their roots in this community," chimed in Swanson, "and they don't want to move away unless they have to. Even when the kids leave the nest to find jobs elsewhere they come back as often as possible. Why, on a long holiday weekend most of the autos have out-of-State licenses."

While the outlook, according to the officials, has its bright side, the current picture is bleak.

Item: Many midtown stores held their year-end sales prior to Christmas, instead of after the holiday season, as was the usual custom.

Item: For the first time in quite a few years the Community Chest drive will fall short.

Item: Breaking and entering, especially into food stores, has now become a fairly common notation on official police records.

Item: City welfare aid doubled from July to November, and many more cases were expected by the overseer of the poor, Mrs. Annette Gagne.

"Right now, nothing short of area redevelopment assistance, as proposed by Senator DOUGLAS, will help us and other depressed sections," is the way Mike Schoonjans summed up the situation. "There are a lot of people here who are too young to die and

not old enough for social security. They want to work, and this sort of program could provide the work for them."

JANUARY 22, 1958.

Hon. PAUL H. DOUGLAS,  
Chairman, Production and Stabilization Subcommittee, Senate Banking and Currency Committee, Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR PAUL: Recent sharp increases in unemployment in my own State of Maine and across the Nation have focused attention once again on the grave and pressing situation existing in those areas of our country plagued by continuing high levels of unemployment. In periods of slackening economic activity these areas suffer even greater economic hardships.

In Maine the unemployment situation is approaching a critical stage with a 7.7 percent insured unemployment rate for the first week in December. In the comparable period of 1956 this rate was 4.7 percent. The Saco-Biddeford-Sanford region of Maine has been classified as an area of substantial labor surplus by the Labor Department for more than 2 years and in the past year the closing of a major textile mill in Saco intensified this already serious problem. In December the national unemployment rate reached 5 percent of the labor force with major layoffs reported in practically all basic industries. Under such conditions the chronically distressed areas are hit even harder than before.

No one can seriously question the value of a program of assistance for these distressed areas aimed at helping them attract new industries and thereby boosting employment. Since this problem is national in scope it is well within the realm of the Federal Government to take the necessary action. Recognizing this fact, the Eisenhower administration has proposed a program of assistance for these labor surplus areas and requested the Congress to enact it into law. Last week the President in his budget message repeated his request for Congressional approval of the program. You have developed comprehensive legislative proposals in this problem yourself.

As you know, I was an early supporter of aid for distressed areas and have continued to urge approval by the Congress of a domestic point 4. The bills containing all of the various proposals for assistance to distressed areas are now before your subcommittee for consideration. It is my hope that at an early date a comprehensive program for assisting these areas will be recommended to the full Banking and Currency Committee for action so that this legislation can be approved by both Houses of Congress early in the present session.

Sincerely yours,

FREDERICK G. PAYNE,  
United States Senator.

## FRED C. REYBOLD

Mr. FREAR. Mr. President, last Saturday, it was again my pleasure, as it has been on numerous occasions in the past, to attend the annual winter meeting of the Del-Mar-Va Press Association. This is an organization made up of editors and publishers of the various newspapers, both weeklies and dailies, published throughout the peninsula which comprises the State of Delaware and parts of Maryland and Virginia.

The Del-Mar-Va Press Association has been meeting regularly for about 45 years, and the gatherings always produce provocative and helpful discussions on the broad subject of news coverage and the service of newspapers to their respective communities.



At the meeting this past Saturday, the principal speaker was a young man of 84 years of age and himself a newspaperman of much merit. His name is Fred C. Reybold, and for the information of the Senate, I might say that his brother, Lt. Gen. Eugene Reybold, was for many years the distinguished Chief of the Corps of Engineers.

I was particularly impressed with the humor and sagacity of Mr. Reybold's remarks, and felt that they would be of interest to the Members of the Senate and to the many other individuals who read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Mr. President, I therefore ask that at this point in my remarks the text of Mr. Reybold's brief address be printed in the RECORD, together with an editorial which appeared yesterday in the Delaware State News entitled "Newspapermen's Newspaperman," which is in the nature of a tribute to Mr. Reybold.

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

ADDRESS BY FRED C. REYBOLD

There is a reason for the publication of every newspaper, conducted by proper persons, each meeting the requirements by varying public tastes.

I find it impossible to lay down any single rule for all newspapers. They are the most thoroughly individual propositions in the world. It cannot be said that they all lean one way or another, but it can be said that, taken altogether, they fairly approximate the prevailing styles of thought. And if a majority of them incline to support established institutions, it is because a majority of the people of America do.

A paper should be a persistent and courageous champion of every good and righteous cause and the relentless foe of every evil thing. No newspaper can ever be sufficiently clever to fool the people. There is no neutral ground between right and wrong. The best that money can buy is never any too good for your readers. Try to see how much you can give them and how little you can take from them. Class will tell, and as has been said a thousand times, "There is no substitute for brains."

A newspaper cannot please all readers, but it must be honest and fearless.

First of all a newspaper must have the respect of its employees and newspaper men and women are, as a whole, honest, fair, and sincere.

A tricky, dishonest newspaperman is soon found out—and it ends his career.

The day of romance in the newspaper world is far from dead, with the passing of the Benjamin Franklins, Horace Greeleys, Charles Danas, James Gordon Bennetts, and other famous editors whose rise from the ranks has always been an inspiration to those in journalistic pursuits, every now and then, one is inclined to think that those days—to use a trite phrase, "Are gone forever." But as years pass on, it is proven that the pen is mightier than the sword today.

Few have ever stopped to estimate what it would cost to publish a newspaper if each publisher were obliged to maintain correspondents in all parts of the world and pay the cable and telegraph tolls on the news sent to the newspapers. The total would be so large that no individual newspaper would be able to meet the expenses.

But the news that you get in your newspaper comes from all over the world. And that news should be accurate so far as possible. We are indebted in a great part, to the Associated Press and the United Press in giving us that news.

There are more than 3,200 members and subscribers to the services of the Associated Press, and the United Press Association is serving 2,229 newspapers and 2,061 radio stations.

I challenge any man in the world to show that any item of news sent out by the Associated Press has been doctored or distorted for personal interests. There may be errors, news may be dishonestly reported to the Associated Press representatives, but so far as the Associated Press organization is concerned, every news story is carefully scrutinized with the sole view of giving unbiased information to the public.

The Associated Press reports are, of course, supplemented by the great newspapers, by cablegrams, and special reports of their own. The news should tell the exact truth so far as possible. I know all newspapers are very careful to be sure of the accuracy of news. But despite all the care taken by those who conduct the newspapers to keep them reliable and honest, there are many persons who question that reliability and that honesty.

One time Horace Greeley stopped the press of the New York Tribune after it had printed one copy of the paper, and then the printers pulled out an item from the forms and set in another. That one copy of the Tribune was wrapped and mailed to the mother of the man who had gone wrong. The paper had to print the story of his wrongdoing, but Greeley knew his mother, and that mother cared. That one copy did not contain the story of the man's disgrace. The world cannot always be so considerate. The man whose mother cares must learn to care for his mother enough to let her read the papers as they come out.

It is said that on the battlefield no bullet ever strikes a man but it goes farther and strikes the heart of a woman somewhere.

Of course, it takes money to run a modern newspaper, for anyone who knows anything about the newspaper business knows that a newspaper would not run very far without money. What is not widely known is that putting a paper across is a science requiring real genius. The man to do it may be one who has never been to college nor written a line of editorial copy himself. He must have a backbone and say farewell to "friends." The road is uphill all the way. Much of the burden bearing has to be done by proxy and a rallying center created for a bunch of loyal subordinates who will stick to the ship and go through storm and stress to the bitter end, which, when reached, is sometimes suddenly revealed as a snug harbor inside the bar.

If the larger newspapers, however, neglect any field of public interest, competition will be resumed, new papers will spring up, for the public must and will be served.

I will tell you how I feel about personal journalism. There is no man big enough to arbitrarily dictate the policy of any metropolitan newspaper. It is a work for many minds and the best minds that can be brought together.

The way to run a newspaper is the way to run anything in business; try to serve your clientele with the best talents and be honest in all things.

Every phase of endeavor is now moving toward amalgamation. The mounting costs of getting out a newspaper today, together with the rising wages in the mechanical department, make it impossible to publish newspapers in big towns in small units.

New York has continued longer in its multiplicity of newspapers than any other big city in the country. Chicago, that once had 5 or 6 morning papers, has now returned to 2. St. Louis with 4 or 5 at one time finally came down to 2. After struggling along with 2 for 10 years, one had to go by the board, and merged with the other. Now in the great city of St. Louis there is only one. The same is true of Denver, New Orleans, Indianapolis, Cleveland, Detroit, and so it goes.

There are more inaccuracies in newspapers of today than in the old days. The telephone has done more to spoil good reporting than anything else. I always tried to get my men to go out and talk to the principals face to face. Real stories are brought in by personal observation.

Men aren't really trained today. They don't have to beat their way up.

I wouldn't trade my experience for any readymade job in the world.

No, the way to improvement is forward, not backward. I am utterly unable to be downhearted over the prospects of journalism in America. The genius of a free people will not let it wither. If we read aright the destiny of our country we shall continue to be its chroniclers; if not, better men will succeed us. But in any event the profession goes marching on.

Now if any of my friends here today ever expect to get into the newspaper field, keep the corners of your mouth turned up always, and think and work, work and think, and read this verse from Kipling every morning:

"And they asked me how I did it,  
And I gave 'em the Scripture test,  
You keep your light so shining  
A little in front o' the next."

"They copied all they could follow  
But they couldn't copy my mind,  
And I left 'em sweating and stealing  
A year and a half behind."

Once a newspaperman—always that. Such is the alluring fascination of this work.  
I thank you.

[From the Delaware State News of January 27, 1958]

NEWSPAPERMEN'S NEWSPAPERMAN

Fred C. Reybold is 84 years of age. But you would never think it if you had been one of the distinguished guests or a member of the Del-Mar-Va Press Association meeting at the Dover Hotel on Saturday.

Reybold was the main speaker at the annual convention. And the talk he gave made us realize that we are indeed fortunate to be journalists. Rich with humor, filled with well related reminiscences, his speech was an inspiration to all those present.

Starting back in 1893 on the Philadelphia Record, this native Delawarean soon made a name for himself in the business of reporting news. Later he came back to Wilmington where he became a part owner and editor of the Every Evening which later merged with the Journal.

What was most interesting about the talk given by Reybold, in addition to the anecdotes which he told so well, was the challenge he hurled at the newspapers of today. He has real faith in their ability to do a job. But he emphasized that the job cannot be done by lazy people who are not aware of the importance of what they are doing.

By custom his talk was held to 29 minutes. But President Dan Tabler was able to get Reybold on his feet again to tell a fascinating story of how he covered the story of a ship filled with refugees from an earthquake in Jamaica coming up the Delaware Bay shortly after the turn of the century.

One part of the talk, which Reybold had prepared for delivery, was on how to run a newspaper. His obvious dedication to the importance of press freedom to America was truly impressive. In fact, United States Senator J. ALLEN FREAR, who was present at the meeting, asked for a copy to be inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Newspapers are important only to the extent they do their job—of keeping the citizens of a democracy informed. Reybold, with his four score and four years, gave his fellow journalists great inspiration and much to think about.

This gentleman is a newspaperman's newspaperman. May he live many more useful and fruitful years.

# WHY THE FEDERAL LOTTERY PROPOSAL OF THE DIRECTOR OF THE BUDGET IS FUNDAMENTALLY UNWISE AND UNSOUND

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I desire to state for the RECORD my emphatic opposition to the recent proposal of Budget Director Brundage that we rely upon a Federal lottery to collect funds for the United States Treasury.

This suggestion is inherently wrong for three basic reasons, in my opinion:

First. It would tap the pocketbooks of our citizens, not on the fair basis of ability to pay but merely based upon who was the victim of a gambling neurosis.

Second. It inevitably would encourage State and local governments to depend upon a similarly unsound method of filling their coffers.

Third. It would have an unfortunate impact upon the Nation's standard of living, because many of those pouring their incomes into the Federal lottery might be the heads of large families with only limited financial means.

As I see it, Mr. President, a form of Federal lottery would put the imprint of the United States Government on legalized gambling. The prestige of Congress and the White House then would back such a proposal. Once the Federal Government had endorsed this kind of operation for raising Federal revenues, how could we censure any States or localities which followed suit by legalizing slot machines, roulette wheels, pinball machines, or dice games? Gambling is gambling. How are we going to draw the line?

Every study ever made of legalized gambling has demonstrated an adverse impact on the general economy of the area. Family savings are drained by men who cannot resist the lure of a lottery or a slot-machine handle. In his book, *Gambling: Should It Be Legalized?* Mr. Virgil W. Peterson, director of the famous Chicago Crime Commission, has shown that "gambling is injurious to the morals and welfare of the people." This makes all the more inexplicable that a man so highly placed in our National Government as the Director of the Budget would suggest the collecting of Federal revenues with a national lottery. How can a minor hoodlum or corrupt magistrate now be assailed for voicing a similar proposal, when it has come from an office as influential as that of the President's Budget Director?

I am disappointed that Percival F. Brundage, Director of the Bureau of the Budget, recommended Federal lottery bonds to help collect revenues for the Treasury rather than proposing fairer and more equitable means. I would have preferred to hear the head of our Budget speak out in favor of abolishing depletion allowances for a few favored industries or in favor of reimposing the excess-profits tax on the manufacturers of armaments and munitions—a tax which the Republican national administration unwisely permitted to expire.

So that Members of the Senate may be familiar with the unhappy proposal made by the Director of the Budget, I ask that a New York Herald Tribune article of January 27, 1958, describing his unfortunate recommendation, be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

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

**BUDGET HEAD SUGGESTS FEDERAL LOTTERY BONDS—WOULD LIKE TO TAP GAMBLING MONEY WITH BONUS ISSUE; DOUBTS APPROVAL**

WASHINGTON, January 26.—Percival F. Brundage, Director of the Budget, said today he would like to find some way of tapping the money Americans spend on gambling. He suggested experimenting with a bond issue that would bear a redemption bonus for the lucky.

Mr. Brundage made the comments on the NBC television show "Youth Wants To Know" when asked if he thought a national lottery would solve all the problems of keeping the Federal budget in balance. His initial answer was "No; it would not, and that besides he did not think a national lottery a practical proposal."

## BRUNDAGE EXPLAINS

After making this remark Mr. Brundage paused for a moment of reflection. Then he added: "But I hate to see all the benefits of the gambling that's done going to the underworld."

Pressed to elaborate, Mr. Brundage said: "I wouldn't mind experimenting with a bond issue with a redemption bonus or something like that."

Then he laughed and added: "But I don't think the Secretary of the Treasury would approve."

His apparent reference was to the British bond lottery. By this system bonds are sold to the public at \$2.80, each of a short redemption period. When the numbers are called some holders receive as much as \$2,800 interest—others, the majority, receive only their money back.

## APPROPRIATION FEARS

Speaking on the present budget, Mr. Brundage said he feared Congress will appropriate more money this year than has been requested by the administration. He said the budget is sound, well balanced, and big enough to meet the Nation's defense needs as it stands, but that "Congress may throw some money into specific, earmarked areas where we might find later that we could better have spent the money elsewhere."

Explaining that he never knew a scientist who was satisfied with the amount of money provided for projects, he said that the \$73,900,000,000 budget gives ample flexibility to take care of emergency defense needs. Of this sum, Mr. Brundage said, \$500 million is to be used, if necessary, to explore breakthroughs in weapons development. Another \$2 billion was flexibly arranged, he said, to be shifted as needed to any defense project. Some Senate Democrats have said they intend to have \$2 billion earmarked specifically for missile development.

Mr. Brundage reiterated the administration's stand that the 1959 budget can be balanced without any tax increase and that the current business slump is not so serious as to cut the Government's anticipated receipts below budget estimates.

## UNITED STATES-SOVIET AGREEMENT PROVIDING FOR CERTAIN EXCHANGES

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, announcement was made yesterday of the

signing of a United States-Soviet agreement providing for cultural, technical, educational, and sports exchanges between the Soviet Union and the United States and for exchanges in radio, TV, and film, subject to reciprocal veto. This agreement is tangible recognition of the basic fact that peace between nations must be firmly based upon understanding between peoples.

If I may have the attention of the distinguished majority leader, who is present on the floor, I should like to compliment him and applaud his initiative in having originally suggested the mutuality of broadcast exchange between the United States and the Soviet Union and upon the occasion of the famous CBS telecast last year. I feel that kind of action, and the actions of others of us who have been working in this field, are a proper basis for what is needed.

I have mentioned this before, and my reason for calling the attention of the majority leader to it now is that I think he is entitled to hear our thanks for what he did, and I express the hope that we in the Congress may also make our contributions in this matter.

I have a resolution relative to the subject pending before the Committee on Foreign Relations. I imagine there are other resolutions to the same effect, all with the purpose of having affirmative action taken in regard to what has been done in the executive department.

In addition to the statement of the distinguished majority leader on policy, it seems to me that if we think through how we in the Congress can have our weight and our authority and prestige in this field of world peace, directly leveled at the issues which involve us and the Russian people, it will be most helpful.

I respectfully lay this matter before the majority leader, knowing his views on the subject only too well, and calling it to his attention.

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

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. First, let me say the Senator's interest and encouragement has been a source of stimulation to me. I thank him for his most thoughtful references to me. I recall with a great deal of pleasure my visit to the great city from which he comes on the occasion when I made certain observations. Naturally I am very pleased the Senator has concurred in some of the views I have expressed, and I trust that the action of the executive department may be in keeping with some of those views.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank the Senator. I hope very much we may have the earliest possible action by the Committee on Foreign Relations on my own resolution, Senate Concurrent Resolution 44, as well as other resolutions, which will place the weight of the Congress behind this whole effort toward mutual exchanges. My resolution applies particularly to students and professors. This is an area to which the President referred yesterday. I hope very much we may have Congressional action and Senate committee action equivalent to the very distinguished proposal of the majority leader.



The people of the United States have already demonstrated their receptiveness to giving fair considerations to what the Russians have to say. This is indicated by the millions who viewed the Khrushchev telecast last year, by the demonstrated appreciation of Russian cultural offerings in the arts, such as pianist Gilels, violinist Oistrakh, and by the Bolshoi Ballet; the free and wide circulation of pronouncements of Soviet leaders, such as that given the December letter from Premier Bulganin to President Eisenhower; by the acceptance by American newspapers of in-tourist advertisements urging visits to the Soviet Union, by the hundreds of Americans who went as tourists to the U. S. S. R. last year; and by the open and friendly reception given the limited number of Soviet delegations visiting the United States during recent years. I would hope that the Russians will permit "Visit U. S. A." ads in Pravda and Izvestia as we have in recent months welcomed such Soviet advertisements in American papers.

The Congress last year, by enactment of section 8 of Public Law 85-316, paved the way for removal of the netting fingerprinting requirement which had proven such a hindrance to visits to the United States from abroad, especially from areas behind the Iron Curtain.

The path of progress for peaceful understanding lies before us. A look at a world map will remind us that the Soviet Union is a close neighbor, separated only by a few miles of the Bering Strait from United States territory; Washington is closer to Moscow by jet airliner than it is to San Francisco by train or highway. Our ties of peace with the people of Canada and Mexico have been forged by understanding; Americans working and visiting in Germany and Japan have won the confidence of these nations and assured their intentions of peace and friendship toward us more firmly than did years of war.

But the Congress has a role, too, in this endeavor. In the satellite nations behind the Iron Curtain in Europe lies a great reservoir of regard and respect for the United States. American customs, fashions, and music are avidly copied by the peoples of the satellite nations; American political freedom and economic progress continue to serve as an inspiration and a goal. Bonds of blood and relationship exist strong between Americans and Poles and Czechs; Americans, Hungarians, and Rumanians; and between Americans and others in the Communist bloc.

On August 4, last, I introduced Senate Concurrent Resolution 44, designed to implement the reciprocal cultural exchange program between the United States and the Communist bloc nations of Europe under the provisions of the United States Information and Educational Exchange Act, particularly with respect to student's exchange at the suggestion of President Eisenhower. This measure is presently pending before the Committee on Foreign Relations and I hope for early action on it by that committee.

The Senate will have an opportunity to ratify the recently concluded United

States-Soviet agreement. The Congress, speaking as it does in our Republican Government for the entire people of the United States, should also not only endorse the stated objectives of the agreement but also its basic objections, strengthen them and open the way for their expansion, when desired, and of their effective implementation. The physicists speak of the conservation of matter—the indestructibility of chemical elements. We must not overlook the conservation of ideas—the indestructibility of man's aspirations for freedom and the "pursuit of happiness." It is we, not communism, who must serve as the inspiration to the peoples of the world. To gain appreciation for our showcase of democracy it must be viewed; to gain circulation for our ideals, they must be exported. The interexchange agreement concluded yesterday after 2 years of extended negotiations marks an opportunity for assuring the peace, an opportunity which it is incumbent upon us to exploit to the fullest. I hope that we shall have early action on Senate Concurrent Resolution 44.

#### PRICE SUPPORTS ON DAIRY PRODUCTS

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I am sure that the mail, in recent days, has been bringing to every Senate office a steady shower of letters vehemently protesting the administration's action in cutting the dairy support price. The farmers who produce the milk and cream are generally too busy to engage in letter-writing campaigns. But the Secretary of Agriculture certainly stirred up a campaign when he announced, in December, that beginning April 1, 1958, support levels for both manufacturing milk and butterfat would be dropped to 75 percent of parity. With one exception, my mail contains only letters of agreement with S. 2924, the bill relating to price support on dairy products, in which I joined as 1 of 17 cosponsors with the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], who introduced the measure. The individual voices of dairy farmers are swelling now with the chorus of farm groups whose resolutions are beginning to arrive. I am sure copies of the resolutions are also being delivered to the office of Mr. Benson. I urge him to study these protests carefully. I hope he will thoughtfully consider the unanimity of the opposition and rescind the cut in supports scheduled to become effective April 1, 1958.

Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a resolution passed by the Farmers' Union and local dairymen of Milton-Freewater, Oreg., at a joint meeting held January 9, 1958, and a December 19 resolution from the Oregon Trail Grange, of Nyssa, Oreg.

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

MILTON-FREEWATER, OREG.,  
January 10, 1958.

HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER,  
United States Congress,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: At a joint meeting of Farmers Union, and local dairymen on January 9, it

was unanimously voted to adopt the following resolution:

We, as members of Twin City local Farmers Union, and dairy grade A milk producers, have voted to go on record as opposing the parity support price cut, that Secretary Ezra Benson has proposed to put into effect on April 1, 1958.

CHESTER A. FERGUSON,  
President, Twin City Local No. 292.  
MABEL KNOSP,  
Secretary.

OREGON TRAIL GRANGE, No. 687,  
Nyssa, Oreg., December 21, 1957.  
HON. RICHARD L. NEUBERGER,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR NEUBERGER: The Oregon Trail Grange at a meeting December 19 went on record as being opposed to a reduction in the subsidy to the dairy industry. Sincerely yours,

F. R. RUNCORN,  
Secretary.

#### LET US BUILD SCHOOLS

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, of all the messages sent to the Congress by the President, the education message delivered yesterday is by far the most disappointing.

It is, in fact, the poorest excuse of a Presidential education message that has yet slithered out of the White House.

From the very first sentence, the President virtually apologizes to the American people for interfering in their God-given right to send their first-class children to second- and third-class schools.

He gives national security as his excuse for the Federal Government's taking an emergency role.

The program that follows is a hodgepodge of penny-pinching acknowledgments that certain problems do exist in education.

I think it is significant that the President refuses to claim this little gesture as his own. He tells us that it was recommended by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare and the Director of the National Science Foundation, and that he approved it. Perhaps the President is ashamed to claim the program for his own—and he should be.

The foremost problem the President completely and deliberately overlooked was the vital need for assistance to States in school construction. I say it was a deliberate oversight, because the President's memory is not that short.

Last year, in his 1957 education message, the President said:

Of all the problems, one is most critical. In 1955, and again last year, I called attention to the critical shortage of classrooms in many communities across the country. \* \* \* I again urge the Congress to act quickly upon this pressing problem.

A year ago the President said classrooms were scarce, and he remembered he had said the same thing in 1955 and 1956.

What has happened in the past 12 months to cause the President to ignore his own warnings of the past 3 years? I do not know what caused the President to change his mind, but I know nothing has happened to change the critical shortage of classrooms.

I think this year we must reverse the procedure. Let Congress send an education message to the President. Let us send him an education bill and demand his signature. Let it include the matters he suggests to meet the national security interest, but let it also include a frontal attack on the classroom shortage with a Federal-aid program.

#### THE SCHOOL LUNCH PROGRAM

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, on January 23 I addressed a letter to the chairman of the Agriculture Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, calling his attention to the fact that the President has again failed to request sufficient funds to permit the school lunch program to keep pace with our growing student population.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed as a part of the RECORD at this point my letter of January 23 to Senator RUSSELL.

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

JANUARY 23, 1958.

Hon. RICHARD B. RUSSELL,  
Chairman, Agriculture Subcommittee,  
Committee on Appropriations,  
United States Senate, Washington,  
D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: In the President's budget I note that the request for the whole school lunch program has remained at \$100 million for fiscal year 1959, despite a steadily increasing number of children of school age, and an increasing participation of school children in the program.

According to figures furnished me by the United States Office of Education, there will be an estimated increase of American school children enrolled in the fall of 1958 of 3,142,000 more than were enrolled in the fall term of 1956. That is an increase of approximately 7.7 percent.

According to the Department of Agriculture, the participation of school children in the school lunch program will rise by an estimated 2,145,000—or 20 percent more than the number participating in the fiscal 1957 program.

Yet we see the President requesting an increase of only one-fifth of 1 percent over the appropriation for fiscal 1957, and no increase whatsoever over last year's appropriation.

It is simply incredible that the President would not see fit to request an amount which would permit this great humanitarian program to function at least on the same per capita level as 2 years ago. The results of appropriating only \$100 million, as the budget requests, will of course, be to cut the 1957 program by 20 percent. More specifically, I am attaching for the information of the agriculture subcommittee a discouraging report prepared by Mr. A. R. Taylor, the director of the Minnesota community lunch program detailing the severe cutbacks in Federal assistance to Minnesota's school lunch program already taking place. Numerous Minnesota school district superintendents have also brought this acute situation to my attention.

In the interest of at least holding the line on this magnificent program, I strongly urge the appropriation for this program of \$120 million for the fiscal 1959 program—an increase over the budget request of \$20 million.

I consider this program of great importance to our farm economy and of critical importance to the health and well-being of our young people. Knowing of your deep in-

terest in the welfare of our farming population, and of our Nation's school children, I sincerely hope that you will do everything possible to secure the subcommittee's recommendation for an increase in the budget request.

Kindest personal regards.

Sincerely yours,

HUBERT H. HUMPHREY.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I call to my colleagues' attention the fact that it is not necessary to introduce special legislation for this purpose, but I did wish to alert them to the fact that I have requested an additional amount of at least \$20 million for the fiscal year ending in June 1959. Surely every Member of the Senate will wish to join me in this effort to boost the program back at least to the level of 2 years ago.

Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a letter I have just received from Donald H. Dunham, of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, supporting my effort to increase the amount requested for the school lunch program.

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

RETIREMENT, SAFETY, AND  
INSURANCE DEPARTMENT,  
NATIONAL RURAL ELECTRIC  
COOPERATIVE ASSOCIATION,  
Washington, D. C., January 27, 1958.

The Honorable HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR HUMPHREY: I certainly wish to indicate our stand on behalf of your drive to restore the Nation's school lunch program at least to the level it was operating on last year. Our association is truly a farm organization representing over 3 million rural farm families. We are contacting Senator RUSSELL to do everything possible to secure the subcommittee's recommendation for an increase in the budget request for the school lunch program.

I consider this program of great importance to our farmer members and the continued health and well-being of the young people of our membership.

Very sincerely yours,

DONALD H. DUNHAM,  
Department Director.

#### URGENT NEED FOR FEDERAL PROGRAMS IN FIELD OF HEALTH

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, few tasks before us are more urgent than that of providing adequate appropriations and levels of pay for the men and women who are engaged in medical research. Upon their success depends whether or not we shall find answers to the grim riddles of cancer, heart disease, blindness, and other plagues harassing the human race.

I have been disappointed to note that the administration's budget does not recommend increases in the funds for the National Institutes of Health, although the research demands upon this great institution are larger and more numerous than ever before.

In my own State of Oregon, great advances in medical research have been attained at the University of Oregon Medical School, at the University of Oregon itself, at Oregon State College, at the University of Oregon Dental

School, and at other institutions—both public and private—which receive grants from the National Institutes of Health.

In the Sunday Journal of Portland for January 5, 1958, my views on this vital subject were developed at substantial length. I wish to thank the editors of the Journal for the opportunity thus afforded me, because of the critical importance of this topic. I likewise would like to call to the attention of my colleagues the fact that, in this article in the Journal of Portland, I have emphasized the great contribution made to medical research generally, and to the National Cancer Institute in particular, by two Members of the Senate with far wider influence and prestige than I possess. These Members are the distinguished senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] and the distinguished senior Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH]. All of us in the Senate—and indeed all members of mankind everywhere—are indebted to them for the effective and persistent effort they have waged to place at the disposal of medical researchers the funds essential to their life-and-death task. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my article from the Journal of January 5, 1958, entitled "\$40 Billion for Arms—Why Not \$500 Million for Cancer?—Let's Halt Cancer—Now," be printed in the body of the RECORD.

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

FORTY BILLION DOLLARS FOR ARMS—WHY NOT  
\$500 MILLION FOR CANCER?—LET'S HALT  
CANCER NOW

(By Senator RICHARD L. NEUBERGER)

If the United States Government can invest over \$40 billion in weapons of war, why not appropriate a stake of at least \$500 million in the war against the most merciless killer of all—cancer? I ask myself this question a hundred times when I pour through the vast volume known as the President's budget.

My dominant interest as a United States Senator is not in public power, as many people undoubtedly believe. It is in a sweeping crash program of Federal support for medical research in general and into the causes and possible cure of cancer in particular. I am most proud of the fact that, in the 3 years that I have served in the Senate, I have had some slight role in increasing funds for the National Cancer Institute from \$21 million to \$56 million.

Yet even this sum is but a token. It takes \$1 million repeated 1,000 times to make just \$1 billion. While we will spend \$10 billion on naval vessels which soon may be obsolete, we invest merely a fraction of this in the National Cancer Institute.

Americans spend annually \$15 billion on liquor and tobacco. They pay \$27 billion for automobiles. They spend \$3.2 billion for TV and radio sets. But for cancer research their Government puts up only \$56 million. Consider that 2½ times as many people died of cancer during World War II as were slain in action on all our worldwide battlefronts.

In 1 year, cancer claimed nearly 10 times the number of Americans who perished during 3 years of Korean fighting. At the present frightening rate, 40 million Americans are destined to have cancer and approximately 26 million of these will die from it.

My wife, Maurine, and I shall never forget the grim but stirring day we spent visiting the Jimmy Fund Building of Children's Hospital in Boston, where more children are be-



ing treated for cancer than any other place on earth.

There we were shocked to learn from Dr. Sidney Farber, the great pathologist of Harvard Medical School, that more children under 14 die of cancer than of any other disease. Indeed, during the last year prior to development of the Salk vaccine, polio killed 579 children but cancer took 3,761.

Our interest centers now in the verdant countryside of Maryland near Washington, D. C. There, at Bethesda, a stately and imposing hospital towers above a cluster of pillared buildings. This is the National Institutes of Health, founded a decade ago by our Government to sponsor research into the deadliest diseases which plague mankind.

Seven separate branches comprise the national institutes. These conduct research into extraordinary cases from all over the land, who are treated investigatively at the huge hospital. Treatment is free. It is the most elaborate and painstaking which money can buy—money paid in taxes by you and me. It is undertaken in the hope that some discovery or breakthrough will be attained which then can help to treat millions of other cases elsewhere in our country.

The national institutes also sponsor generous grants to clinics, medical schools, research laboratories and doctors in all 48 States. The grants are approved by boards consisting of famous medical authorities like Dr. Farber, Dr. Isador Ravdin of the team who operated on President Eisenhower; Dr. Shields Warren, Dr. Stanley Sarnoff and many others.

Although I have been criticized as an advocate of socialized medicine because of my active support of the national institutes, the basic fact remains that 65 percent of the funds available to the national cancer institute are earmarked for grants to non-Federal investigators or private institutions.

For example, during the fiscal year 1957, a total of 6,452 such research grants were made by all the institutes throughout the Nation, disbursing a total of \$82,000,000. Oregon's research allotments were divided as follows by the seven major categories of the national institutes:

National Institute of Arthritis and Metabolic diseases.....	\$149,623
National Institute of Neurological Diseases and Blindness.....	96,704
National Institute of Dental Research.....	32,392
National Institute of Allergy.....	37,728
National Cancer Institute.....	210,833
National Heart Institute.....	105,777
National Institute of Mental Health.....	41,220

This compilation will serve to indicate the impact of the program on a State the size of Oregon, which contains almost precisely 1 percent of the national population. By far the bulk of the funds granted to this State have gone to the University of Oregon school at Portland—a total of 31 grants amounting to \$475,108 in value.

Next has been Oregon State College with 18 grants totaling \$138,514. University of Oregon at Eugene has received 8 grants aggregating \$66,636, while all the Oregon funds from the National Institute of Dental Research have been assigned to the University of Oregon Dental School.

One of the most substantial grants made to a single project in Oregon has been that for \$74,511 to the university's medical school for a study of tissue culture and metabolism in leukemia, which is the deadly cancer of the bloodstream. This undertaking has been supervised by Dr. Edwin E. Osgood, head of the school's division of experimental medicine.

It is typical of the allotments made by the National Cancer Institute. When Maurine and I were at lunch with the famous researchers on the staff of Children's Hospital,

we learned their high opinion of the research qualifications of Dean David W. E. Baird, Dr. Frank B. Queen, Dr. Osgood, and others on the faculty of Oregon's Medical School.

But is enough being done? The total budget of all the National Institutes of Health for the present fiscal year amounts to \$241,183,000. This seems like an immense total to the average taxpayer. Yet contrast it with nearly \$8 billion for carrying the national debt, \$5 billion for the Department of Agriculture, that \$15 billion for liquor and tobacco, and \$3 billion for movies and sports admissions.

As these words are written, a letter comes to my desk from H. J. Rand, president of the Rand Development Corp., a private research organization. In support of my bill for \$500 million for the National Cancer Institute, Mr. Rand writes that he believes a major breakthrough has been made.

"It only requires money and time to exploit this breakthrough. I would estimate that four times the amount of funds could be used in this project without straining our facilities. A major amount of the invaluable time of key research personnel is spent in fund raising. Even work at the National Cancer Institute is being retarded by lack of funds. I suggest that a Senate investigation might bring these facts into the open."

Dr. Isador Ravdin, himself a celebrated surgeon, has said that surgery and X-rays may have reached their zenith in the treatment of cancer—that the dominant hope for a genuine discovery now rests in what is known as chemotherapy. This means some compound that may retard the wild growth of malignant cells. It also means the expenditure of enormous amounts of money.

We were told at Children's Hospital that, a decade ago, the youngster suffering from leukemia survived an average time of 4 to 6 weeks after diagnosis. Now survivals at the hospital average from 16 to 20 months. The difference is caused by compounds which retard but, alas, do not halt the sinister disease.

Dr. Farber told us that some 30,000 mouse tests annually are used to determine the value of such compounds. He showed Maurine and me samples of mice in which cancers have been planted and then made to disappear completely, all by result of chemotherapy.

Unfortunately, the compounds retain many toxic properties and cannot be risked on human patients. "But we ought to be making not 30,000 tests a year," said Dr. Farber, "but 300,000 tests or even 3 million."

This sense of urgency lies behind the thinking of Dr. Farber, Dr. Shields Warren, and others that Federal cancer research funds should be on a continuing basis. By this they mean the money should hold over from year to year. Budgets for cancer investigation, they claim, cannot be handled on a fiscal-year basis. It must be known far in advance that funds will be available for lengthy programs. Skilled researchers must have some permanence of tenure.

My bill provides that the sum of \$500 million for cancer study shall "remain available until expended." The purpose of this provision is to let the medical boards of the National Cancer Institute know that they do not have to spend the money at an unwisely fast rate, if sound proposals for research seem lacking. I am confident that the bulk of the grants would continue to go to medical schools and other non-Federal outlets.

Happily, this need for more extensive governmental financing of cancer research is not a partisan issue. And why should it be? Cancer is no respecter of political parties or of pocketbooks.

In my efforts to expand funds for the National Cancer Institute, I have found complete support and agreement from two Mem-

bers of the Senate with far wider influence and prestige than I possess.

One is Mrs. MARGARET CHASE SMITH of Maine, the only woman Member of the upper Chamber of Congress. She has long argued for greater encouragement for medical research. The other is LISTER HILL of Alabama, descendent of a long line of illustrious physicians and himself named for the noted British surgeon, Sir Joseph Lister. Mrs. SMITH is a Republican and Senator HILL a Democrat, and that is as it should be.

I am certain the sum of \$500 million, to be disbursed by medical researchers in pursuit of a single disease, undoubtedly sounds like a lot of money to a citizen struggling with his income-tax return.

Yet Dr. Queen at the University of Oregon Medical School pointed out recently that the cost of cancer in Oregon alone each year totals \$143 million and in the State of Washington some \$217 million. In two States of comparatively small population, cancer thus costs over a third of a billion dollars annually.

Today we look back with compassion on the era of the frontier, when scarlet fever or diphtheria were most of the time fatal maladies. These diseases now respond to vaccines and protective serums. Will a future generation regard with equal pity our own staggering mortality from cancer? Some of America's greatest medical researchers have told me that such sympathy may possibly be avoided if a genuine "crash" program of basic research is financed and supported.

I am certain many readers of this article wonder why such splendid nongovernmental groups as the American Cancer Society and the Damon Runyon Memorial Fund are not adequate to finance all the research that is needed. These organizations do splendid work. They command the allegiance of outstanding and unselfish people. It was a great honor recently for me to be asked by the Runyon Fund to present a \$15,000 donation for cancer-research projects to Drs. T. B. Fitzpatrick and H. S. Mason of the University of Oregon Medical School.

But the sheer magnitude of the cancer problem calls for governmental funds on a vast scale. To date the Damon Runyon Fund, dedicated to the gifted author who died of cancer of the throat, has disbursed \$11,345,378 in all 48 States and 18 foreign countries for cancer investigations. This must be compared with the \$56 million spent in a single year by the National Cancer Institute and with \$500 million which leading researchers look upon as a goal.

One further thought occurs to me, in advocating an accelerated program of study in this life-or-death field. Millions of Americans are troubled over Russia's startling new ascendancy in the realm of space conquest. They worry about our prestige and standing internationally. They wanted the United States to thrust a bigger and heavier satellite even farther into the unknown reaches of the universe.

But what if America, instead of doing this, could announce some day that at last a genuine breakthrough had been made in the study of human cells running rampant and that the terrible riddle of cancer had been solved?

Another moon to match the travels of Sputnik or a compound to halt the ravages of cancer—which of the two announcements would make the name of America blessed among all the peoples of the earth?

#### THE ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY AND THE GREAT LAKES CONNECTING CHANNELS

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, in the spring of next year, one of the great maritime milestones of this country will

occur when the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Seaway is officially opened.

Our pleasure in dedicating this great engineering artery into the heart of the North American Continent will be dampened, so to speak, by but one thought: The seaway—for the immediate present—will really be only half a seaway. The reason will of course be that 27-foot deep-draft shipping can be accommodated only as far as Lake Erie, until connecting channels to the upper Lake States are deepened and improved.

Under the circumstances, it becomes imperative that funds be allocated to complete these channels by the earliest possible date.

In all of our advance planning to date, 1962 has been the target deadline for the completion of the channel work. This is not an early target by any means.

But now, we learn that because of the pressure for overall economy in civilian-type expenditures in the next fiscal year's budget, there is going to be a slowdown or, some might call it, a stretch-out in the present channel improvement plans.

My purpose in speaking today is to point out, however, that the channel work is a capital improvement of interest to 30 million people. It is no ordinary river and harbor project. Channel funds cannot be considered in the same class as an appropriation to improve some harbor, say, in the gulf, or on the east or west coasts, or even a Great Lakes port itself.

On the contrary, the channels are the indispensable second half of the entire vast project, a second half which makes the first half expenditure completely sound.

Remember, we of the upper Lake States will still be cut off, so to speak, from deep-draft shipping until the channels are improved.

Up until now, we have been limited in our commerce basically because of the inability of deep-draft navigation to get through the International Rapids section of the St. Lawrence Seaway. Now, that is being taken care of by seaway construction. But we have also been limited from deep-draft shipping because of the impassability of the present upper channels to deep-draft shipping.

Speed, therefore, is of the essence in completing the seaway.

The case for it can be summarized:

First. America is facing a dip in her economy. Channel construction funds will help generate economic activity, directly and indirectly. Channel funds will help open up the great market of the upper Lake States to increased employment, increased commerce.

Second. Completion of the channel work is an act of elementary justice for the upper Lake States. It is these States which the record will show—fought longest, hardest and most consistently for the seaway, in the 30-year battle for it.

The very least that they can expect is that they shall receive the benefit of the seaway at the earliest possible date.

Third. Uncle Sam cannot fully realize his own overall investment in the Inter-

national Rapids section until the full 2,300-mile seaway is opened to deep-draft shipping.

I send to the desk now two items: The first is an editorial from the Milwaukee Journal, issue of January 24, which emphasizes the importance of completing the Great Lakes connecting channels. The second is an excellent summary of the progress on the main seaway construction job itself. This summary was presented by the information officer of the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation, Mr. Edward R. Place, at Nashua, N. H., earlier this month. Mr. Place's speech documented the tremendous interest throughout the Nation and abroad in this great overall project. I ask unanimous consent that both these items be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the Milwaukee Journal of January 24, 1958]

#### DEEPEN LAKES CHANNELS SOON

A good example of false economy is the proposed slowdown on deepening connecting channels between the western Great Lakes as part of the St. Lawrence Seaway project.

There are 130 miles of connecting channels, including the St. Clair River, Lake St. Clair, Detroit River, St. Marys River, and the Straits of Mackinac—joining Lakes Erie, Huron, Michigan, and Superior. They are to be deepened to 27 feet. Now ships calling at Milwaukee are limited to 21-foot channels incoming and 25-foot channels outbound on their way from Lake Erie to Lake Michigan.

The seaway is due to be completed in 1959. It will provide a minimum 27-foot (instead of the present 14-foot) route into Lake Erie. The channel deepening project was scheduled to be completed in 1962. But under the budget plans of President Eisenhower annual expenditures for the channel work would be cut almost in half, forcing a stretchout of the work to 1965.

As it is, Milwaukee will not get the full benefits of larger shipping that the seaway will make possible at the time the seaway is finished. If the President's proposal is adopted, Milwaukee will not get full benefits for as long as 6 years after the seaway completion.

It wouldn't make sense to go to the expense of running water pipes into a home and then decide to save money by not providing faucets for 3 years. The channel expenditures are going to be made as part of the capital improvements program. The way to get the most benefit out of the seaway is to start using it as soon as possible. If larger shipping is blocked from Lake Michigan it is bound to restrict not only the benefits lake ports hope for but the amount of tolls which are to go toward paying seaway costs.

The seaway is being built. The channel work is an integral part of the seaway development. The wisest economy would be to push the work as rapidly as possible and to get the project into business. It's false economy to postpone the day when the seaway can realize its full potential.

#### WORLD SPOTLIGHT ON ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY

(Address by Edward R. Place, information officer, St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation, at Unitarian-Universalist Church, Nashua, N. H.)

Forty-one years after the initial St. Lawrence Seaway power bill set off a long series of vigorously fought debates in the United States Congress, extending between 1917 and 1954, partial navigation of the fabulous international waterway is only 6 months away.

Today the project is about three-fourths completed.

From where we sit at the United States seaway headquarters offices in Washington, it can be said that the world spotlight is on the seaway. It may astonish many of you, occupied as you are with family, occupational, and community responsibilities, that the realization of a bold century-old dream is so near at hand.

Those of you who have not had leisure time to visit the seaway work sites during the past 3 years of earth-moving and construction miracle may with good reason wonder why all roads in the universe lead to Montreal, and Beauharnois, Cornwall, and Massena, Iroquois, and Welland.

During the course of my remarks this evening, I will report on various aspects here and abroad of interest and enthusiasm which appear to be portents for the seaway's success to a degree surpassing even the wildest hopes of generations of dedicated advocates from both sides of the Canadian-United States border.

My presence here as a representative of the Seaway Corporation, in response to your kind invitation of many weeks ago, proves to me that Nashuans, along with many other New Hampshire and New England citizens, have adopted a sensible and practical Yankee attitude toward the seaway. You accept the seaway power project as a nearly accomplished fact, and you want to know how you can best take advantage of the new power for manufacturing goods and the improved navigation facilities for moving goods.

In a recent address before the World Affairs Council in Milwaukee, Seaway Administrator Castle declared that all who are engaged in transportation services will share the benefits from the increasing import-export trade, of Canadian ore discoveries, along with laboratory research for new products, population growth, and industrialization in the Great Lakes Basin and St. Lawrence Valley.

"With all these favorable factors and trends so plainly evident today," he said, "no crystal balls are required to recognize that the St. Lawrence Seaway facilities will prove to be a great stimulus to our national economy. Instead of being a threat to other areas and other types of transport services, we believe the seaway should prove to be a boon to all services and to the country as a whole."

The seaway is an outstanding example of international cooperation in which two countries are together developing a project of great magnitude which will promote trade for their mutual benefit and that of other countries. These facilities will, therefore, contribute to the furtherance of the security and economic stability of the Free World.

The northern tip of New Hampshire is, roughly, 100 miles from the St. Lawrence River in Canada. Nashua, being in southern New Hampshire, is, of course, much farther removed. Even though New Hampshire is not 1 of the 8 States bordering on the seaway and the Great Lakes, or even 1 of the 9 States that are said to be directly tributary—that is, States from which trade can be expected to flow across the Great Lakes States to make use of the seaway—it cannot be assumed that the seaway will benefit only 17 States and less than half of our population.

The economy of the United States is so interdependent, with the welfare of citizens of one State depending upon the welfare of citizens of another State, that it is impossible for so large a segment of our economy to receive benefits without the good effects spreading to all of our citizens and to every State.

I would not venture to tell you that Nashua's manufactures of textiles, shoes, wood products, tools, hardware, and machinery will boom the moment the first ship passes through the Long Sault Canal and the new 80-foot seaway locks next July. On the other hand, you should not be discouraged



from exploring the benefits to business and trade through cheaper transportation costs the seaway will provide.

As a native New Englander, I have previously been given the opportunity to tell the seaway story in nearby Keene, in Portland and Presque Isle, Maine, and in Bennington, over in Vermont. It may interest you that Maine's potato farmers are intrigued with the idea of getting a highway for truck transports cut from Aroostook County through the Wilderness to serve as a link to the port of Quebec and Great Lakes markets for their spuds, via the seaway. As previously said, all roads—and, I might add, rails—lead to the seaway, now or eventually.

Winter has halted, or slowed down, the work on the billion-dollar seaway-power project, and the St. Lawrence River is closed to navigation until the ice breaks up in the spring. The combined working forces are far below summertime peak employment of around 15,000. Most of the contracts are on schedule.

In the International Rapids section the United States seaway project is in good shape. The Long Sault Canal, a big ditch 10 miles long, with a bottom width of 442 feet and a minimum depth of 27 feet, was virtually completed during December. The canal excavation contracts called for moving of 17 million cubic yards of earth and rock, while the two lock excavation contracts required moving more than 5 million cubic yards of material, a total of over 22 million cubic yards. Eisenhower lock was over 92 percent complete and Grasse River lock over 85 percent complete on December 1, 1957. More than 1 million cubic yards of concrete were placed in these massive structures, each of which will raise and lower ships 45 feet.

United States seaway facilities will open next July for 14-foot draft ships. This is necessitated by the raising of the power pool for generation of hydroelectric power. Some 38,000 acres will be inundated, forming a huge seaway lake and flooding out the existing Canadian 14-foot canals westward from Cornwall, Ontario. All river traffic in the International Rapids section would be blocked by the St. Lawrence power dam and Long Sault spillway dam unless the Long Sault Canal were completed, thus providing a bypass for ships around the power structures. St. Lawrence cargo volume now amounts to some 12 million tons annually.

During 1958, the Seaway Authority of Canada will concentrate upon completion of its four new seaway locks, St. Lambert and Cote Ste. Catherine above Montreal and the upper and lower locks located in the Beauharnois Power Canal. Canada's fifth lock at Iroquois was completed last fall, and a successful test run took place on November 22. Both the United States and Canada will continue dredging between Montreal and Lake Ontario, and Canada will complete the deepening of its Welland Ship Canal, connecting Lakes Ontario and Erie. Together the United States and Canada are building a high-level suspension bridge with 120-foot clearance for vessels, preliminary to tearing down the present span between Roosevelt town, N. Y., and Cornwall Island. During 1958 the Seaway Authority will occupy its new headquarters building at Cornwall and the Seaway Corporation will move into its new operations building at Massena.

In the spring of 1959, the stage will be set for oceangoing ships up to 27-foot draft to utilize the vastly modernized St. Lawrence Waterway, and engage in greatly expanded commerce and trade with St. Lawrence River and Great Lakes ports. Thus, one of the world's greatest engineering feats will have been accomplished and a mighty dream will have come true.

It is anticipated that the bigger ships from foreign lands as well as United States and Canadian fleets, representing over 80 percent of the world's cargo vessels, will

commence using the completed Montreal-to-Great Lakes Seaway in early April 1959. It is likely that the gala international ceremonies marking this historic event will be held over until balmy weather in May or June for the convenience of Britain's charming Queen Elizabeth, who has already announced her intention of participating in the seaway opening along with President Eisenhower, in whose first administration the Seaway Act was passed. Millions of Americans and Canadians will celebrate the realization of the fourth seacoast which will transform the Great Lakes into the world's eighth sea, sometimes referred to as America's Mediterranean.

By 1962, the connecting channels of the Great Lakes will be deepened to 27 feet from present depths of 21 feet upbound and 25 feet downbound, and the way will be cleared for a channel with a minimum depth of 27 feet all the way from the Atlantic to Duluth, Minn., and Port Arthur, Ontario, on Lake Superior. An incomparable inland waterway, 2,342 miles long, will bring ships flying the flags of a hundred nations into the heartland of our continent, making great seaports of inland ports and enriching the economy of the United States and Canada beyond measure.

There are heartening reports that ships especially designed for the seaway trade are being constructed in foreign shipyards. For example, two new passenger-cargo vessels being built by the Fjell-Oranje Line for Great Lakes service will be streamlined ships of about 9,000 deadweight tons with first-class accommodations for 100 passengers. The vessels are scheduled for delivery in the spring of 1959. The ships will operate from Rotterdam, the Netherlands, and probably English Channel ports to Montreal and Chicago.

Interest of European shipping officials in the seaway is indicated by the fact that Mr. Charles Sartori of the Hamburg Chicago Line and Mr. H. Steuch, general manager of the Baltic and International Maritime Conference, came over to attend and make constructive statements at the users' conferences conducted by the Seaway Corporation last September in Washington and Chicago. They also attended a similar conference in Ottawa, Canada.

The Seaway Corporation has been pleased to escort foreign shipping officials on inspection tours of the seaway construction area, among them a distinguished group from Norway.

Travel writers tell me that cruise promoters in France are considering the idea of transatlantic seaway excursions, providing tourists with a floating hotel while enjoying the sights and attractions to be found in such cities along the seaway route as Quebec, Montreal, Toronto, Buffalo, Cleveland, Toledo, Milwaukee, Chicago, and Duluth.

Potentialities for use of the scenic seaway for passenger ships are so challenging that Senator ALEXANDER WILEY, of Wisconsin, a coauthor of the Seaway Act, once proposed that they pay a toll of a dollar a head to help pay for seaway construction costs. However, the law as written now provides that the seaway be self-liquidating and self-sustaining through tolls to be paid by shippers during the next 50 years.

Among hundreds of seaway film showings which our information office has arranged during the past year in response to requests, there have been a number in European countries sponsored by miscellaneous organizations, including the Manchester Ship Canal Co. in England. Other requests have come from Switzerland, the Netherlands, and Cuba. I may say that the Seaway Corporation has produced two films in the Fourth Seacoast series and will produce three more.

One of the best of the non-Government films on the seaway construction is Caterpillar Tractor Co.'s the Eighth Sea, which has

been viewed by many hundreds of thousands throughout the United States and Canada and abroad.

It has been estimated that construction equipment being used by contractors on the seaway-power project is valued at around \$75 million, and the opportunity to watch these monster machines at work from public overlooks provided by the seaway and power entities has attracted a million or more tourists to the vantage points erected for seaway superintendents. Administrator Lewis G. Castle of the Seaway Corporation has often predicted that the seaway will equal or surpass Niagara Falls as America's No. 1 tourist attraction.

Le Vie Del Mondo, an Italian magazine published by Touring Club Italiano—a magazine very similar to our National Geographic—last September published an 18-page article on the seaway. Our press releases go to many countries, embassies, overseas shipping lines, and foreign publications, helping to focus the world spotlight on the seaway.

Last season the State Department sponsored a seaway tour, in cooperation with the Seaway Corporation, for 4 professors and 19 students from Guatemala University of San Carlos. Students were all members of the school of engineering graduating class.

From Japan came an inland-waterways group of 16, a party of 12 industrialists, and a smaller group of civil engineers and steel-company executives. Twelve engineers from Formosa made up another group touring the seaway project. Members of the Edinburgh Chamber of Commerce and manufacturers came from Scotland. Four engineers came from India. Officials of Germany's Kiel Canal, 20 students from England's Imperial Defense College, and other foreign delegations too numerous to mention inspected the seaway last year. We are preparing to welcome a group of Turkish public-utilities executives from Istanbul.

Distinguished Americans who recently toured the seaway include former President Herbert Hoover; Senator Theodore Francis Green, of Rhode Island, chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee; Senator George D. Aiken, of Vermont; Gov. Vernon W. Thompson, of Wisconsin; Admirals Hopwood, Libby, and Burrows, of the United States Navy; and a host of others. Chicago businessmen and industrialists filled a boat to capacity and inspected the seaway from afloat and ashore. Milwaukee industrialists chartered a plane for a 3-day seaway inspection trip arranged by Milwaukee Association of Commerce. Hundreds of buses stream to Massena and Cornwall with their loads of engineers, businessmen, school teachers, students, etc., for a look at the seaway. A large-scale tour for college engineering students is being organized for early April by a Milwaukee school official.

All roads lead to the seaway as the world spotlight plays on the greatest construction show on earth.

Is it any wonder that traffic and parking have become major problems for Massena, whose housing problem was already made critical by the influx of seaway workers? A new hotel and 53 trailer courts, at last count, have helped to ease the housing situation in the seaway's gateway city on our side of the border, while its industrial growth is assured by the new plants now under construction by the Reynolds Metals Co. and General Motors, and by the expansion of the existing plants of the Aluminum Company of America.

For generations the St. Lawrence Seaway was a favorite question for college debating teams, as well as a subject for themes, term papers, and the like. Very likely some of you folks here tonight will recall writing compositions on the seaway during your school days.

Today America's educational institutions are playing an important part in spotlighting the seaway power project.

In our colleges and universities, interest in the seaway is not confined to professors of economics, international law, political science, history, engineering, geology, agriculture, geography, transportation, and marketing. Students by the hundreds on campuses all over this country and Canada, as well as famous universities abroad, are researching and writing about the seaway. A student in Belgium actually visited our offices for a series of exhaustive interviews after corresponding with us for about a year.

In recent months, selected groups of Goucher College and American University students, accompanied by their professors, visited our Washington offices for a give-and-take discussion of the seaway project, following film showings and educational talks by several of our officers.

Indiana University's School of Business has published a valuable study on the effects of the seaway on grain movements and other agricultural products. Fenn College of Cleveland has prepared a study of the impact of the seaway on the port of Cleveland. Harold M. Mayer, associate professor of geography at the University of Chicago, has written a 288-page book-length study entitled "The Port of Chicago and the St. Lawrence Seaway." Marquette University has sponsored a comprehensive seaway forum. Many university law and engineering journals are featuring seaway articles. Recently Syracuse University professors published a book entitled "The New St. Lawrence Frontier."

Prof. Sargent Russell, of the University of Massachusetts, made research studies for a report by the New England Governors' Committee on Public Transportation. The report, entitled "The St. Lawrence Seaway and New England" was published in two parts. Professor Russell also has prepared a recent seaway study for the United States Department of Agriculture, entitled "Potentials of the St. Lawrence Seaway for Marketing United States Agricultural Commodities."

United States Military Academy cadets hold the unofficial collegiate championship for seaway literary efforts, on the basis of largest number of requests received from any single educational institution for our information materials to be used in writing theses. Students of Kent State University in Kent, Ohio, have been next most prolific in writing on various aspects of the seaway. Currently, several Harvard College students are doing research preparatory to writing papers on the seaway, possibly as a consequence of recent publication by the Boston Globe of a series of eight articles by Otto Zausmer, describing a Great Lakes-St. Lawrence voyage aboard a Dutch freighter.

College students are not alone in burning the midnight oil on seaway studies. Hundreds of grade and high-school students have written us for assistance on seaway projects of one kind or another. Several classes have collaborated on designing seaway exhibits, and one schoolboy has built a truly remarkable scale model of the seaway power project in the International Rapids section, complete even to running water.

One of the earliest and most profusely illustrated books on the seaway is "Billion Dollar Story," on which the editors of the Massena Observer have collaborated. We know of a dozen books on seaway history now being written, several to be used as school textbooks.

Recently off the press is Lowell Thomas' Story of the St. Lawrence Seaway, published by Henry Stewart, Inc., of Buffalo, N. Y. One sentence from Mr. Thomas' book pro-

vides a happy thought on which to close: "The seaway and power scheme is now one more powerful link in the chain of Canadian-American friendship."

#### CIVIL RIGHTS—ADDRESS IN LITTLE ROCK, ARK., BY PALMER HOYT OF DENVER, COLO.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, one of the courageous figures in American journalism today is my devoted friend, Palmer Hoyt, editor and publisher of the Denver Post, of Denver, Colo. He is a great editor because he is not afraid to champion unpopular causes. Typical of this able person in our fourth estate was his recent pilgrimage to Little Rock, Ark., where he spoke in favor of an enlightened attitude on civil rights and in opposition to the use of armed force to oppose civil-rights verdicts of a unanimous United States Supreme Court. It was characteristic of Palmer Hoyt that he took this stand in the presence of Governor Orval Faubus of Arkansas who had employed the National Guard to defy the Supreme Court and the President of the United States. To the credit of Governor Faubus, he listened courteously to Mr. Hoyt's address.

Mr. Hoyt likewise was true to his own beliefs when he praised two other valiant editors, J. N. Heiskell and Harry Ashmore, of the Little Arkansas Gazette, who have dared to print the news and to oppose the use of armed force during the Little Rock school-integration crisis.

It is easy and simple to speak in favor of school integration and orderly processes in a northern city. It requires far sterner stuff to do this in the South, whether you are a politician or an editor. We of the North too often fail to recognize this. We frequently are too hard on southerners in this regard. Palmer Hoyt's speech at Little Rock, Ark., to the Arkansas Press Association on January 10, 1958, was in the best tradition of such valiant figures in American journalism as William Lloyd Garrison, Elijah Lovejoy, and William Allen White. The following brief tribute to Mr. Hoyt appeared in the Pendleton East-Oregonian of January 18, 1958:

Ep Hoyt, editor and publisher of the Denver Post (his first newspaper job was on the East Oregonian), has been praised and condemned for statements he made at an Arkansas State press association banquet on the problems that grew out of integration at Little Rock high school. Our only comment is that it took courage to discuss the subject in Arkansas and when you're looking around the newspaper world for a man with courage you need look no farther than Ep Hoyt.

Inasmuch as I have referred extensively to the address in Little Rock by Palmer Hoyt on January 10, 1958, it is my belief that Members of the Senate will be interested in this outstanding speech, in which Mr. Hoyt has emphasized the unfortunate impression created overseas when "the armed power of an American State was involved to prevent nine Negro children from obtaining an education."

I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Hoyt's address be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

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

#### AMERICAN TRAGEDY IN THREE PARTS

(Speech by Palmer Hoyt, Arkansas Press Association, Little Rock, Ark., January 10, 1958)

Mr. President, Governor Faubus, members of the Arkansas Press Association, ladies and gentlemen, I am glad to be here tonight to talk to such a distinguished group of fellow newspapermen. And I am happy to have, at long last, the opportunity to meet one of America's most controversial figures—your own Governor, the Honorable Orval Faubus.

My father was a Baptist preacher, and I was brought up on the Bible.

One of my favorite Bible stories was that of a gentleman, name of Daniel, who, with a little urging, sauntered into a lions' den one day.

As a child, I used to wonder how old Dan felt when the gate clanged shut and he found himself alone with those lions.

Now I know. Because here I am. I'll have to agree that you are a nice-looking bunch of lions. Furthermore, I doubt if Daniel had the pleasure of being introduced by the head lion.

But even so, it occurs to me that, lest I be devoured, I had best make my position clear.

You know, first, that I am a newspaperman. As such, over a period of almost four decades, I have worked for better human relations but I have learned that good human relations cannot be legislated. They are the product of time, education, and effort.

Some of you may look upon me as a "damnyankee." May I say, parenthetically, that I was 25 years old before I knew "damnyankee" was only one word.

A few of you, and I hope it is only a few, may regard me as a carpetbagger.

I would be less than realistic if I didn't concede that newspapermen, damnyankees and carpetbaggers, all three, seem at the moment to be fairly unpopular in this great commonwealth.

Before embarking on my main thesis tonight, may I say—this I do believe: No man can reflect upon the incident known as "Little Rock" without feelings of compassion for the people intimately and personally involved. A community within the Nation that is troubled by internal dissension, harassed by external critics and humiliated by civil disorder is no less a sorry spectacle than a nation itself in the grip of civil war.

Let the millions of Americans outside of Arkansas ask themselves if they, under similar provocation from within or without, could comport themselves with greater poise or restraint.

I shall not presume to levy judgment upon your gracious Governor, Orval Faubus. What transpired here, after your school board set in motion a gradual program of integrating your public schools, has been exhaustively discussed by Arkansas' own press.

The facts have been widely and painfully appraised.

And, it seems to me that Little Rock's Arkansas Gazette, under the guidance of my friends, J. N. Heiskell and Harry Ashmore, reported accurately on the news of conditions within this city when the Arkansas National Guard was called into action. It is my personal view that the Gazette's editorial position has reflected great journalistic statesmanship. I have noted that the same is true of some other Arkansas papers.

It is not for me, as a newspaperman, damnyankee, carpetbagger, or whatnot, to evaluate the motives of any party to this case. I am, as you will see, less interested in motivation than in effect.

I have accepted your president's invitation to speak to you as a fellow American, and as



such to point out what seems to me to be certain inescapable facts and conclusions.

The first is, that you and I and all of us in the Free World are in a mess. If we don't do something about it soon, there will be no laws to squabble about and no way of life to preserve.

The second point is that we have all—our leaders and ourselves—had a hand in making this mess. We have been complacent about our ability to defend ourselves; selfishly materialistic and appallingly unconcerned with the consequence of our behavior upon the rest of the world—particularly the effect on the minds of men.

Suddenly we are awakened by the beeping of satellites, the flash of rockets not our own, and the unpleasant sound of angry words of men who do not love us.

And this is the background against which we may be on stage and performing an American tragedy in three acts.

As I have said, all 3 acts concern all of us, but 1 of them concerns you especially.

What are the acts of this unfolding, this implied tragedy?

The first is the effect and the impact of such episodes as the Little Rock case on our own respect for law and on our leadership of the free world.

The second act involves the economic challenges raised against the American people by the evil, if dedicated, geniuses in the Soviet Union.

The third act, and perhaps the climax of our tragedy, is built around the fundamental question of survival. Survival against internal economic collapse; survival against the threat of thermonuclear war or international blackmail in the age of the rocket, the missile and the platform in outer space.

The order of the acts is not accidental. Let me illustrate. Not long ago, I had dinner with Robert MacNeal, president of the Curtis Publishing Co., who had recently returned from India and Pakistan.

He had been in those countries after sputnik had been launched by the Soviet Union.

I asked Bob MacNeal what the newspapers of India and Pakistan said about this Russian scientific achievement—how were they taking it?

"Oh, they were impressed," he replied, "but the headlines were still devoted to Little Rock, not to sputnik."

Mr. MacNeal's observations have been substantiated repeatedly by American and foreign—friendly foreign—newspapermen.

Why Little Rock?

Why Little Rock of all places?

Arkansas has been associated in the minds of most Americans with moderation—with hard earned and solid progress in human understanding and economic recovery, with statesmanship on the national scene.

Yet the world believes that the armed power of an American state was involved to prevent nine Negro children from obtaining an education.

And bear in mind what an education means to the world's backward millions struggling for human identity, and bear in mind that of the world's 2½ billion people, two-thirds have colored skins.

The world believes that this action was so acceptable to the people of an American State that it took not alone the persuasive power of the courts, but the repressive power of superior armed force as well to reverse it. I'm not here tonight to argue with you whether those nine Negro children should be in that school or when. In the light of the present world crisis, that question is incidental.

The rest of the world is not going to wait around for us to make up our minds where we stand on integration.

The people of the rest of the world are making up their minds right now, whether to stand with us Americans or against us.

And it makes a lot of difference to the uncommitted people of the world where we—the American Nation—as the strongest remaining free nation—where we stand on integration.

These uncommitted people say to us, "How can you Americans, who claim to man the very citadel of democracy and equality, how can you insist on maintaining second-class citizenship? Do you Americans believe what you preach—or don't you?"

Unfortunately, we cannot answer them with "yes, but \* \* \*"

We cannot say to them, "Yes, but not now."

The other side is talking about right now and serving notice that there isn't time to pause and ponder. That there is time only to pick the winning side.

We cannot say to them "Yes, but there are some difficult legal questions involved."

Admittedly there are, and in those years when we had time to debate them, they were interesting.

Take the question of States rights for example.

To what extent are we, a single nation, bound to a single destiny; and to what extent are we a collection of 48 commonwealths, free to go our own separate ways and determine our own destinies?

Despite the millions of words that have been written on the subject, and the tragic lengths that men at times have gone to in disputing the issue, the concept of a nation made up of self-determining units set upon separate and divergent courses could not and cannot be made to work for very long.

Recently I read of experiences of the officers of the Confederacy even as they fought for the concept of State supremacy in the Civil War. They, who had written into the preamble of their constitution the words "We the people of the Confederate States, each State acting in its sovereign and independent character." They themselves were to experience the frustrations described by A. M. Houser, in his new book, *Lincoln's Education*, from which the following quote is taken. I quote:

"The officers of the new Confederacy had scarcely taken their seats before their chickens, led by State sovereignty and strict interpretation, began coming home to roost. It seemed impossible for them to make an order or pass a law but some court, commonwealth, or individual would declare it unconstitutional; therefore null, void, and of no effect.

"States claimed a right to withhold or withdraw their troops. Some organized a State militia, the members under their exclusive control and exempt from conscription by the general government. . . . One Christmas present received by the Confederate Government, in 1863, was a letter from Governor Vance, of North Carolina, threatening to collect his militia and levy war against the Confederate troops.

"A citizen of North Carolina, arrested by order of the Secretary of War, was rescued and set free by this militia. Some Confederate States passed exemption laws which rendered great bodies of men free from conscription by the general government.

"In 1863, it was estimated that one-half of all those available for military service either could not be found or had been exempted from service. The Confederate Congress repeatedly—twice in one week—refused the President permission to declare martial law. No Supreme Court was established, so each local judge decided the Constitution and laws in accordance with his own beliefs or prejudices."

That, my friends, is a matter of history.

When the concept of one Nation, under one flag, and cemented together by a single constitution, was affirmed in the blood of the Gray and the Blue, we as a people then

started on the rocky road of making that Constitution work. The Constitution was amended and interpreted many times in the light of changing conditions, new challenges, and the added enlightenment of education.

We have had many contests, bitter, grueling and costly, over the implications and impact of the basic law. And foremost among the points of conflict has been the 14th amendment provision that: "No State shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States."

Some of my friends in the South argue that the 14th amendment was never properly ratified. But they do not argue it too seriously. Even such an able exponent of the southern cause as James Jackson Kilpatrick, editor of the *Richmond News Leader*, admits that by tacit acquiescence over a period of 90 years the 14th amendment has been recognized as a valid part of the Constitution. That acknowledgement, one might say, is a forward step.

If the 14th amendment is a valid part of the Constitution, there remains the argument over what it means. Sixty-two years ago when the United States Supreme Court first considered the amendment in connection with segregation, it held in effect that if Negroes were provided with facilities equal to the facilities provided for whites there would be no violation of privileges of citizens of the United States.

After that decision, the South breathed a sigh of relief. Its way of life had been saved. The Supreme Court was praised as the protector of States rights. Negroes could be kept in their place which was not described specifically but turned out to be a place somewhat inferior to that reserved for citizens of lighter skin.

After half a century of operation under the doctrine that separate facilities were equal facilities, the Supreme Court took another look at the entire problem and decided, unanimously, that it had been wrong.

The Court found in effect that separate facilities cannot be equal facilities. It decided that the mere fact of separation does things to people.

The court order against segregation brought it as many brickbats as the 1896 decision upholding segregation, had brought it flowers. Some, who were unacquainted with the fact that judicial history is marked by frequent reversals of earlier opinions, wanted to make it illegal for the Supreme Court to change an opinion once made.

They would require the Supreme Court to be all-wise and infallible the first time around.

Some have wanted Congress to take away certain appellate powers of the Supreme Court—appellate powers in school segregation cases, for example. I wonder if they have considered the consequences of that proposal? The Constitution says the judicial power of the United States shall extend to cases arising under the Constitution.

If the Supreme Court were denied the authority to decide constitutional questions, those questions would still have to be decided. In that event, the lower courts—either the United States district courts or the circuit courts of appeal—would become the final arbiters of what the Constitution means.

If there were no Supreme Court of final appeal, the Constitution would mean one thing in Iowa, something else in Florida, and something else again in California. United States citizenship would not carry the same privileges and immunities in the East, the West, the North, and the South.

A better pattern for anarchy and the breakdown of law could not be imagined.

Some complain that the Supreme Court based its school desegregation order on modern theories of sociology rather than on law.

If that is true, could it not also be true that the 1896 decision, approving separate but equal facilities, was based on out-moded theories of sociology in that day?

Court decisions must be based on the facts as well as the law. In 1896, the Court took it for a fact that separate facilities for Negroes and whites would turn out to be equal facilities. A half century of experience showed the fact was otherwise—the earlier decision, based on a false premise, was held to have been wrong.

So I suggest that law may be rooted in workable human relations as well as human relations may grow in the soil of the law. And we should remember that our existence as a free people rests on respect for law.

Some southern newspapers have referred to the Little Rock incident as a local problem.

If I can bring any message to you, the newspapermen of Arkansas, it would be that you must not, you dare not adjudge Little Rock to be a local issue.

Little Rock, Ark., whether you or I like it, has become an outpost in America's cold war struggle. A struggle against alien forces who would enfold behind the iron curtain the billions of off-white people who populate the earth. Little Rock is an outpost just as surely as are our Strategic Air Command bases on the periphery of the Soviet empire—standing out there between us and possible death by blast and by radiation.

Four years ago, American prestige abroad was shaken by our internal crisis over McCarthyism. People throughout the world were shocked by evidence that in the America of the Bill of Rights—symbolizing to all that men dream of human dignity, fair play and due process of law—those great principles were being trampled by the same people who conceived them and brought them such glory.

We learned then, as we never appreciated before, that we cannot talk and write one way in the United States and act another—if we are to hold the leadership of the free world.

We cannot fight in the cold war of ideas with alibis and rationalization of our own progress.

We must fight the war of ideas with the truth of our own slowly improving behavior. And behavior that suggests contempt for law and stubborn opposition to equal rights among persons of all colors, hands over weapons of murderous potential to our enemies. Such weapons could help bring about our downfall in act I of Little Rock and Human Relations.

How are we to overcome the potentials of failure in the second act of the American tragedy—possible defeat in economic competition—the bread-and-butter aspects of our way of life?

Lenin once predicted that the United States would drown itself in a sea of red ink.

We have done much to give the lie to that prediction. While we are not depression proof, we have demonstrated that we can successfully survive crises to which other nations have succumbed. But today no intelligent person can discuss American economics save in terms of reference to the flanking cold-war movement of Soviet competition.

Barbara Ward, British author, and one of the great authorities on world affairs, recently put together some significant words on this subject. Writing in the New York Times magazine, Barbara Ward said:

"Khrushchev has issued his challenge in the very field in which the West—above all, America—is best fitted to respond. In some measure, he admits it. The concrete aim he sets the Communist world is to surpass American standards within the next decade. In a very real sense, the material aim of the Communist world revolution is to achieve the American way of life.

"Who, then, are better placed than the Americans and their allies to meet and reverse that challenge? Who are better placed to set their incomparable economic and technical organization to work to raise world standards and to expand their own wealth so that the challenger limps behind, his goal of parity always eluding him, his figures for steel and power, his statistics of living space and family budgets, his offers of aid and capital always and easily out trumped by the expanding resources and matching generosity of the free peoples?"

"This surely is a competition into which our competitive society can enter with zest and confidence. We are being challenged to do exactly what we are best fitted to do by training and temperament and tradition. It is as though the Russians, instead of issuing a challenge at their national game of chess, had offered to take the Americans on at baseball. Production, expansion, productivity, technology, inventiveness, rising standards for all—could the free nations, with America at their head, be asked to achieve anything more congenial to their national genius, anything more profoundly in tune with their ways of thought and life?"

How will we answer Miss Ward's question? This economic competition is our game all right. But when we look around at the way some of our leaders are calling the signals we must wonder sometimes whether our side really wants to win. If we don't accept the challenge of our competitors for worldwide economic leadership, we will lose by default. We will lose the game and much more. And this would be the second act of the tragedy.

Finally, to the third act, foreign relations or man and the missile. This act could be the climax to our tragedy: our exposure to blackmail, if not extinction, by failing to meet and to overtake Soviet military and scientific competition in the manufacture and use of rockets, missiles, and the conquest of the wild, black yonder of space.

Through the long years of American mastery of machines, we of the United States have believed in our superiority in all things technological as we have believed in God himself.

Reports and rumors of Russia's great advances in machines and missiles were ignored, or laughed at. From the highest places came assurances of our mastery and our might.

Then came the day. The day not soon to be forgotten. It was sputnik day, October 4, 1957. Many of our leaders made fun of it. One said: "An interesting bauble." Another said: "What's a piece of iron in the sky?" And another said: "Sputnik has no military significance."

Our people were troubled. Their worry was not substantially eased by pronouncements from the men in the Government.

For 3 months now, we have been witness to incredible disclosures of our inter-service rivalries, our muddled defense structure, the revealed frustrations of top military men and scientists who have become sickened by the red tape, the waste of energy and money, the absence of any sense of national urgency at the top of our Government.

Our people were not relieved of worry by the first postsputnik meeting of the National Security Council. After 2 hours of discussion, the Council announced that nothing much could be done until the rivalry was settled between the Army's Jupiter and the Air Force's Thor. This, the National Security Council suggested, might take 6 months.

Many people shuddered. With a world smoldering—we, the supposed leaders of the free world and civilization's last, best hope—must await the decision in a foot race between two of our service hosecarts before we could hope to put the fire out.

Our people were not relieved when the President later took to the air to allay the

public's fears and referred to alleged rivalry between the services, and told of our current manufacture of 37 different General Motors missiles by three services and their satellite contractors.

After sputnik came muttnik, and we learned that this space traveler, the size and weight of a Volkswagen, was propelled upward by a rocket thrust of 1,200,000 pounds. There is no American scientist who has or will testify that our own rocket thrust as yet developed is more than half of that.

More recently the country has been warned by the Rockefeller and Gaither reports. These are chastening manifestos of humiliation to a people who prided themselves, in blind complacency, of being first with the best.

Are we reacting now with the directness, speed, imagination, and foresight for the future as the people so obviously desire? Let's hope the answer will be positive, demonstrated action by the President and the present session of Congress. If it isn't, then this will be the third and final act in our American tragedy.

The settings for the three acts I have outlined are in Arkansas, in the concrete canyons of our financial centers, and in the feverish atmosphere of our National Capital.

We in America will leave our own records for others to measure in literature, in remnants of culture and, perhaps, if all does not go well, in radioactive dust.

Let's go back some 60 million years to the dinosaur, the huge reptile that ruled the then world. The dinosaur ranged far and wide. One of his favorite areas was Colorado and his bones are to be found in our plains and mountains.

The dinosaur was mighty, and his will prevailed. But one day he disappeared.

Why?

He could not adjust to his changing environment.

And so may it be with modern man.

And so with us. Ask yourself:

Can we adjust to our changing environment?

From the beginning of time, the ages of life on this earth have been revealed and identified by fossilized evidence. The bones, for example, of the Java man, the Neanderthal man, or China man have told us much about the evolution of humankind.

Assuredly we are not unaware of the weaknesses of those prehistoric men, weaknesses which left them prey to the environment of their own times.

If in the last half of the 20th century we contribute to the disintegration of our own civilization, our failure may, from the perspective of history, be ascribed to at least three monumental defects in our character:

First, failure to accommodate ourselves to the challenges of human relations;

Second, failure to make our economic way of life work;

Third, failure to protect ourselves against the barbarism of modern aggressors.

In such an event, may not future students of our age find in the fossilized remains of our civilization remnants they may choose to call the Little Rock man, the Wall Street man, or the Washington man?

It is for us to decide.

If this tragic scenario I have outlined is not enacted, it will be because you—the newspapermen of Arkansas, and others like you the country over—see clearly and act courageously in this time of local, national, and international trial.

#### PROCEDURES FOR REPORTS BY EXECUTIVE AGENCIES RELATIVE TO DEVELOPMENT OF LAND AND WATER RESOURCES

The Senate resumed the consideration of the resolution (S. Res. 148) to pre-



scribe procedures and contents for reports to the Senate by executive agencies with respect to proposed projects for conservation and development of land and water resources.

### CALL OF THE ROLL

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PROXMIER in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Alken	Goldwater	Morse
Allott	Gore	Morton
Anderson	Green	Mundt
Barrett	Hayden	Murray
Beall	Hennings	Neuberger
Bennett	Hill	O'Mahoney
Bible	Hobbs	Pastore
Bricker	Hruska	Payne
Bridges	Humphrey	Potter
Bush	Ives	Proxmire
Butler	Javits	Purtell
Byrd	Jenner	Revercomb
Carroll	Johnson, Tex.	Russell
Case, S. Dak.	Johnston, S. C.	Saltonstall
Chavez	Kefauver	Scott
Church	Kennedy	Smith, Maine
Clark	Kerr	Smith, N. J.
Cotton	Knowland	Sparkman
Curtis	Kuchel	Stennis
Dirksen	Langer	Symington
Douglas	Lausche	Thurmond
Dworshak	Long	Thye
Eastland	Malone	Watkins
Ellender	Mansfield	Wiley
Ervin	Martin, Iowa	Williams
Flanders	Martin, Pa.	Wyborough
Frear	McClellan	Young
Fulbright	McNamara	

Mr. MANSFIELD. I announce that the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLAND], the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONROE], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. TALMADGE], are absent on official business.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I announce that the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], and the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPP], are absent on official business.

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER], and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PROXMIER in the chair). A quorum is present.

Pursuant to the order entered on Thursday, January 23, 1958, the Chair recognizes the senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER].

### REPORT BY SENATOR ELLENDER TO COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS: A REVIEW OF UNITED STATES FOREIGN POLICY AND OPERATIONS

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I was delighted to note in the press this morning that the present administration is finally putting into effect some of the programs which I have been advocating to the Secretary of State and the Presi-

dent for the past 3 years. If one will examine my reports during 1955, 1956, and also the report I am presenting today to the Committee on Appropriations, it will be noted that I recommended and emphasized the great importance and value of an exchange program between our country and the Soviet Union.

Before I report to the Senate in detail on my most recent trip to Russia, I should like to review briefly some of the places which I visited.

On an easel in the rear of the chamber is a map showing the vast U. S. S. R., which, by the way, covers about one-sixth of the earth's surface. During the last 3 years I was able to visit what I regard as the most important industrial and agricultural areas in Russia.

I did not go to Russia as a tourist; I went there as an American citizen, in order to learn all I could about that country, our foremost adversary in the cold war. I had no difficulty whatever in visiting the various points I desired to see.

I was not followed around by any kind of Gestapo or secret police. I was permitted to take pictures of whatever I desired, with few exceptions. They were railroad bridges, airfields, and, of course, military installations.

I have in my office today more than 22,000 feet of 16-millimeter motion picture film which I took during 1956 and 1957. These movies were taken by me, at my own expense, and were processed at my own expense. The film I have is, of course, available for the use of the Members of the Senate—in fact, I should like to have it used all over the country, in order to better acquaint people of the United States with conditions behind the Iron Curtain, particularly in Russia.

It is my firm belief that if the people of the United States knew more about the Russian people, and if the people of Russia knew more about us, the great race in armaments could be ended.

Today there is fear on the part of the East and fear on the part of the West. Unless and until this fear is dispelled—unless and until confidence is restored between the peoples of East and West—disarmament and peace—for which all of us aspire—will never become realities.

Mr. President, my report contains, as I have stated, certain recommendations for improving our foreign policy position. These recommendations are simple. There is nothing complex about them. But, I sincerely believe that if they were put into effect, we could create a climate in which confidence could be restored between the people of the United States and the people of Russia.

On my first trip to Russia, I entered by way of East Germany. I went first to Poland, and then to Moscow. I visited in and around Moscow over an area approximately 100 kilometers in radius. I visited factories and farms—state farms as well as collective farms. Then I traveled to Kiev, thence to Odessa, and from Odessa, to Bucharest, Rumania.

In 1955, while in Moscow, I spoke with Anastas Mikoyan, Russia's No. 3 man, and the Politburo expert on trade

and economics. He urged me to visit Russia again; he said I would be permitted to go wherever I desired—to make my own itinerary. That is exactly what I did in 1956. The map displayed in the rear of the Chamber shows the areas of Russia which I visited that year.

I entered Russia by way of Leningrad, visited in and around that city, and took photographs of factories, people on the streets, public markets, and so forth. Then I went to Moscow. While I was in Moscow, I again visited factories, farms, stores, and businesses in that entire area.

I traveled by automobile from Moscow to Yalta, on the Black Sea—a distance of almost 1,000 miles. I stopped at Khar'kov, after motoring there by way of Tula, Orel, and Kursk. I visited many villages along my route and talked to the people working in the factories and on the farms.

I spent a few days in the Crimea, and saw the people of Russia at play.

From Yalta I went to Rostov by car. In order to go there, I had to retrace my steps since there is no direct road from Yalta to Rostov on the Don. I also traveled by automobile to Stalingrad, from Stalingrad, I flew to Moscow.

From Moscow, I flew over the Ural Mountains to Kazan, thence to Chelyabinsk, the Pittsburgh of Russia.

I flew over the so-called dry lands by way of Athasar, Karaganda and Balkhash. Then I proceeded to Alma Ata, which is near the Chinese border. I spent considerable time inspecting the surrounding area.

From Alma Ata, I traveled to Tashkent. In that area, cotton is produced in large quantities and I was told that production is between 7 million and 8 million bales.

From Tashkent, I flew to Termez and then crossed into Afghanistan.

During my trip that year I was able to talk to Mr. Khrushchev for over 2½ hours; the subject matter of my conversation was submitted to the committee as a part of my report last year. It was also made available to the State Department. Without going into detail concerning that conversation, it generally covered Soviet-United States relations. Mr. Khrushchev was very much interested in the visit I was going to make in his country, and he asked whether I had included Siberia in my itinerary.

I told him that I had not; I said Russia is a very large country, and that I did not think I would have time to visit Siberia. As it was, I spent over 1 month in Russia in 1956. But I said to him that if he would give me a raincheck, so to speak, I would like to see Siberia the following year, that is, 1957.

So, Mr. President, last year I returned to Russia by way of Poland, from Copenhagen, Denmark. I saw much of Poland.

From Warsaw, I flew to Vilna, Lithuania, and then to Moscow. From Moscow, I flew to Gorky, on the Volga River, from Gorky to Kazan, also on the Volga River, from Kazan I flew to Irkutsk, with two stops en route. Irkutsk is located about 41 kilometers from Lake Baikal, one of the largest inland freshwater lakes in the world. I traveled all

over that area by automobile; I also traveled on Lake Baikal by boat.

From Irkutsk, I proceeded to Novosibirsk, which is a great industrial center in Siberia. From that city I went to Barnaul, a great agricultural center, and then to Omsk, to Sverdlovsk, and to Kuibyshev.

From Kuibyshev, I flew to Krasnodar, then Tbilisi, and finally Baku. I got out of Russia by way of Iran.

Mr. President, as I believe my colleagues will agree after the outline I have presented of the places I visited in Russia, I have seen the most important industrial and agricultural centers of the Soviet Union. I could describe in detail what I saw in these various places, but I will not undertake to do so at this time. Senators will find on their desks copies of my report, in which I have incorporated a diary kept by me on a day-to-day basis while in Russia. Many of the things I saw are described by me in that diary.

Mr. President, before describing some of the things I saw in Siberia, in particular, during my most recent visit, I should like to give a short background sketch of Russia, covering the period prior to the 1917 revolution through 1957.

An understanding of this background is necessary if we are to properly evaluate the present situation in the Soviet Union. I believe that with this background, Senators will conclude, as I have, that the Russian people are not well informed about our way of life. I believe they will also agree that the way of life which now has developed in Russia is a better one than the Russian people have ever had before, at any time in their history, although it is far inferior to our own.

In 1957, as in 1956, my conversations with the people of Russia were facilitated by my having at my side an official of the United States Embassy at Moscow who spoke and understood the Russian language. Besides making it easier for me to discuss America with the Russians I spoke to, the fact that the translations were made in the presence of a fellow American and with his help, assured me of maximum objectivity.

Almost uniformly, I found improvements in Russian conditions as contrasted with my findings of 1956, and the year before, 1955. As a matter of fact, some of my previous estimates—particularly with respect to Russia's agricultural potential—had to be modified in the light of my trip through Siberia.

This enormous area, which most of us consider the world's icebox—a huge prison camp, a vast waste of barren land—is actually becoming Russia's breadbasket. While the climate is somewhat more severe than that of our own upper Middle West, the area has proven itself capable of producing some fruits, much livestock and dairy products, and a large variety of root crops and grains. Yields of grains are high, although methods of planting, cultivating, and harvesting are obsolete by our own standards.

Perhaps the most significant aspect of my findings on this visit was change, and, with respect to the various goods and services available to the Russian consumer, the change was invariably for the

better. Also, people are more talkative—they were more prone to assert themselves. Generally speaking, I found a much higher degree of contentment among the peoples of Russia than on my previous visits. In addition, I found considerable national pride, a pride which was visibly increased when the people learned of the successful firing of the first space satellite. I was in Russia when the event occurred and the news was made public, and there was much jubilation among the Russian masses.

Thus, in prefacing any account of my journeys through the Soviet Union, I feel it important to impress upon the Senate my three major impressions of post-satellite Russia.

First. There is an atmosphere of confidence.

Second. There is apparent domestic contentment, but a rising curiosity about America and an urge to forge ahead of us.

Third. There is a growing belief among the Russian people that their system is superior in all respects to ours in the West.

These three factors must certainly receive primary consideration in any policy our Government undertakes vis-a-vis the Soviet Union. But in considering these factors, they must be read against a background of Russia as it stands today compared with the pre-Bolshevik Russia of the czars.

Only by measuring present-day conditions in Russia by the comparative yardstick of conditions as they existed a quarter century ago can any proper perspective concerning this vast nation be attained. In addition, the conditions existing in the Soviet Union under communism and the Government's abolition of private property are important circumstances to be weighed before reaching any conclusion concerning future policies toward that country.

In Russia, the Government is supreme. Nothing else matters—only the Government. Every square inch of land belongs to the Government. All commerce and industry are Government controlled. Under no circumstances is an individual able to go into business for himself, not even as a barbershop owner or a taxi operator.

Instead, all crafts, in fact, all businesses, are incorporated into state managed entities where everyone works together for what Soviet leaders declare to be the common good of the state. Revenue-producing investments by the individual of any of his surplus funds are limited primarily to state institutions that lend money.

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

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. LONG. Someone has asked if the Russians ever pay taxes. My impression is that there are no taxes in Russia, because everybody works for the Government; the Government takes just what it wants.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator is correct to a large extent. However, there is a small charge, in the nature of a tax, imposed by the unions to pay the recreational expenses of some of their members. The funds so derived finance rest trips

for special workers. I saw many of these workers at play in Yalta while I was there in 1956.

There is also a small charge levied, sometimes as much as 5 percent of a family's salary, in order to permit the family's children to attend kindergarten, so that the mother and father can work.

There are taxes of that kind, but there are very few, if any, taxes imposed on the people of Russia for the purpose of running the Government. After all, the Government owns everything in Russia.

I continue with my observations concerning the background of and conditions in Russia.

The money deposited by an individual bears a small rate of interest, depending on the length of time it is left on deposit. This type of social and economic organization exists through all strata of Russia.

Under such a controlled system, in which the welfare of the individual is evidently sacrificed to the good of the state, Russia has been able, within a short span of years, to pull itself up from a weary, downtrodden nation, wracked by internal strife and bearing the heavy burden of a hungry, desperate class of peasant serfs under the old czarist system, to its present leadership of obviously high technological development.

Many Russian people today may have only black bread, cabbages, beets, potatoes, and a pot of tea—but today it is enough to fill their stomachs. To a hungry population, the mere advance of a crust of bread is an accomplishment—and one which, whether or not we agree with the manner in which it is done, must be recognized as a form of progress.

From the days of 1916, when almost all of Russia hovered together in abject poverty, in hunger, in a state of serfdom, while serving a fantastically rich nobility, the older people of Russia today can see visible signs of their march forward—toward national pride, better living standards, and industrial development—a march which today places them among the vanguard of the world's nations.

The younger people, who have known nothing but communism in their lifetimes, and who have had no opportunity to observe any other form of government, glory in their country's progress—and in the corresponding rise in the welfare of their fellow countrymen.

This, above all, we must recognize. And in that recognition we must, I believe, abandon the approach of some who, because they dislike or perhaps fear communism—indeed, I am sure they abhor this system of government as I do—will not hear or even listen to the spoken words of its accomplishments.

The mark of an intelligent soldier is to recognize the capabilities of his opponent. To mock a foe is to mock yourself.

Communism will not vanish because we ignore it. Neither will it disappear because we vilify it. It exists. It is functioning.

It has brought a new way of life to a people once left far beyond progress in the wallow of inner conflict. It has pro-



vided a better standard of living—no matter if we care to dismiss it as still far below our own—for an entire nation of people.

Of course, in the U. S. S. R. there is nothing remotely resembling the freedom of individual choice, action, and enterprise which we in the United States enjoy today. However, it must be recognized that in the Soviet Union, such freedom has never existed. Russian history bears ample witness to the lack of what we regard as basic principles of freedom. Under the czars, which is the period with which the typical elder or middle-aged Russian compares his life today, there was no freedom of the press, no freedom of expression, no freedom of economic choice for the average Russian. Opposition to the then existing government was ruthlessly ferreted out by a secret police whose methods were not basically different from those used by the Communists.

Perhaps the most astonishing accomplishment of the Russia of today is its rapid transformation into an industrial empire. That the tremendous growth of Russia's industrial economy has been reached in the short span of one generation testifies to the hard work done by the Russian people. To those who would dismiss, or soften the impact of this achievement by merely pointing out that it was accomplished by a ruthless leadership holding the combined noses of an entire people to the Marxist grindstone, it again must be remembered that compulsion is nothing new to the average Russian. Under the Communists, he exchanged the compulsion of the czarist aristocracy for the compulsion of a totalitarian state. The only change in the picture, insofar as Ivan is concerned, is that at least part of the nation's increased wealth has trickled down to him instead of all of it remaining in the pockets of a very few persons of supreme social status.

In other words, in assessing the present temper of the Russian people—not their present leadership, but their people—we must always bear in mind that there are no shades of gray in the picture of Russian development since 1917. Instead, there is only absolute contrast between the days prior to the October revolution and those now upon the colossus of Europe and Asia. The term "capitalism," as applied by the Communist leadership in describing the United States, does not reflect the system which our country actually enjoys today, but instead is used as a synonym for the system prevalent in Russia during czarist times. By insisting that all economic systems are either capitalistic—that is, czarist—or Socialist—that is, that now in effect in the Soviet Union—the Soviet leaders have been able to keep their people convinced that the Russian system today is the ultimate of perfection.

The Western World is now at a great disadvantage in waging a positive campaign to change this unbalanced and untrue picture laid before the Russian people, because there are not words available to convince them of the progress we have made, of the abundance we enjoy. To the average Russian, a system which would prove more beneficial than the one

under which he now lives is inconceivable, simply because he has no knowledge of anything other than absolute exploitation under the czars compared with a much better way of life under communism.

As it stands, then, we must realize that the Russian people—as of this day, at least—are apparently well content with their way of life. The individual may not have progressed much, by our standards, but he has progressed—he is much better off than he has ever been.

Mr. President, I have read an extract from my report covering the background of conditions as I found them in the Soviet Union. I believe that background shows clearly the fact that as of today there has been no adequate way for us to inform the Russian people concerning our way of life—the way of the life of the people of the Western World.

The simple program which I have been advocating for the past 3 years stresses filling that great gap in our foreign policy. Since 1955, I have urged our Government to undertake an exchange program between the United States and the U. S. S. R. of people from all walks of life—teachers, students, legislators, in fact, as I repeat, people from every walk of life. That is one way by which I sincerely believe we can make it possible for the Russian people to learn more about us, thereby creating a climate of confidence in which the seeds of lasting peace may be nourished. Confidence is necessary on both sides of the Iron Curtain if we are ever to achieve any permanent peace.

Mr. President, I would now like to describe generally conditions as I found them in Siberia.

I have asked many people in our country what their ideas of Siberia were—what it looks like—and invariably I received answers such as "an icebox," "a prison camp," "a barren area where nothing grows."

I have also asked people here what they think the people of Siberia look like. Most of them answered: "Aren't they Mongolians?" "Aren't they Eskimos?" "Aren't they people of the yellow race?"

I have not found one single, solitary person—one who has not been to Siberia—who was able to give me a near description of what Siberia or its people really looks like.

Of course, I, too, was very much surprised when I visited Siberia. I did not think I would find great industry, tremendous water resources developments, or flourishing agriculture.

Today Siberia is the granary of Russia. There is as much food produced today in Siberia as in almost any other area of Russia. It even exceeds the production of the Ukraine.

In Siberia I saw wheatfields containing not hundreds of acres but thousands of acres—acres which produce as much as 30 bushels of wheat. Some of the land, of course, was less productive.

As an example of the tremendous growth of Siberia, Novosibirsk, almost in the center of this productive area of Russia, was just a little trading town of about 5,000 people in 1905. When the Trans-Siberian Railroad was routed

through Novosibirsk, the population increased to 60,000. Today over 800,000 people live there.

The same is true with respect to Irkutsk, on Lake Baikal, of Omsk, and of Sverdlovsk, on the eastern slopes of the Ural Mountains. The population of those cities has quadrupled during the past generation.

What caused all of those people to move to those cities? The answer is very simple. The Russians have developed their Siberian industry more rapidly than I have ever seen industry develop anywhere else. They have also been rapidly exploiting the hydroelectric potential, in which Siberia is wealthy.

I visited one of the big foundries in Novosibirsk, and saw a plant manufacturing hydroelectric turbines which will produce 200,000 kilowatts. The largest turbine in the United States will produce 105,000 kilowatts. I saw foundations being laid in Novosibirsk for a plant to produce turbines of 300,000 kilowatts capacity.

The Lake Baikal region is the source of much of Siberia's wealth. Before I visited that region I thought Lake Baikal was surrounded by desolation, where little or nothing grew. I was mistaken. I found that Lake Baikal is surrounded by forests.

In addition, 368 rivers or creeks flow into Lake Baikal, yet it has only one outlet, the Angara River. That situation is a natural for hydropower development and the Russians are putting it to full use. I visited one hydroelectric plant on the Angara River which, by the end of this year, will produce more than 800,000 kilowatts.

About 300 miles north of that site, near Krasnoyarsk, another hydropower plant is being erected, which will produce 3.2 million kilowatts, almost double the capacity of the largest we have in our own country. It is there that the 200,000 kilowatt turbines to which I alluded earlier are to be placed.

The Angara River flows into the Yenisei River, which in turn flows into the Arctic Ocean.

On the Yenisei River, not very far from Krasnoyarsk, a survey is now being made into the possibility of erecting a facility which will produce 3.6 million kilowatts, again almost twice as large as the largest in our own country, Grand Coulee.

This water resources development is being greatly expanded. With the increased availability of electricity to power industry, more and more people are moving to the area. In addition, great coalfields and many gold mines are found around Irkutsk. All natural resources in that area are being developed. Hence, as a result of this development—along with the increasing availability of coal and water power—Siberian industry is rapidly growing.

I might say that the people who are moving into that part of Russia are the same kind of people as those who made America great—they are pioneers. They are willing to work. One does not find any Mongolians or halfbreeds

there. The people are all of European stock, who have migrated to Siberia before and since the revolution.

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

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I commend the Senator for the statement he is making to the Senate, and, through the Senate, to the American people. In particular I wish to express my deep thanks to him for his reference to the hydroelectric power development in Russia, because it stresses what so many of us have stressed, that the energy of civilization is the energy of power which man can develop from the natural resources which God has given us.

The emphasis which the Senator from Louisiana has just placed upon power development in Russia illustrates very well why some of us have fought so long and so hard in the Congress over the years for the maximum development of the great energy resources of America. We have a dramatic illustration, from the lips of the Senator from Louisiana, that the future of our civilization is dependent upon our not wasting our electric-power resources. However, it is important that we have full development of such resources, and not underdevelopment of the river basins of America, if we are to keep abreast of Russia in the great contest of 100 years before us, between freedom on the one hand and Russian totalitarianism on the other.

I thank the Senator from Louisiana. I am greatly indebted to him. He is performing a great service here today.

Mr. ELLENDER. I thank the Senator, I am in complete accord with what my good friend from Oregon has said.

What I have said about power development is only the beginning. I have not touched upon the facilities on the Ob River, just north of Novosibirsk, where a great facility is being erected which will produce 800,000 kilowatts. Two more facilities are scheduled to be built on the same river.

Inasmuch as we are discussing hydroelectric power, I would like to touch briefly upon dams being built on the Volga River. I visited six of those huge dam sites. In order to increase the volume of water in the Volga River, the Russians are now in the process of diverting into the Volga two rivers which now flow into the Arctic Ocean. When the hydropower facilities on the Volga and its tributaries are completed, the Volga River alone will produce 65 billion kilowatts a year. Think of that—65 billion kilowatts a year.

Few of us knew about those projects. The trouble was, as my good friend from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] pointed out last week, that the people of this country were kept somewhat in ignorance of what was going on. They were told, "Let Russia alone, and sooner or later she will collapse." From what I saw, the Russians are not about to collapse. I would say they seem to be on the march.

The people of Russia are becoming more and more educated. As I shall point out, the expanding educational system will probably sound the death knell of communism as it now operates

in the U. S. S. R. For one thing, the Russian people are thinking for themselves more and more.

There is a great surge toward decentralization today in Russia. Senators have read about it. I discussed the subject last year with Mr. Mikoyan. During my conversation with him, as my diary will show, I expressed surprise that Russia's sixth 5-year plan had not been announced, and I told him that I was curious to learn why that was. He said, "Senator, we presented the sixth 5-year plan to the people of Russia, the local oblasts, republics, and so forth, but they refused to accept it."

Why do Senators think they refused to accept it? We can read between the lines. The previous 5-year plans had promised the Russian people more consumer goods—a promise which did not come true. Instead, Russia's resources were devoted to preparing for a war which I hope will never come.

The people of Russia want more consumer goods. They desire a greater voice in the operation of their own Government. Believe it or not, that is a fact.

Recent issues of the Washington Post have contained an Alsop column, along with a news story to the effect that collective farms in Russia were now to be permitted to own farm implements. Similar articles appeared in other newspapers.

In Russia there are two kinds of farms, collective and state. There are no privately owned farms. A state farm is owned and operated by the government. The people who work on it are paid a salary, and, I might add, they are pretty well paid.

Collective farms are operated by a certain number of families. Some collectives may have as many as 500 families operating them; others may have as many as a thousand. These people agree to work together and divide the profits. As I pointed out in my reports of 1955 and 1956, and as I repeat in my current report, the people who operate these collectives do not like the idea of having to go to the Government, to what they call the machinery tool stations—which are operated by the government—to get implements with which to cultivate and harvest their crop.

This is only a natural development. An MTS may serve as many as five or six collectives. But it has turned out that some collectives have been able to get the necessary implements from the station, whereas others could not. That caused a great deal of dissatisfaction among the farmers, to the point where Mr. Khrushchev announced, only 2 days ago, that collectives would be permitted to own their own tools, tractors, plows and so on. That announcement was the end result of a gradual process, and it certainly did not come voluntarily from the Moscow level. It came about because the people demanded it.

It is the Russian educational system—the rising level of Russian education—the tendency of the Russian people to think for themselves, to assert themselves—that is bringing a growing change. The announcement of the new

farm equipment ownership policy is just one small example of this change.

My good friend the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] has spoken of the Russian educational system. He has referred to the efforts made by me, by the late Senator Taft, and others, in trying to have a decent aid-to-education program placed on the statute books.

Because of that failure, we now find that there are serious defects in our own educational system.

I wish to say, without fear of contradiction, that if we disregard the teachings of atheism and communism in the Russian schools, we can learn a great deal from the Russian school system.

There is no such thing as an elective course in a Russian high school. In our schools, of course, a student can elect many such as cooking, interior decorating, driver training, and others. Many of these so-called electives are of little value; most are chosen by students because they provide an easy way to obtain credits.

In Russia, on the other hand, courses are prescribed. There no—or, at least, only a few—electives are available in the secondary schools. Today compulsory education through the high-school level prevails in Russia in cities of 5,000 and over; in the country and in cities below that population education is compulsory up to the seventh grade. Plans are under way now, I was told, to get more teachers and more schools so that there will be universal secondary education throughout Russia.

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

Mr. ELLENDER. I will be happy to yield in a moment. Students in Russia enter school at the age of six. They begin studying fundamental mathematics in the sixth grade, chemistry in the sixth grade, and physics in the seventh grade. They study those subjects until they graduate.

They must take a foreign language, either French, English, or German. However, the study of one foreign language is compulsory.

In general, school pupils in Russia must follow a prescribed course of studies. There is no wide selection of easy courses, such as we have in our own country.

Before a student graduates he is given every opportunity to make up his mind as to what profession he would like to follow.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I would hope to ask the Senator a question, if I might, with particular reference to what he is saying about the Russian educational system.

Before stating my question, I should like to say that the Senate is very fortunate that one of its Members has had access to Siberia. I recently read a book about American history, which explained that one of the reasons our country had such fortunate relationships with France, which was the dominant power



in Western Europe during the 19th century, was that leading Americans, like Benjamin Franklin and Thomas Jefferson, had the opportunity of becoming personally familiar with the French people.

During the Second World War, I was stationed at Whitehorse, in Yukon Territory, and at Fairbanks, in Alaska, and I remember how surprised I was to note how proficient in mechanics and piloting airplanes and servicing vehicles the Russians were. These Russians had come from Siberia to take delivery of our lend-lease bombers in that distant realm in the Far North. Their skill confirms what the Senator has told us today.

This is the question I should like to ask of the distinguished Senator from Louisiana, who is making such an informative talk to the Senate. Mrs. Neuberger told me that she had breakfast this morning with two outstanding educators from our State, who related to her how difficult it often was to attract able, intelligent, idealistic, and educated people into the teaching profession, because of the comparatively small financial rewards, and, frequently, the very low prestige which the teaching profession enjoys in certain parts of our country. What is the status of the teachers in the communities of Russia which the able Senator visited?

I ask this question not only from the standpoint of comparative salaries and standards of living, but as to the favorable recognition which teachers receive and the prestige which they are accorded. In other words, I refer to the general atmosphere which might induce an outstanding person in the Soviet Union to enter the teaching profession.

Mr. ELLENDER. Teachers, as a rule, are well paid. Many receive the equivalent of as much as 700 or 800 dollars per month. The teaching profession is considered one of the noble professions. Teachers are given good facilities in which to work. Of course, the buildings do not compare with ours by any means. However, when one goes through the school laboratories, one is very much impressed. They have all kinds of modern equipment.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Would the Senator from Louisiana say that relatively, from the standpoint of contrast and comparison, a teacher in Russia is paid more and receives more recognition, with relation to the other people in a particular community in Russia, than is the case of a teacher in our own country?

Mr. ELLENDER. I would say so.

Mr. NEUBERGER. In other words, there is a greater inducement to a young person in Russia to go into the teaching profession than there is in our country?

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes, because they have certain incentives, one might say. Teachers study at higher institutions at government expense. They are then assigned to positions according to what they have studied, and according to the level of knowledge obtained. In other words, they are given full opportunity to practice their profession, in the same way that a doctor or member of any other profession is treated.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Is that not a salient lesson to us in our country?

Mr. ELLENDER. As I said a little while ago, if we leave out the teaching of communism and atheism in Russian schools, we could learn a great deal from the school system in Russia. That applies not only to the schools themselves, but to what the schools teach, and also to the teachers themselves.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I thank the distinguished Senator. Recognition of teaching is a vital matter.

Mr. ELLENDER. Of course there are some schools in Russia which are still on a par with our little red schoolhouse of old and which one still sees even in some parts of our own country. The development I have referred to does not take place to the same degree all over Russia, but it is there, and the products—the graduates—of the school system are in evidence. They are now becoming the leaders in Russia.

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

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Before the Senator gets off the subject of education, and before I ask him the question I have in mind, I wish to join in complimenting him upon the very fine report he is making and on making available to the Senate and to the country the benefit of his experiences. I think this is something of which we need a great deal more. The Senator from Louisiana is to be commended for having taken so much trouble and for having devoted so much of his time, when the Senate is in adjournment, to accumulating this knowledge. I think what he has done is highly commendable.

Mr. ELLENDER. I thank the Senator from Arkansas. As my good friend the Senator from Idaho [Mr. DWORSHAK] said to me, "That is plenty of work beyond the call of duty." But I am glad to do it, because I do not know of an area of the world with which the people of America are less familiar. The more we know of it the better off we will be.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I agree with the Senator. I think this is a subject of which we all need greater knowledge, if we are to follow a wise course.

On the subject of education, I wish the Senator would develop, from his knowledge of the situation, this thought: I have seen it reported that the Russians are quite selective in the way they apply education. In the earlier stages of primary education they will give everyone an opportunity. But about the 6th or 7th year they begin to test the youngsters. Those who show an ability to go ahead and acquire advanced knowledge in the sciences or the languages are given the opportunity to go further. But the Russian educational system is quite ruthless in eliminating from higher education those who are not able to acquire it, and those persons are then sent off to the technical or vocational schools. Would the Senator develop that thought?

Mr. ELLENDER. I shall be glad to do so. The Senator has anticipated me.

After a child reaches, let us say, the 5th grade, or when he is about 10 or 11 years old, he is given an opportunity to

join the Pioneers. This organization maintains camps and clubhouses. When I first asked our officials about Pioneer camps, I was told that they are institutions where children are taught communism and atheism. That may be so; I will not deny it. But the Pioneer camps are also educational institutions. They are made up of many clubs and subclubs in which the children learn botany, zoology, physiology, music, and art, among other things. Lectures are given to Pioneer clubs by doctors, chemists, physicists, and representatives of other professions. Through these clubs, interest in special fields is developed.

If a child shows interest and proficiency in a certain subject, he is given an opportunity for further study in that field. If a child appears to be proficient in medicine and wishes to become a doctor, he is shown how a hospital operates. If he shows an aptitude for mechanical engineering, he is taken to a factory where large engines are made, and so on.

A child is given every opportunity to determine for himself what his field of future study may be. He is given an opportunity to make up his own mind not only in the Pioneer camps, but even at school. He also gets advice from his parents and his teachers.

After a Russian high school student selects a profession, he is given certain tests. If these tests indicate proficiency in the chosen field, the student is sent to college. Some continue in medicine, some in chemistry, some in physics, some in the other professions or sciences. In other words they are given the opportunity but must pass tests in order to qualify for further education.

In response to a question I asked in practically every secondary school I visited last year, I was told that only from 35 percent to 40 percent of the students who graduate from them go on to higher educational institutions. Those who do have all their expenses paid. The students do not have to worry about tuition. They do not have to worry about money to pay for their lodging and board. The government furnishes that to them.

What happens to the others—the 60 percent or 65 percent—who do not go on to the higher institutions? They work in the factories and the fields. However, their education has not ended. Connected with Russian factories are institutions—schools—which teach employees more about the work they are doing.

It often turns out that a youth rejected for college training at the secondary school level, later shows proficiency in engineering or medicine, let us say, after he goes to work in industry or agriculture. If this is the case, he is given an opportunity to continue his studies in an institution of higher education.

It has been said that the Russian children are arbitrarily forced into a profession. Certainly, much persuasion is used, but I saw no evidence of force being used.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. If the Senator is about to leave this subject, I wish to comment on another matter. A moment ago the Senator mentioned that the schools expose the students to the arts. Did the

Senator visit the Bolshoi Theater in Moscow, and will he comment upon the quality of the arts which have been developed, such as the ballet, or the music, or any of the other activities in Russian art? Would he mind commenting upon whether there is anything in Washington as good as the Bolshoi Theater?

Mr. ELLENDER. It was my privilege in Moscow to see a performance of the Swan Lake ballet. I was enthralled with the fine performance I saw and the beautiful music I heard.

Even in Siberia, the arts are stressed. I attended three or four operas, in Omsk, and in Novosibirsk. There I heard the finest kind of music and listened to the finest of singers. I remember attending one performance of the light opera, Odessa. It was simply magnificent. The musicians, actors, and singers were all trained in Moscow and were given the opportunity to further their studies at the great conservatories which are located throughout Russia.

The Russians are very proud of their highest scientific institute—

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Academy of Science?

Mr. ELLENDER. The Academy of Science. I visited the building which houses the academy's central office in Moscow, 2 years ago. I also visited a branch of it in Novosibirsk during my recent trip.

We must watch Novosibirsk. In my opinion, Novosibirsk is going to become one of the greatest industrial centers of the Soviet Union.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield briefly, once more?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CLARK in the chair). Does the Senator from Louisiana yield to the Senator from Arkansas?

Mr. ELLENDER. I am glad to yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I should like to recall that the Senator from Louisiana was a cosponsor of Senate bill 472, in 1948, and was a member of the committee which reported it, as I recall. That bill was passed by the Senate by a vote of 58 to 22, but it failed of passage in the House. We have lost 10 years on that program. It was a program for general assistance. It was not confined either to science or to buildings, but it was for general assistance to education. The Senator from Louisiana was eminently correct then, as the evidence has proved.

This other thought occurred to me: In the last year there was on foot a movement, which I thought would succeed, to erect an opera house in the Nation's Capital, so that in that field the United States would make progress, similar to that made by Russia. But what happened to that attempt? By a narrow margin, the site for it became controversial; and now nothing is being done; and apparently there is no hope for our country even to enter into that field with any assistance from the Federal Government.

I submit that is a rather discouraging record in those two fields. Does not the Senator from Louisiana agree?

Mr. ELLENDER. I do not wish to take the position that the United States

should emulate Russia in all the things that Russia does. But I return to the proposition I first enunciated when I initially suggested an exchange program in 1955.

When I said a few nice things about what I saw in Russia at that time, I was vilified; called pro-Russian and pro-Communist—just because I told the truth about what I found in Russia, and so informed the people of the United States.

Today, I am proud to say that the administration is at long last following some of the suggestions I first made in 1955, which I repeated in 1956, and which I emphasize again today. I am beginning to believe that the work I have done is starting to pay dividends. However, I do not want any credit; I just want to help my country. I do not want to see us continue the policy which has brought little, if any, success, so far as our relations with Russia.

I wish to discuss one other method the Russians employ in encouraging their people to work hard, propaganda.

The people of Russia are kept constantly informed of developments in their country, and thus they become interested in them. The people of Russia are given credit for what they do. They are also rewarded in many ways. For one thing they are paid fairly well, depending on their capabilities. I found when I visited some of their collectives, for example, that a tractor driver could be paid the equivalent, in American money, of \$700 or \$800 a month.

But, most important, propaganda within Russia is constant and very effective. Wherever one goes the radio constantly blares out the accomplishments of various regions. The Russian Government stimulates competition between the people of various areas. The people are told: "Look at what the people of Moscow did. Consider what the people of Novosibirsk have done. Just see what the people of Sverdlovsk have been doing. Cannot you exceed those goals?"

In that connection, let me refer specifically to one such example of propaganda which I saw myself, dealing with the huge dam at Kuibyshev. When that project got under way, the people of the locality were called together and were told what was to happen. They were told what they could expect, and were informed that the project was their own. The Russian propagandists took motion pictures of the people who visited the site. Other motion pictures were taken when the river was closed, when the turbines were installed, and when the first power was produced.

These pictures were made into a complete motion-picture film, distributed throughout the Soviet Union, and used by the Russian leaders as an example of what people working together under socialism could accomplish.

In addition to this form of propaganda, the Russian Government also lavishes praise upon the country's workers. Medals, certificates and other awards are made to outstanding workers. I saw many of them proudly displaying their decorations. In all the factories, one sees photographs of the most proficient workers on the walls—a veritable

honor roll. All the workers work hard because they desire to have their photographs included in the display—to have their names on the honor roll.

The recognition given individuals for accomplishments is not confined to industry. Agriculture workers, too, receive awards. For example, while in Siberia, I saw some of the finest wheat that I have seen anywhere in the world—just as good as any wheat we have in the United States. It was developed in Siberia, for use in Siberia. It cannot be grown successfully south of Siberia, but it is well adapted to the weather and conditions existing in Siberia.

Motion pictures were taken of the efforts to develop this new type of wheat, and, like the pictures of progress on the dam at Kuibyshev, were shown all over Russia. While I was in Moscow, I also saw some motion pictures of the progress being made with apple growing in Siberia. Imagine how difficult it must be to grow apples in Siberia, where the temperature drops to as low as 30° or 40° below zero. In Siberia, apple trees grow horizontally, instead of vertically. At any rate, whenever a development of the kind I have discussed is achieved, it is recorded on motion picture film, and this film is shown to all the people of Russia, to inform them of the progress which has been made, to make the Russian people feel that they are part and parcel of all these developments and this progress, to stimulate them to more and more hard work.

Mr. President, I could speak for many hours on the things I saw in the Soviet Union, but I shall not do so. My report, a copy of which is on each Senator's desk, contains detailed information on my journey through Russia, as well as my findings of conditions in the Near East, certain Iron Curtain countries, and France.

At this time I wish to call the attention of the Senate to the fact that appendix B of my report contains a complete history of our foreign-aid programs, including the amounts of money spent, and how these funds were spent. Appendix C is a history of our information program.

I believe this information will be of value and help to the Senate.

At this time, Mr. President, I turn to certain conclusions I have reached as a result of my most recent trip through the Soviet Union, with special reference to what I believe should be a "new look" at our foreign policy.

Since 1948, the year the Marshall plan began, our Nation has spent over \$50 billion ostensibly to roll back the Red tide of communism. Initially, these expenditures were designed to restore the war-ravaged nations of Western Europe, in order to place them in a position to be of aid to the Free World should the Soviet Union attempt an armed aggression. Later, when proposed goals were reached, and even surpassed, the program was transformed from one of rehabilitation into one of development and mutual defense. Huge amounts were supplied to a host of coun-



tries to help build armies, for capital development, for technical aid.

I specifically refer to appendix B.

Viewed in the light of these vast expenditures, the record of achievement thus far is a dismal one.

Europe, fully restored to economic health, and enjoying unprecedented prosperity, still leans on the United States for participation in her home defenses—still refuses to bear her fair share of the Free World's burdens, particularly in the Middle East, Southeast Asia, Formosa, and South Korea.

Many other nations which we have assisted lavishly in the past are either actively practicing or moving in the direction of neutralism, if not outright alinement with the Soviet Union.

A few make no bones of the fact that they pursue a policy of pitting the United States against the Soviet Union in order to obtain the maximum aid from both countries.

Russia and her satellites—who are our avowed opponents in the global cold war—are not weakening, nor do their policies seem to suffer defeat or even frustration as a result of the heavy-spending approach we have used in the past. On the contrary, some of our advisers contend that the Russians are making gains in the Middle East, in Southeast Asia, in Africa, and even Latin America.

They are increasing their domestic agricultural and industrial bases, as my report amply demonstrates.

Their technology is constantly improving. Sputniks I and II offer abundant proof of this.

In almost every imaginable way, by almost any comparison that might be made, the United States today is in a much less favorable position in its international relationships—and particularly in its competitive position with the Soviet Union—than it was in 1948, despite the expenditure of over \$50 billion of our dwindling national wealth.

As I have often stated, our country cannot continue on its present course without inviting not only ultimate international defeat, but national disaster.

Our present policy involves the continued expenditure of gigantic sums for foreign-aid purposes—over and above funds appropriated for the maintenance and modernization of our own Armed Forces—large appropriations for an Information Service; continuation of an almost unbearable and destructive tax rate that threatens to destroy initiative; the constant threat of near stagnation in the proper protection and preservation of our precious natural resources; and the promise of continued neglect of other vital areas of our national economic progress, particularly public power, housing, commerce, and others.

The recommendation I have advanced for the past 3 years is reemphasized at this time, that is: The time has come for us to take stock and to take a new look at our foreign policy.

Given a continued or heightened cold war of indefinite duration, the pursuance of our present policies must eventually result in the strangulation of our free-

enterprise system, either by a continued decline of individual initiative and increasing reliance upon Government control and regulation of the economy, or eventual collapse of our total economy under the pressures of constantly growing Government spending and a swelling debt load.

Either of these alternatives would be disastrous.

The first would represent an easy default victory by state socialism over the forces of free enterprise, the second would carry with it the full realization of a basic tenet of Marxist communism, namely, that given a long-term crisis to face, the free enterprise—capitalistic—nations must fall of their weight.

The three visits I have made to the Soviet Union, the impressions I have gained during them, and the information I have gathered, have resulted in the following suggestions, which I offer for the consideration of the Senate—indeed, for the consideration of all our people.

#### RECOMMENDATIONS

I recommend that the United States reexamine its approach to the waging of cold war. Recognizing that our actual adversary in this conflict is the Soviet Union, I recommend that this reexamination be undertaken in the light of the following, the implementation of which will help to dispel the fear of each other prevailing among the peoples of the East and the West, and restore mutual confidence, which is necessary if we are to achieve a lasting world peace.

First. Our information program directed to the Iron Curtain, and particularly to the Soviet peoples, should be expanded. In this expansion, all propaganda in its traditional forms should be abandoned. Instead, a positive approach should be applied uniformly. No reference to communism per se should be permitted. Accurate, factual reporting of the news and conditions in the Free World must be stressed. Every effort should be made to objectively depict the enormous advantages of our way of life, without disparaging the system presently in effect in the Soviet Union or behind the Iron Curtain.

Second. An expanded and realistic exchange-of-persons program between the Soviet Union and the United States should be inaugurated at once. This expansion can be achieved with no additional cost, by simply discontinuing many so-called information programs operated elsewhere that are unnecessary. As detailed in the body of my report, I am convinced that most of the peoples of the Soviet Union are sincere in their belief that the form of government and the economic system under which they live are second to none. This conviction flows from their inability to compare their present-day living standards, industrial and agricultural techniques, cultural progress, and technological development with anything other than those existing within the Soviet Union's borders in prior times. By exchanging delegations, from every walk of life—scientists, technicians, workers, farmers, students, legislators—the people of Russia would have the opportunity to see at

first hand the boundless advantages which a free-enterprise system, founded on the bedrock of representative government, has to offer. In this program, however, extreme care must be exercised. Under no circumstances should a bona fide exchange program be permitted to become a means for infiltration of our borders by Soviet agents.

As I said previously, Mr. President, I am glad to note that the administration has at last seen the light, but the program announced yesterday is too small. The State Department desires to exchange 5 United States students, let us say, or 5 professors, or 5 technicians, if Russia does the same thing. I would go much further. I want a large group of Russian people to come here, to see what we have, to grow envious, so that the dissatisfaction about which I have been talking can grow so large that their leaders will either change their ways or the Russian people will change their leaders.

Third. With the change of emphasis in our cold-war policy toward the Soviet Union outlined in recommendations 1 and 2, designed to dispel the fear which exists between the peoples of the United States and the U. S. S. R. and to create a climate of confidence, should also come increased willingness upon our part to meet as often as possible with leaders of Iron Curtain countries, or the Soviet Union. Despite the record of broken promises which prior Soviet leaders have left in the wake of prior talks, our failure to join and participate in top-level conferences—even summit conferences—provide powerful ammunition for the Soviet propaganda machine.

It eases the task of Red information agencies to picture the United States to the people of the Soviet Union—along with other lands throughout the world—as unwilling to discuss peaceful solutions of world problems.

The committee is well acquainted with the desire of all Americans to attain and maintain a lasting world peace, a peace security in dignity and made lasting through mutual trust. However, our Government's failure to show a willingness to confer with Soviet leaders on the peaceful solution of world tensions is being broadcast throughout the length and breadth of the world as indicative of our aggressive intentions. With a weapon such as this at the command of expert Communist propagandists, we are constantly losing ground in our effort to maintain sympathy for and understanding of our international objectives.

Fourth. I recommend that our policy of attempting to create full-fledged modern armies in small underdeveloped countries be terminated, and that our assistance be confined to a realistic technical aid effort. This move would be designed to create a broad base of trained native peoples, a base which would attract private investment capital, or which—at the very least—could properly utilize any government-to-government capital which might later be made available for development purposes. An approach of this type would strengthen the economic stability of the country,

while at the same time allowing the country to maintain its prestige and self-respect by standing on its own feet.

By encouraging underdeveloped countries to maintain military forces far beyond their capabilities to support, we are actually creating conditions tailor made for the advance of communism.

As the Comptroller General noted in his report to Congress on an examination of the military-assistance program on March 31, 1957, the extension of arms aid to a number of nations has not always been motivated by purely military considerations, nor has the impact of this aid been properly evaluated in advance, or in conjunction with, its availability:

The military-force objectives presently approved for United States support in certain allied countries are not always realistic in terms of recipient country manpower and financial capabilities are not always mutually acceptable to the countries concerned, and are not always motivated by military considerations. (Report, supra, p. 2.)

In a number of countries the United States has programed and is delivering military equipment in excess of that which can be effectively absorbed and utilized by the recipients at their existing stage of development. The recipients either have not been able to use the aid furnished because of their financial and economic incapacity and their manpower limitations or they have not desired to use the assistance for the purposes intended by the United States. (Report, supra, p. 3.)

Mr. President, in every report I have made for the past 4 or 5 years I have pointed out the fact that we cannot continue to affix large armies upon the economies of small countries, armies that are dependent upon us for their existence. I think it is high time we stopped that procedure. Whenever we impose upon small countries, countries which are just starting, the burden of providing funds in order to maintain large armies, they are unable to do anything else. There is no money left to develop their economies—to give their people a better way of life. If we do not grant them aid, they become angry with us. Yet, if they try to maintain large armies, they cannot supply the needs of the people of the country. That, as I said, brings on communism, or perhaps some other kind of ism.

As it now stands, the hasty application of great amounts of economic and military aid to newly independent, underdeveloped nations is often working to our extreme disadvantage.

First, in those nations whose economies are not sufficiently developed to maintain a military force of the capabilities desired by United States advisers, the gap in national income created by heavy military expenditures is sought to be filled by America extending so-called defense support assistance.

As administered in the past, this type of economic aid has frequently failed to trickle down to the masses. In a number of countries, particularly in the Middle East, and Southeast Asia, living standards remain visibly unchanged for the great majority of people despite large United States expenditures there by way of defense funds. There are,

in these countries, two economic strata—the very rich, and the miserably poor.

The latter are, without exception, the object of constant Soviet propagandizing. United States policies, requiring the maintenance of large standing military forces, are blamed for low living standards. Capitalistic America is also blamed for lining the pockets of the rich while caring little for the poor.

In these same countries, as the body of my report demonstrates, the wealthy pay little or nothing in the way of income taxes, or, for that matter, all taxes as compared to us.

Mr. President, most Americans do not mind paying their just share of the taxes imposed by our Government provided they believe the money thus paid is put to good use.

But such is not always the case. For example, when I visit a country such as Iran, Lebanon, France, or Italy, where I know some people make as much as 4 times the income I make, but pay only 5 to 12 percent of their income in taxes, my blood boils. But what makes me really angry is the fact that the money which I pay in taxes—and I am frank to admit that I am in the 69-percent bracket—and that which is paid by other citizens, is used to give aid to those countries. They would not need help if only their governments imposed realistic taxes, and forced those who are able to pay to do so—just as is done here in the United States.

Thus, as the whole burden of defense and economic growth in a given nation may be ours, so is the blame for that nation's poverty heaped upon our shoulders.

Fifth, I again recommend, as I have for the past 3 successive years, that immediate steps be taken to solve the Arab-Israeli dispute. Unless and until this is done, the Middle East will remain an open, festering wound—one which poses a constant threat of infection to the entire world.

Our attempts in the past, through military and economic assistance, to appease both sides in the hope that the problems will solve themselves have not worked and will never work. That part of the world offers the U. S. S. R. a great opportunity to keep its propaganda machine almost constantly at work in its efforts to keep the world in turmoil.

In this connection, Mr. President, I should like to relate an experience of my own that bears on this subject. I had not been out of Russia more than 10 hours when I happened to meet one of the leaders of a Middle East country I visited. He said, "Senator, have you heard the latest?"

I said, "No; what is it?"

He said, "Do you know that today in Syria there are more than 2,000 Russian technicians, busily engaged in assisting the Syrians, and that war is imminent? Do you know that the Syrian Government has given to the Russians not only naval bases, but airbases?"

I was very concerned, and I asked, "Where did you get your information?" He said, "From our representatives in various countries of the Middle East."

I said, "Are you certain of it?"

He said, "I am positive."

I got the same story from some leaders of other countries I visited. I told them, "If the condition is as serious as you say, I want to visit Syria and see for myself," especially since I had been there during every year for 4 years previously.

I asked our Embassy in Damascus to make appointments for me with all the leaders of any consequence in Syria. President Sayed Shukri el Kuwatly got out of a sickbed to talk with me. The President of the Syrian Parliament, H. E. Akram Hawrani, the most influential man in Syria, saw me. I saw the head of the army. I saw the head of the Ministry of Agriculture. The prime minister was away somewhere, but I saw his assistant.

Every one of them vehemently denied that Russia had anything like 2,000 technicians there, or that Syria had given bases of any kind to Russia.

After seeing these people I talked with our own Chargé d'Affaires, and our own attachés in Syria. They all said, "Senator, there is no basis for the statement that there are 2,000 Russians here, and that bases were given to Russia. We do not know anything about that." Yet that rumor was being spread all over the Middle East. Even the press of this country was filled with statements to the effect that war was imminent between Russia and the United States over what might happen in Syria. It would not take many such rumors to spark serious trouble. Mr. President, I repeat, that unless and until the Arab-Israeli question is settled, there will be the festering sore to which I refer—a sore which will bring much trouble in the future. It will require a great deal of courage to bring about a settlement, but it must be done.

I believe such a settlement could be based upon limiting Israel's borders to the 1947 United Nations Resolution, a limitation upon immigration into Israel, and policies designed to create and foster cooperation between Israel and the Arab countries. In this connection, let me read from my observations last year concerning the Middle East. I read from page 455 of Senate Document No. 31, 85th Congress, 1st session:

I left this troubled area convinced of one thing, and that is that it will be impossible to establish a self-sustaining State of Israel. Particularly is that true if the minimum goal of not less than 2,500,000 inhabitants is to be reached. Should the population remain at 1,500,000 to 1,600,000, as is now the case, then this tiny little land might eventually become self-supporting. Even with that alternative, however, it would require an investment of many, many millions of dollars to build a sound economic base. As for sustaining a population of two and one-half to four million without foreign subsidies, this is seeking the impossible. If Israel's population ever reaches that point, world Jewry must be made to understand that it must continue to subsidize Israel heavily and indefinitely.

It is heartwarming to note the progress being made in Israel, although at high costs. Because of an inadequate background in technology, the populations in the neighboring Arab countries are not as well developed for survival in today's atomic age as are the Israeli. What the Middle East needs is the promotion of a political climate under which the Arab and Jewish popula-



tion could cooperate to raise living standards and develop the economy of the area. If, as I contend, Israel cannot become a self-sustaining state to take care of displaced Jews, it might be well to explore the possibility of reducing the area of the present state to the size proposed in the 1947 United Nations resolution. To this end, fixed boundaries should be promulgated, and any additional Jewish immigration should be channeled into Arab lands, conditioned, of course, upon their being permitted to live in peace there. I feel that if only this could be achieved the Arab and Jewish populations, by working together, could achieve an unprecedented economic development. In other words, the technological training of the Jewish immigrants should be used as a nucleus around which to build a highly developed Jewish-Arab economic sphere of influence.

I cannot overemphasize the necessity for some early solution to the present difficulties in the Middle East. As I warned the committee in 1954, the Middle East is the most volatile place on earth—it, and it alone, offers the greatest likelihood as the source of world war III.

There is no possibility of lessening the tension by extending assistance to both the Arabs and Israelis. We are beginning to be hated by the Arabs, and will undoubtedly be despised by the Jews if we refuse to further help them economically and militarily. It is time for the Jewish people of America and of the world to realize the complexities of the problems involved and the difficulties inherent in achieving a solution. It must be borne in mind, too, that comparatively few people of Jewish faith are involved, in contrast to the vast numbers of Arab people. A solution built around the continued existence of the State of Israel—but a state required to remain in fixed boundaries—and designed to promote cooperation between the Jews and people of the neighboring Arab countries must be achieved. What the Arab leaders fear most of all is that Israel will expand and eventually take them over.

I am convinced that these views are especially pertinent today.

While I am convinced that the implementation of these recommendations would result in a much higher degree of success than a continuation of our present policies, it is not my view that they will work miracles overnight. On the contrary, the New Look I have advocated should take place concurrently with the maintenance of a strong defense by the United States. We must not lower our guard. A modern, efficient Defense Establishment is the best guaranty we have against any attempt on the part of would-be world conquerors to follow the path of aggression instead of peaceful international competition.

In essence, the burden of my recommendations involves the maximum use of the single greatest resource our Nation possesses—not dollars, but the tremendous abundance of both material and spiritual advantages which freedom has to offer.

America is the world's greatest show-place for the accomplishments of a free economy dedicated to providing a free people with the highest standard of living in the world.

With such an exhibit of the fruits of our labors, it should be readily apparent that, in comparison with our growth over the relatively same period of time, Russia's advance has been accomplished despite, rather than because of, the dictates of Socialist theories, and perhaps owes

its success more to the hard work of her people than to any tenet or theory set forth by Lenin, Marx, or Stalin.

Let us open wide the doors to our show-place; let us welcome all who would come to see—to compare—to imitate.

Let us lay the foundation for trade and a restoration of commercial contacts between the east and the west.

Let us not apologize for our abundance, but, rather, let us display it to the peoples of the world as an example of what hard work can achieve for all who are willing to work.

Let us be honest enough to caution those who are to choose between socialism and freedom that such miracles are not wrought overnight, but must come gradually and through self-help.

Above all other things, let us not fear an honest competition with Soviet communism.

The approach I have outlined involves only the realization that it is time for our country to choose a more advantageous ground upon which to wage this most crucial battle of the cold war.

We have been confronted in recent years by what amounts to nothing more than an all-out effort on the part of the Soviets to defeat the democratic nations by peaceful means. Rather than see victory go to them by default, I urge our Government to pour its full effort into a massive fight for the minds of men—all men, everywhere.

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

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator from Louisiana has just delivered a very powerful and important speech on Russian-American affairs. The significant thing to me is that he was permitted to make that speech today without interruption from either side of the aisle. Had he undertaken 2 years, 4 years, 6 years, 8 years, or 10 years ago, to make such recommendations as he has submitted, and to make the statements he has made concerning European and Russian affairs in particular, he would have been challenged before he reached his first recommendation.

The fact that his speech has been attentively received today indicates that we are really making progress.

I was particularly interested in what the Senator said about our constant attacks on communism as such getting us nowhere, and the recommendation that, instead of continuing such attacks and concentrating almost 100 percent on such attacks, we should endeavor to "sell" America.

A month ago I had occasion to visit some of the small American countries. I visited the USIS libraries in those countries. Their materials were worn out. They did not have enough material to work on. Those people were eager to obtain the material from our American libraries. In one of them 40 percent of all the material was in circulation at all times.

The thing which impressed me was that the material which seemed to be in greatest demand did not appear to be what might be considered propaganda material. It consisted of books and

periodicals which dealt with everyday life in the United States. That was the material which was in demand. I believe that the same situation is true in other parts of the world.

The Senator from Louisiana has performed a valiant service, and I hope that other Members of the Senate, whether they agree with his recommendations in every detail or not, will give them the consideration they deserve.

Mr. ELLENDER. I thank the Senator. I would say, however, that the recommendations I have just submitted were first enunciated by me 2 years ago, in 1956, based on my inspection during 1955.

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

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. DWORSHAK. The Senator from Louisiana is contributing another vital chapter to the reports which he has been making for several years on his inspection trips to foreign countries. Having traveled with him in the fall of 1956 for about 3 weeks in the Pacific area, I am fully aware of the diligence and fairness with which he discharges his duties in trying to get factual information concerning the extremely expensive program of foreign aid.

I should like to ask the Senator whether in these many contacts and observations in the recipient countries it has been possible for him to reach any conclusions as to whether the spending of billions of dollars for military and economic aid has resulted in engendering friendliness and understanding among the peoples who have received those benefits from us, or whether there is actually discernible hostility, if not actual resentment, on the part of many of those nationals, because they fail to understand properly the motives of our foreign aid program. Will the Senator from Louisiana give us some conclusions on that particular point?

Mr. ELLENDER. I covered that issue at great length in my 1956 report. As it has often been said, it is impossible to buy friendship. I found instances of that in many places, but let me be specific. This past year, when I left Russia, I went to Tabriz, the second largest city in Iran. In Tabriz I found poverty the like of which I have never seen anywhere else, yet in that country we have spent hundreds of millions of dollars to assist people.

I came to a school which we had built in Tabriz. Tax money from the Senator of Idaho and money from myself was used to build a high school there. It was quite large, and could take care of four or five hundred students.

I was shown the school by our ICA representative in that area, and I learned that we had erected the building 3 or 4 years ago. The condition under which we built it was that we would help to furnish money for the teachers for 2 years—then Iran would take over. At the time of my visit, the 2 years had passed.

I never saw such a disorganized school. Most of the teachers had gone away. The principal was mad as a hornet at us, and he said to me, "Senator, why don't you get your Government to keep

on sending money for our teachers?" There, in the principal, we have one angry person, and he is spreading his anger around. We find that situation all over the world. I found an even more distressing situation while in Tabriz, however.

I was taken to a rug factory, where 800 people were employed. Of the 800, 600 were children ranging in age from 8 to 14. The owner of that factory was violating the laws of Iran by employing those children, but he was not in the factory. He had left when he heard that I was coming there.

I could not get permission to visit the factory, but I did see some of it—including one area where little children, little hands, were tying knots in rugs, to the chant of a big fat Persian.

Imagine that, Mr. President.

The owner is a rich man. He has a large factory, and his home is beautiful. I would wager that, although his income is probably 3 or 4 times mine, he does not pay more than about 8 or 10 percent of his income in taxes, while, as I have already said, I am in the 69 percent bracket. It makes me mad, and I think it makes our people mad, to think that we are paying high taxes to help countries which could well afford to help themselves if only the rich paid a fair tax rate. If Iran collected a proper tax from people like the wealthy rug merchant in Tabriz, it could pay teachers to use the school we built for the people of that country.

Democracy cannot be made to work in a country like that, where the government either refuses or is incapable of making the wealthy pay their just proportion of taxes, so that the poor can obtain a better way of life.

What would happen today if people in our country who were able to pay, paid only about token amounts of the income tax imposed by law?

The conditions I have referred to are not peculiar to Iran. One can find them in any country whose government is either incapable of making its people bear a just proportion of taxes, or refuses to do so.

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

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. THURMOND. I should like to congratulate the distinguished Senator from Louisiana for the informative and enlightening address he is delivering today. It is one of the most interesting addresses I have heard in the Senate since I have been a Member of it. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator if he believes, because we have given foreign aid by billions of dollars to countries overseas, that when the showdown comes those countries will necessarily be with us because of that aid, or whether he believes they will go along with whoever they think will win, or will be neutral.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator has posed quite a question. Let me answer it with a specific instance. The Senator knows that soon after NATO was established and we became a member of it, the force necessary to defend Europe was fixed at 66 military divisions, 30 of which

were to be active divisions. Of this 30, we were to furnish 5½.

With all the money that we have given to Western Europe, after putting those countries back on their feet, after helping their recovery to a point where they are better off today than they have ever been, on the western front today we have, as I recall, only 12 active divisions. Five and a half of those active divisions are made up of American soldiers.

We also find that the NATO countries are still withdrawing their forces. France withdrew a great many troops and sent them to North Africa. We read last week that the British are going to reduce their armed forces by two-thirds. In addition, she is reducing taxes. Yet we in the United States are spending more and more on defense, including aid to these allies.

That, I believe, is indicative of what we can expect if our present policy is followed. Let me remind the Senator that Europe is no isolated example. Who is carrying the load in southeast Asia? Who is carrying the load in Formosa? Who is carrying the load in South Korea? We are.

That is why I say that unless we adopt a new policy—unless we take a new look we are in for further failures. We cannot continue along the road we have been traveling and maintain our way of life.

Mr. THURMOND. Merely because we have helped these nations with billions of dollars does not necessarily mean that they will stand with us if a showdown comes. Is that correct?

Mr. ELLENDER. Of course. I can assure the Senator of that.

Mr. THURMOND. It is a matter of survival for them, and they will go with whoever they think will be the winner, or remain neutral. Is that correct?

Mr. ELLENDER. We have no guaranty that we will not find ourselves alone, I can assure the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Louisiana yield the floor?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield the floor.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I should like to join with my colleagues in complimenting the distinguished Senator from Louisiana upon the very concise, excellent talk he has given us today concerning his recent trip to Russia, Europe, and Asia.

Mr. ELLENDER. I thank the Senator from Massachusetts.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, informed the Senate that, pursuant to law, the Speaker had appointed Mr. TEAGUE, of Texas; Mr. RA-BAUT, of Michigan; Mr. MILLER, of Maryland; and Mr. WAINWRIGHT, of New York, as members, on the part of the House, of the Board of Visitors to the United States Military Academy.

The message also informed the Senate that, pursuant to law, the Speaker had appointed Mr. RILEY, of South Carolina; Mr. FRIEDEL, of Maryland; Mr. ANDERSEN, of Minnesota; and Mr. OSTERTAG, of New York, to be members on the part of the

House of the Board of Visitors to the United States Naval Academy.

The message further informed the Senate that the Speaker had appointed Mr. GARY, of Virginia, and Mr. WIDNALL, of New Jersey, to be members on the part of the House of the Board of Visitors to the United States Coast Guard Academy.

The message also informed the Senate that the Speaker had appointed Mr. YOUNG, of Texas, and Mr. FINO, of New York, to be members on the part of the House of the Board of Visitors to the United States Merchant Marine Academy.

The message further informed the Senate that the Speaker had appointed Mr. ROGERS, of Colorado; Mr. MAGNUSON, of Washington; Mr. CHENOWETH, of Colorado; and Mr. SCRIVNER, of Kansas, to be members on the part of the House of the Board of Visitors to the United States Air Force Academy.

The message also informed the Senate that the Speaker had appointed Mrs. ST. GEORGE, of New York, as a member of the National Monument Commission, to fill an existing vacancy thereon.

The message announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Vice President:

H. R. 5938. An act to amend section 812 (e) (1) (D) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1939 with respect to certain decedents who were adjudged incompetent before April 2, 1948;

H. R. 7762. An act to amend section 223 of the Revenue Act of 1950 so that it will apply to taxable years ending in 1954 to which the Internal Revenue Code of 1939 applies;

H. R. 8865. An act relating to the administration of certain collected taxes; and

H. R. 9035. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the basis of stock acquired by the exercise of restricted stock options after the death of the employee.

#### FORTIETH ANNIVERSARY OF UKRAINIAN INDEPENDENCE

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, the courage and spirit of the people of the Ukraine are foremost in our thoughts as we join with them in celebrating the 40th anniversary of Ukrainian independence day. After centuries of foreign rule, the intrepid people of the Ukraine finally expressed the eternal yearning of free man everywhere, and a new nation was born when the Ukrainian national council at Kiev proclaimed the independence of the country. Unfortunately, in 1920 this nation became one of the first victims of Soviet imperialism.

Despite years of enslavement, however, these people, who for such a brief period enjoyed freedom, have kept the spark alive. It remains for us in the free world to encourage and support their aspirations in full recognition of our common cause. Let us not forget that the strivings of the valiant Ukrainians, as well as those of the other Soviet enslaved people, are a part of the same effort in which all the people of the free world are engaged.

Today more than ever we are reminded that the struggle between tyranny and freedom will be won in the hearts and



minds of men. No group, in my opinion, better exemplifies the tenacity and adherence to principles of freedom than the valiant Ukrainians.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Goldwater	Morse
Allott	Gore	Morton
Anderson	Green	Mundt
Barrett	Hayden	Murray
Beall	Hennings	Neuberger
Bennett	Hill	O'Mahoney
Bible	Hoblitell	Pastore
Bricker	Hruska	Payne
Bridges	Humphrey	Potter
Bush	Ives	Proxmire
Butler	Javits	Purtell
Byrd	Jenner	Revercomb
Carroll	Johnson, Tex.	Russell
Case, S. Dak.	Johnston, S. C.	Saltonstall
Chavez	Kefauver	Scott
Church	Kennedy	Smathers
Clark	Kerr	Smith, Maine
Cotton	Knowland	Smith, N. J.
Curtis	Kuchel	Sparkman
Dirksen	Langer	Stennis
Douglas	Lausche	Thurmond
Dworshak	Long	Thye
Eastland	Malone	Watkins
Ellender	Mansfield	Wiley
Ervin	Martin, Iowa	Williams
Flanders	Martin, Pa.	Yarborough
Frear	McClellan	Young
Fulbright	McNamara	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

#### PROCEDURES FOR REPORTS BY EXECUTIVE AGENCIES RELATIVE TO DEVELOPMENT OF LAND AND WATER RESOURCES

The Senate resumed the consideration of the resolution (S. Res. 148) to prescribe procedures and contents for reports to the Senate by executive agencies with respect to proposed projects for conservation and development of land and water resources.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS] to recommit the resolution to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and the Committee on Public Works with certain instructions.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I do not know how long it is intended to continue the debate on the resolution. So far as those of us who favor it are concerned, we shall be very happy to have a vote on it in a short time.

In the course of the debate yesterday on Senate Resolution 148, questions were raised as to whether or not this proposal had been considered by the Western States and other western reclamation interests. The proceedings of the National Reclamation Association, at its conventions at Salt Lake City in 1956, and at Phoenix, Ariz., in 1957, have been reviewed. The record shows that at both conventions the procedures for the evaluation of land and water resource projects were discussed at length by the water policy committee of the association.

This water policy committee is composed of a representative from each of the 17 Western States, and it has the

advice and counsel of State engineers and other spokesmen of the water interests of each State. If there is any organization that can speak for the water interests of the Western States—even though we may not always agree with their conclusions—it is the National Reclamation Association and its Water Policy Committee, which reflects the views of the organized western water interests.

The present chairman of the water policy committee is Mr. Hugh Shamburger, State engineer of Nevada, who is exceedingly well qualified for this position.

At the Phoenix convention of the National Reclamation Association in November 1957, the following comment is made on Senate Resolution 148 and printed in a pamphlet labeled "The Voice of the West," embodying the resolutions and report of the water policy committee of the Association, approved by 17 State caucuses and adopted by the National Reclamation Association at its 26th annual meeting at Phoenix, November 6 to 8, 1957.

The cover of that publication reads:

The voice of the West—Resolutions and report of water policy committee, approved by 17 State caucuses; adopted by the National Reclamation Association, 26th annual meeting, Phoenix, Ariz., November 6-8, 1957.

It was my happy privilege to be asked to deliver an address upon that occasion, and to see several Members of the Senate present at that time.

The comments with relation to Senate Resolution 148 are as follows:

#### PROCEDURES FOR THE EVALUATION OF LAND AND WATER RESOURCE PROJECTS

The water policy committee in its 1956 report commented at length on the problems and proposals involved in Senate Resolution 281 of the 84th Congress, 2d session.

After hearings and considerable staff work, Senate Resolution 148, responsive to the directions in Senate Resolution 281, was introduced in the 1st session of the 85th Congress and referred to the Committees on Interior and Insular Affairs and Public Works.

The principal purpose of Senate Resolution 148 is to provide full information to the Congress on land and water resource projects. Thus, Congress will be able to make the necessary decisions on resource policies and will be saved from abdication that constitutional responsibility by default. Adequate information, as provided in Senate Resolution 148, should lead to a more intelligent evaluation of the land and water development projects.

After a careful review of the policy questions involved in Senate Resolution 148, the Water Policy Committee expressed general approval of this measure. If the provisions of the resolution were to be enacted into policy procedures, the presentation of proposals to the Congress from the Departments of the Army, Interior, and Agriculture would be consistent, the data on projects would be presented in a more complete manner, and the possibility of unwarranted delays in the presentation of proposals would be minimized.

Senate Resolution 148 is commended to the membership of the National Reclamation Association for careful study.

I point out that members of the water policy committee were not at all confused. They saw that the purpose was to provide full information to the Congress

on land and water resources projects; and they stated:

After a careful review of the policy questions involved in Senate Resolution 148, the water policy committee expressed general approval of this measure.

That is in line with what I tried to say yesterday. We studied this question as carefully as we could, and tried to make sure that what was offered to the Senate for action was proper.

It was stated yesterday that this measure should be in the form of a joint resolution. I believe that when the actual criteria are established, they should be in the form of a joint resolution. No one contends differently.

This resolution comes to the floor of the Senate in response to the Senate's own request for information. The Senate asked that the question be studied, and that a report be submitted to the Senate.

I hope the motion to recommit will not again throw this question into controversy, involving long continued arguments. We have considered the question. An opportunity was extended to any Member of the Senate to attend the hearings when they were under way. The hearings were finally concluded, and the report was submitted.

The hearings were on Senate Resolution 148, and not on some extraneous matter. Therefore I hope the proposal to recommit will not be agreed to, because it could only be construed as a motion to kill the entire study, which was undertaken after earnest solicitation on the part of any people who are very much interested in the water problems of the United States.

I hope the motion to recommit will be rejected.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I rise in support of the motion of the Senator from Utah to recommit Senate Resolution 148 to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and the Committee on Public Works. I do so for several reasons.

First, the action of the two committees is not in conformity with the directions contained in the resolution, which committed this question to those committees for study and report.

Second, the resolution now pending before the Senate, if adopted, would constitute unilateral action on the part of the Senate, without concurrent action by the House, on a question which, in the committing resolution, was repeatedly described as a responsibility of the Congress.

Third, I support the motion to recommit because, in my opinion, this resolution would dilute the criteria for establishing the financial feasibility of a public-works project to the point where the most fantastic and extravagant projects contemplated for conservation of water would come within the definition of a financially feasible project.

With respect to my first reason, under Senate Resolution 281, the Senate assigned this subject for study by the two committees which I have identified. I submit to my colleagues that if one reads the resolution, he must reach the

conclusion that the Senate, when it passed Senate Resolution 281, contemplated that the Congress would fix the criteria upon which the financial feasibility of a public-works project should be determined.

To support that proposition I wish to read from section 1, as follows:

That it is the sense of the Senate that the stabilization of the national economy and the effectuation of the wisest, most orderly, and most economic utilization of the land and water resources of the Nation for the widest possible public benefit requires that the Congress continue to exercise all of its constitutional powers—

If the pending resolution is adopted, it will not place the authority in Congress, but will constitute an action unilaterally by the Senate, not joined in by the House.

Secondly, I now read from section 4, as follows:

That reports to the Congress in support of requests for the authorization of projects for the conservation and development of land and water resources should include evaluations made in accordance with criteria prescribed by the Congress—

I now wish to read what in my opinion most forcefully points out that when Senate Resolution 281 was adopted it was intended that the recommendation made by the two committees should be acted upon by the Senate and House of Representatives, not by the Senate alone.

I now read the concluding paragraph of Senate Resolution 281:

Sec. 6. That the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and the Committee on Public Works be, and they hereby are, directed jointly to study, in consultation with other appropriate committees and executive agencies, and to design and to formalize comprehensive and particularized sets of standards and overall criteria for the evaluation of all proposed projects for the conservation and development of land and water resources—

I omit reading a few words, and resume my reading—

all to the end that the Congress shall fully exercise its constitutional powers—

I submit that the language in Senate Resolution 281 clearly declares that this disputed subject should be settled by Congress, not by the Senate alone.

So much for that phase of my support of the recommitment motion.

I now come to what I believe to be the more fundamental objection to the pending resolution. There are now about \$8 billion worth of backlogged public-works projects on the shelves. Last year we passed a bill authorizing the construction of \$1,500,000,000 worth. That bill is now pending in the House. The quantity of the work that is backlogged is reflective of the fact that with respect to the "porkbarrel" projects, authorizations were given for public works as to which there is hesitancy about going forward.

The pending resolution contains one very interesting paragraph. It states what the criteria shall be. In paragraph 3 it provides:

Benefit-cost ratios calculated by using total tangible benefits and total tangible costs for 100 years, and for 50 years, except where the economic life of the major project facility is less.

There is justification, I believe, in asking: Why is it directed—and if not directed, at least implied—that the studies should be made on the basis of a one hundred-year amortization of the cost? I believe I know the answer to that question. It is that if it is found that a project cannot be declared financially feasible on the basis of a 50-year amortization, it is to be suggested: "Look at it from the standpoint of 100 years."

In the bill we passed last year, there were included \$1 billion worth of projects declared to be financially infeasible, or not to have been studied to the extent where a report could be made recommending that a particular project be built.

If this is to be the criterion, if this is to be the mode of determining financial responsibility, I submit that the most fantastic projects will be made to appear financially feasible by spreading the cost of amortization over a 100-year period, instead of a 50-year period.

In my judgment, this is a most important piece of proposed legislation, and it cannot be looked upon merely as an innocent request for information from the various divisions and departments of government. In effect, it will become a directive, and projects which it will be possible to amortize in 100 years will be declared to be financially feasible, even though, if they could be amortized in 50 years, they would have to be declared infeasible. Those are the reasons why I believe the pending resolution should be recommitment.

If the resolution were recommitment, what damage would be done? The committee would continue its study, and there would probably come out of the committee a joint resolution in which the House would concur. If that is done, Resolution 281 will have conformity; otherwise, it will not.

I do know that there is complaint that the President vetoed the public works bill 2 years ago. More power to him. I hope, if the one we passed last year comes before him from the House, he will veto that one, too. I cannot understand how he could avoid doing it, when we recognize the fact that there are \$1 billion worth of projects in it which have not been adequately studied or have been declared to be financially not justified.

Those are my reasons for supporting the motion of the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS] that the resolution be recommitment.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I have been quite interested in the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Ohio with reference to the resolution. I wish to express to him my deep appreciation for the frankness with which he has stated his position. The great Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS], who submitted the motion to recommit and sponsors it on the floor of the Senate, is one of the ablest advocates of conservation in the Senate. He has as proud a record of service in behalf of conservation of water and development of soil resources as any Member of the Senate.

I am convinced of his sincerity of purpose in sponsoring the resolution, and that it is his desire to do what he believes

will be helpful to the cause of conservation. I respect him and honor him for that attitude.

It is quite apparent that the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE] has no such purpose. He supports the resolution because he thinks if it is adopted it will hinder and impair and slow down water conservation and the development of soil resources in the United States. He has made it quite plain that he is not trying to develop a better method than the one now in use to bring about the objectives of Senate Resolution 281. He has made it quite clear that he wants to do what he can to kill or impair the objective of Senate Resolution 281, of 1956, under which the Committee on Public Works and the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs reported S. 148 to the Senate.

I think it is quite significant that the distinguished Senator from Ohio knows more about what is in Senate Resolution 281, which was passed before his arrival here, and which was considered for months by Republicans and Democrats alike in the Committee on Public Works and the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, than do the members of those committees; when the fact about the business is that it was evident on the floor yesterday that the distinguished Senator from Ohio did not even know what was in Senate Resolution 148.

I say to the Senator that the Committee on Public Works and the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs held joint and separate hearings on the resolution, in a sincere effort to carry out the objectives of Senate Resolution 281 and to implement its spirit, which is to bring about a more effective program of conservation of the total soil and water resources of the Nation.

The distinguished Senator from Ohio decries the fact that there is a backlog of authorizations. He took the same position on the floor last year when the Senate passed the omnibus rivers and harbors bill. As I recall—and I want the Senator to correct me if I am mistaken—he and his distinguished colleague from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER] jointly sponsored an amendment to the bill for a project in his State, and the Senate accepted it. Then the distinguished junior Senator from Ohio voted against the bill. If I am in error, I should like to be corrected.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The Senator from Oklahoma has stated the proposition correctly. When the bill came before the Senate, it involved expenditures of \$1,500,000,000.

Mr. KERR. The Senator is mistaken. The bill did not involve an expenditure of a single dollar. It was not an appropriation bill.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The Senator may make the best of that point, but he cannot change the substance of what we are talking about. The Senator from Oklahoma may pick on commas and periods, but the substance of what I have in mind will not be changed by the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. KERR. I am convinced of the accuracy of that statement.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The bill provided for \$1,500,000,000 worth of projects, \$1 bil-



lion of which were declared either to be financially not feasible or not to have had studies completed to the point where the engineers could make recommendations upon them. While the bill was pending, the junior Senator from Ohio reported that all the agencies of government had recommended a \$13 million harbor project.

Mr. KERR. Whereabouts?

Mr. LAUSCHE. In Cleveland.

Mr. KERR. In what State is that?

Mr. LAUSCHE. It was declared to be financially feasible and that it could go forward. I said I would join in approving the project, but that I would vote against the bill.

May I ask the Senator from Oklahoma what amount of projects relating to his State, and which were not financially feasible, were contained in that bill?

Mr. KERR. Not one dollar.

Mr. LAUSCHE. It was a rather substantial amount, as I recall.

Mr. KERR. I say to the Senator from Ohio that if a full and comprehensive knowledge of the economic feasibility of the projects in that bill were to dawn upon him at this moment, I should fear the result of the impact of the truth of it on the psychology of the Senator from Ohio.

There was not a project contained in the bill which had not been declared economically feasible, and with a very high cost-benefit ratio, in the State of Oklahoma. The projects in that bill which were located in the State of Oklahoma had been approved by the inter-agency committee established in 1950 by legislation. The Corps of Army Engineers, the Department of Agriculture, the Department of the Interior, the Federal Power Commission, the Public Health Service, and representatives of eight States, had labored to bring to Congress the report of the economic feasibility of those projects.

The statement by the Senator from Ohio about the nonfeasibility of the projects in Oklahoma is just as erroneous as was his statement that there was a billion dollars worth of projects in the bill which had been declared to be infeasible by the administration.

The junior Senator from Ohio is a great man and a fine man, but I say to him that it is beyond the realm of legislative omniscience to be able to speak familiarly of matters with which one has had so slight and fleeting an association.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield?

Mr. KERR. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Opinions may vary as to the virtues of the resolution, although I myself do not think the resolution calls for anything which any committee of Congress having responsibility in this field might not ask for on its own initiative. The purpose of the resolution, as I understand, is to bring about some uniformity in the making of the reports which we receive, and to get the agencies to use the same yardstick when they allocate costs as when they measure feasibility.

One little point came up in the colloquy between the Senator from Oklahoma and

the Senator from Ohio, which I think should be clarified in the interests of accuracy. If I understood him correctly, the Senator from Ohio was acting under the impression that the omnibus flood control bill which was passed by Congress 2 years ago contained projects totaling about \$1,600,000,000. I thought I understood the Senator from Ohio to say that more than \$1 billion of them had not been found to be feasible or had not passed review by the Corps of Engineers.

Mr. KERR. That was the remark the Senator from Ohio made, and with reference to which I said his statement about the Oklahoma projects was just as incorrect as the other one.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I will stand to be corrected on whether the amount was \$500 million or \$1 billion. I am sure it was at least \$500 million; I think it was \$1 billion.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. My recollection of the matter is that the Senator from Ohio had the figures turned around. I have just consulted with the clerk of the Committee on Public Works, and he tells me that that is correct. Something more than \$1 billion worth of projects had been approved and found to be feasible; that they had gone to the Bureau of the Budget and had been reviewed by the Corps of Engineers.

So something more than \$500 million of projects had not completed all the processes of review. However, many of the projects were under review at the time.

When the Senate passed the bill last year, the processes had been completed on more projects, so that something in the neighborhood of \$200 million worth of projects were all that had passed all the several steps of review.

So at first, instead of there being \$1 billion worth of projects which had not been found feasible, it was \$1 billion plus which had been found feasible, and \$500 million on which reviews had not yet been completed.

When the bill was passed last year, studies on something more than \$1,400,000,000 of projects, or approximately that amount, had been completed, and the reviews had found them to be feasible.

The amount which now is under review is in the neighborhood of \$200 million. It may be that since the report was made last summer, the review of some more of those projects may have been completed.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from South Dakota for giving us the specifics on the question to which he has addressed himself. What he has stated shows the enormity of the error of the Senator from Ohio, when he said that when the bill was passed last year, \$1 billion worth of the projects involved in it had not been found to be economically feasible.

The point I was making, Mr. President, is that the action of the Senator from Ohio is calculated to slow down water and soil conservation and development. I referred to his action in connection with the omnibus bill of last year as another evidence of that atti-

tude. It is one to which he is entitled, and I honor him in the exercise of his choice and his privilege and his right to decide as he wishes. But I think other Senators, in contemplating his support of this motion, are entitled to know that it is consistent with the record he has made here in opposition to soil- and water-conservation projects, not in support of them.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield to me?

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President—

Mr. KERR. I yield to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. ANDERSON. I believe I understood the Senator from Ohio to take the position that he believed he was laying down a new yardstick to be used when the Congress wishes to measure irrigation projects in terms of 50 or 100 years.

Would it help the Senator from Oklahoma if I were to remind him that there are irrigation projects which now have a 100-year pay-off period? One is in Oregon; another is in South Dakota; another is in Colorado. Whenever an irrigation project which has been entered into in good faith is found, because of soil conditions or because of a change in the water supply, to require action by the Congress to extend pay-out periods Congress can act; and the Congress has acted.

I applaud the fact that when the Congress has found it necessary to do so, it has extended the pay-out period on these contracts for irrigation, even up to 100 years.

It is still within the realm of contemplation that other projects may get into pay-out trouble, just as these three projects did, and other pay-out periods may need to be changed.

Although that may be pointed out as a defect, I thought it was a recognition that Congress had been wise in doing these things previously. Does not the Senator from Oklahoma believe that to be so?

Mr. KERR. Entirely so, and I thank the Senator from New Mexico for that observation, because I think it points up the fact that the pending resolution is not based upon a desire or an effort to change the criterion controlling the Congress. This measure simply seeks to require the Government agencies to bring to our committees additional comprehensive information, not controlling on them, but in order that it may be available to them, and through them, to the Senate, whereby a broader scope of information may be available to us.

It seems to me that the distinguished Senator from Ohio is afraid to have the members of the Senate committees obtain comprehensive information about a project, lest perchance they might find a basis to justify its authorization.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield further to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SPARKMAN in the chair). Does the Senator from Oklahoma yield to the Senator from New Mexico?

Mr. KERR. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON. With reference to this criterion, I say to the Senator from

Oklahoma that I make the flat statement—and I do not think anyone will contradict it—that Senate Resolution 148 does not change one criterion or any set of criteria. No one can possibly prove to the contrary.

Furthermore, the newly numbered section 4 contains some language different from the original language of the original resolution. That new language was suggested by the Comptroller General of the United States. To say that someone who is trying to expand the program has included such language is simply not to speak in accordance with the facts. The Comptroller General of the United States, well within his rights, said they would like to have included a provision for the period of time allowable for review of the power investment and things of that nature; and we wrote that provision into the resolution, in response to the request of the Comptroller General of the United States.

Mr. KERR. And consistent with the principle of seeking to establish a means whereby more complete information could be made available to the committees, with reference to matters under their consideration.

Mr. ANDERSON. Certainly.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield to me?

Mr. KERR. In just a moment.

Mr. President, at this time I yield first to the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE], who for some time has been seeking recognition; and thereafter I shall yield to the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, it is my understanding that the 75- and 80-year amortization period applies in a substantial degree to irrigation projects, but that there has been a rather uniform 50-year limitation in the case of power projects and water projects. My position is—

Mr. KERR. At this point, will the Senator from Ohio permit me to correct him? The irrigation projects are water projects.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Yes; that is true.

Mr. KERR. And often they are power projects.

Mr. LAUSCHE. That is true. But in calculating the time in which the cost of a water pumping station or a power generating station can be amortized, the conclusion is reached that such stations have a life of 50 years. The life of the irrigation projects runs to 65 or 75 years.

I submit the proposition that the language contained in the section I read will make it possible to extend the period beyond 50 years in amortizing those projects, which in the past have uniformly been held to be payable in 50 years.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, the Senator from Ohio could not be more completely mistaken.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President at this point will the Senator from Oklahoma yield to me?

Mr. KERR. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON. I agree with the Senator from Oklahoma that the Senator from Ohio could not possibly be further from the facts of the matter.

The reclamation law provides for a 40-year repayment period, plus 10 years,

which have been added in order to get the projects under way. Generally speaking, our reclamation projects have a 50-year life. But water projects where power is created do not have that. As a matter of fact, when the central Arizona project was under consideration by the Senate, and since that time, it was pointed out that by means of the construction of certain dams—and the Glen Canyon Dam will be one of them; the Bridge Canyon Dam would be another, if it were added—the life of Hoover Dam would be extended another 100 years.

My personal guess is that the Hoover Dam will be in operation 300 years, and probably more than that. We do not have any limitation in that respect. It will pay out much sooner than that. But the great dams of the Pacific Northwest—among the most wonderful works I know of—will go on and on, far beyond the 50-year or 65-year or 80-year period.

For the life of me, I do not see what is wrong with allowing Congress to find out what can be expected to happen in those 100 years.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, at this time will the Senator from Oklahoma yield to me?

Mr. KERR. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I believe we can meet this issue very squarely if the Senator from Oklahoma will answer 1 or 2 simple questions.

First, is any Member of Congress bound to cast his vote for some project in the future, by anything that is included in this resolution?

Mr. KERR. Not remotely.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Is any policy in respect to the manner in which future projects will be built declared in the resolution?

Mr. KERR. No. I say to the Senator from Wyoming that the policy declared in the resolution is that we request the agencies of the executive branch of the Government to give us information on alternate plans of cost-benefit ratio, without approving any or without disapproving any and without making any remote effort to bind this body, or any Member of it, as to what it or he should do with reference to any of those proposals.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Is it not a fact that all that is done by means of the resolution is to request information?

Mr. KERR. The Senator from Wyoming is eminently correct.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. And if the request is complied with, such information will be submitted without entailing any obligation upon either the executive branch or the legislative branch?

Mr. KERR. That is correct.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Is there any member of the Committee on Public Works or of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs whose vote on any future project will be controlled by anything contained in this measure?

Mr. KERR. Not remotely; nor do the proponents of the resolution seek such control. The resolution expressly disclaims any such purpose.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Is it not a fact that, without this resolution, Congress

in the past has extended the repayment period on reclamation projects?

Mr. KERR. Up to 100 years.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Is it not a fact that there is nothing in the resolution which would increase the powers of Congress or lay any compulsion on any Member of the Senate or of the House to vote in a particular way?

Mr. KERR. The Senator is eminently correct. The sole purpose of this resolution is to bring more light, more information, to our committees, to enable them the better to serve us.

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

Mr. KERR. I yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. Supplementing the point which was made by the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], is the Senator from Oklahoma aware of the fact that we are now being told by experts in our Engineering Corps that, because of great improvements made in modern construction techniques, the life expectancy of a typical power dam today is equivalent to 150 years, instead of 50 years?

Mr. KERR. As a minimum, yes.

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

Mr. KERR. I yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. GORE. Granted that some Members of the Senate may not be as enthusiastic as are others about the development of natural resources or the conservation of water resources or resources of soil, is there any logical reason why even those who are less enthusiastic should not wish for, and perhaps be benefited by, the additional information for which this resolution would call?

Mr. KERR. I think the answer to that question is decidedly in the negative, Mr. President, because if this resolution is accepted in spirit by the executive, and if, in response to it—if the Senate should agree to it—the executive accedes to our request for information, which is the extent of the resolution, Congress will be provided with more comprehensive information about a project. If there were anything about the project which would indicate it should not be authorized, those who sought to oppose the authorization would have an equal opportunity with those who favored it to be armed with more complete information about the project than is the situation under the present policies of the executive departments or the present practice in their associations and relations with the committees.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. KERR. I yield.

Mr. GORE. Is it not true that those of us who reported this resolution favorably had in mind, not the promotion of arbitrary decisions, but enabling the Congress of the United States to detect arbitrary decisions if such decisions should be made?

Mr. KERR. The Senator is eminently correct, whether an arbitrary decision was favorable or unfavorable.



Mr. GORE. Or based upon facts of which the Congress was advised or unadvised. Is that correct?

Mr. KERR. That is correct.

Mr. GORE. Is it not true that we had in mind the laying of full facts before the Congress in order that the committees of Congress and the Congress itself might make decisions in light of the full facts?

Mr. KERR. In the light of more complete and fuller facts. The Senator is eminently correct. I sincerely hope the motion—

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. KERR. I yield.

Mr. COTTON. The Senator has indicated, if I understood him correctly, that nothing in Senate Resolution 148 lays down or attempts to lay down any policy on the part of Congress; that it is purely concerned with obtaining necessary information from the agencies regarding proposed projects.

I call the Senator's attention to page 6 of the resolution, section 4, which, if I read it correctly, does not refer to reports or information from downtown, but provides that "authorizations of multiple-purpose water resource projects" shall include and shall specify certain things.

I am not indicating that that is not a desirable thing, but is that not laying down a policy for Congressional action, at least so far as the Senate is concerned?

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator allow me to answer that question?

Mr. KERR. Yes. I yield to the Senator from New Mexico for that purpose.

Mr. ANDERSON. That provision was put in the resolution at the request of Mr. Joseph Campbell, Comptroller General of the United States. I do not think it lays down any policy. The Comptroller General felt he needed to have that information. I would not want to deprive him of it. Joseph Campbell is a very fine Comptroller General, and we thought we should pay attention to his request.

Mr. KERR. I wish to say further, in that regard, that at the conclusion of section 4 of the resolution, to which the Senator from New Hampshire has referred, it is specified that additional information shall be contained in an authorization. The only policy contained in this resolution is that more complete information be made available, and I think the provision is consistent with that purpose.

Mr. COTTON. That section certainly goes beyond a request from committees of Congress for information from executive agencies of the Government. It declares what should be specified in authorizations, which are acts of Congress. I am not suggesting that this provision is not desirable, but I think it goes beyond the question of merely seeking information for the committees of Congress. I will take the Senator's judgment on that point, because he is better versed in these matters than I am.

Mr. KERR. My judgment is that this paragraph lays down the policy that, in-

formation should be contained in the authorization for a project as to which method is to be used in the allocation of costs or how the allocation of costs shall be determined. In other words, the policy is that such additional information shall be contained in the authorization.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield?

Mr. KERR. I yield to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I hope the genial Senator from Oklahoma will modify his answer to the question suggested by the Senator from New Hampshire, because I believe the provision goes a little further than requiring information to be provided. It does declare the policy of the Senate to be that authorizations should specify the method by which allocation of costs shall be determined. I think such a requirement is highly desirable. We have had many examples of cases in which one agency of the Government has reported on the feasibility of a project on one basis, using one yardstick; and then, after the project has been constructed, we have found that another agency has used a different yardstick for allocating costs. The Comptroller General was eminently correct in suggesting that Congress should specify that in the authorization of the project the method by which the allocation of costs should be determined should be stated, and not left subject to conflict or quarrel between the various agencies.

Mr. KERR. I agree with what the Senator has said with respect to what the paragraph contains, but in order for me to agree with the statement of the Senator from New Hampshire, as I understood his statement, I would have to agree that the principle is laid down as to which method should be used. The paragraph does not lay down the principle of the method by which allocation of costs shall be determined. It lays down the policy that the method which at the time is in the mind of the Congress shall be stated in the authorization.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I can see the Senator's distinction.

There is one other provision in section 2, which I think goes beyond the question of merely getting information.

It is provided in section 2 that the reports by the Federal agencies should be sent to the Congress not later than 6 months after they have been submitted for comment to the governors of the affected States. That is merely an expression of policy, but it is an important expression of policy so far as the Senate is concerned.

In section 3 it is declared that the policy of the Senate would require that the projects recommended for construction by the Secretary of Agriculture under the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act should be transmitted to the Congress not later than 3 calendar months after their approval by the said Secretary of Agriculture.

Both of those items deal with furnishing information to the Congress, and in that respect they come within the an-

swer of the Senator from Oklahoma, but they do declare a policy. That policy is that instead of permitting the reports to kick around for many months, we should hear from the agencies within 6 months in a case in which reports have been submitted to the governors of the States for comment, and within 3 months after the Secretary of Agriculture has made up his own mind that he should report.

Mr. KERR. Does the Senator from South Dakota agree with me that, even on the basis upon which he has called the attention of the Senator from Oklahoma to the question, the entire resolution is still in the form of a request and does not purport to assume the dignity of a directive?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. That is true. What we are considering will not be a law, but merely an expression of the Senate.

Personally, I welcome a resolution such as this, which would bring about some uniformity among the reports submitted to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and to the Committee on Public Works. There are too many times when the Committee on Public Works has received the viewpoint of the Corps of Engineers and the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs has received reports from the Department of the Interior. In some instances those reports relate to the same project.

Probably the most patent illustration occurs with respect to my own State and the other related States in the Missouri Basin, where we have the great Missouri River, which involves projects being constructed both by the Corps of Engineers and by the Bureau of Reclamation. The Missouri River runs through many States. The Missouri Basin projects involve the States of Montana, North Dakota, South Dakota, Nebraska, Iowa, Minnesota, Kansas, and Missouri. All those States are affected by the Missouri River. Some of the States have projects under the Corps of Engineers, and other States have projects under the Bureau of Reclamation. Some States have projects involving both agencies.

We now have a situation in which there is no clear definition as to the responsibility so far as power is concerned. The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] conducted some hearings, at which time many witnesses appeared and testified before the committee. One witness had one point of view with respect to how power should be paid for, or what should be covered with respect to repayment to the Treasury. Another witness had other views. When representatives of the two agencies appeared before the committee we found a divergent point of view as between the Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation as to what was the responsibility of the power users in paying for the power.

The Comptroller General did not have any firm idea on the subject. An effort was made to look into the precedents, and different reports were found on different bills. Finally, by a very complex construction which related clause (a) in one report to clause (b) in some other report, or to some interpretation

given by the Comptroller General with respect to some other project, an effort was made to "hatch up" a basis for fixing the repayment responsibility.

All that section 4 would provide is that it shall be the policy, so far as the Senate is concerned, that when a report is made to the Senate it shall include a recommendation as to the allocation of costs and the method of repayment which is to be followed. Presumably if the Senate fulfills its responsibility it will write into the legislation, either specifically in the act or in the report accompanying an authorization, the method which is to be followed or the principle which is to be followed in the allocation of costs. That is highly desirable from the standpoint of the Comptroller General and from the standpoint of the United States Treasury.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator from South Dakota. It was my privilege to work side by side with the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] as well as with the distinguished Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] and the other members of the subcommittee of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs in the hearing, in drafting the language of the resolution. I say to the Senator that on the basis of the long and friendly and cooperative association we have had on the Committee on Public Works I know in my own mind that there could be no difference between the Senator from South Dakota and the Senator from Oklahoma as to thought and attitude with reference to the resolution and what it contains.

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

Mr. KERR. I yield to the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. COTTON. The question upon which I was attempting to obtain information has perhaps now been forgotten by the Senator, because of what has intervened.

I wish to say first to the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma that I agree completely with him and with the distinguished Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] that the objective suggested in section 4 is a desirable objective. My question, however, was as to whether section 4 laid down a policy of the Senate. That was a preliminary to another question which I should like to ask the distinguished Senator.

My next question is not asked in any sense in an argumentative way, but is asked because it is the crux of the whole question which concerns so deeply the Senator from New Hampshire.

I know the Senator from Oklahoma always speaks very eloquently and very sincerely. The Senator has stated in the past few minutes, and has further emphasized to the Senate, that the resolution we are considering, with all that it contains relative to the method of computing costs, relative to the time of amortization, relative to the consideration of future development in years ahead—and all the other things that are included in the resolution—has no real effect on any action of Congress in the future and cannot change such action,

because it is merely a resolution to enable the Senate to obtain from the agencies downtown, such as the Bureau of the Budget, the Department of Agriculture and the Department of the Interior, the information which the committees want and which the Senate needs.

I should like to ask what might occur as a result of the action of the Senate of the United States on this resolution. Assume for the sake of argument—which I am not quite ready to concede in entirety—that what the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] said is correct—that there is nothing new in the resolution, that every one of these criteria has already been used and laid down by various agencies, and that the resolution does not add a thing. When the Senate acts to approve this resolution, I believe the Senator from Oklahoma will agree, it will take a formal action to approve various criteria. The various criteria will be given a seal of approval, a force, and a potency which will be referred to by Senators on the floor and in committee, and by Representatives in the other body in the years to come, as indicating, when a project is under consideration for approval, that the Senate of the United States in Senate Resolution 148, adopted way back in 1958, laid down a policy and by inference, at least, gave its approval to the criteria set forth in the resolution with respect to the information requested. Does the resolution not have some potency in that respect?

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I appreciate the question of the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire. In the statements I have made with reference to my interpretation of the resolution I have tried to speak factually and sincerely. I must submit to the distinguished Senator that I would hesitate to answer the question he addressed to me as to what effect the resolution might have on actions of Senators in the future in speeches they might make on the floor of the Senate in favor of or against any proposed authorization.

I believe my distinguished friend will recognize that, fertile as is the imagination of both the Senator from New Hampshire and the Senator from Oklahoma, it would put them to a greater strain than probably they should be subjected to at this late hour of the day to attempt to specify the reaction which Senators in future years might have to this resolution.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I should like to direct one more brief question to the Senator from Oklahoma.

If what he says is true, and if it is stretching our imagination too far—

Mr. KERR. I did not say the resolution would stretch the imagination. I said that I would have to stretch my imagination in order to answer the Senator's question.

Mr. COTTON. If it strains our imagination too far to picture what might be the potency of this resolution in the minds of future Senators, I invite the Senator's attention once more to the middle of page 4, and the criteria in section 5.

The resolution provides that information should be furnished regarding the "physical feasibility and costs of providing capacity in the project works for current needs and future uses that may reasonably be anticipated to develop during the useful life of such project works."

That is the one section with respect to which I find it difficult to believe—and I have searched rather conscientiously in connection with this question—that it is not an addition to what has been previously laid down by the departments downtown as criteria. When we consider that some of these projects may extend over a period of 100 or 150 years in the future, as has been stated on the floor of the Senate, I ask, How about the strain on the imagination of the people downtown, who must advise the Senate on that particular section?

Mr. KERR. Let me say to the distinguished Senator that I thought paragraph 5 was a very useful paragraph in the resolution. As the Senator has just stated, it would result in a request from the Senate to the agency affected to provide the committee with information as to the physical feasibility and costs of providing capacity in the project works for current needs and future uses that may reasonably be anticipated to develop during the useful life of such project works.

I do not believe that such information would be a burden or a liability to the committee. I do not think it would involve undue hardship on the Corps of Engineers or the Bureau of Reclamation to make such a study of the usefulness of the project as would enable it to give the committee a picture of the physical feasibility and costs of providing capacity in the project works for current needs and future uses that may reasonably be anticipated to develop during the useful life of such project works.

I take it that the word "capacity" means storage capacity, for current needs and future uses that may reasonably be anticipated to develop during the useful life of such project works.

I believe that such information would be helpful.

Let me say to the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire that if that is the paragraph in the resolution which has placed such a heavy burden upon his mind and created concern to such an extent that he is greatly worried as to the result our action today might have upon the minds of Senators in the future, I ask him this question: If the sponsors of the resolution were to agree to ask unanimous consent to delete that paragraph, would that obviate the Senator's opposition to the resolution, and let us get on with the business of the Senate?

Mr. COTTON. I shall permit Senators to get on with the business of the Senate in just a moment.

My answer must be "No." It is the steadfast opinion of the Senator from New Hampshire that the passage of this resolution, with all the criteria which are laid down in it—and there is scarcely any restriction to such criteria—involves a very great many contingencies. If such criteria were fol-



lowed—and the dignity which would be given to them by passing the resolution today would mean a strong argument that such criteria should be followed—my imagination is not vivid enough to imagine any project in any part of the country which is beneficial to anyone, which could not be justified by some part of the resolution.

Mr. KERR. I thank the Senator. I was of the opinion that the elimination of the paragraph referred to would not obviate his opposition. I thank him for making it plain that in reality the basic difference between the Senator from New Hampshire and the Senator from Oklahoma can be found in this colloquy, in that the Senator from New Hampshire might be seeking a checkrein, as the President said the other day, while the Senator from Oklahoma might be seeking to apply a stimulant to the conservation program.

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

Mr. KERR. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON. I do not know whether this is the answer to the question, but I do know what was in the minds of some of those concerned with the resolution.

Some time ago a bill was passed providing for a dam in the State of Idaho, known as the Palisades Dam. At that time careful regard for the people of that area might have contemplated that future needs might require the construction of another dam, the Burns Creek Dam. Nothing of that nature was included in the report. Sometimes the Bureau of Reclamation includes such observations, and sometimes it does not.

This year both Senators from Idaho came forward with the Burns Creek project. It was a reasonable project. The bill was passed by the Senate. It is held up in the House of Representatives—I hope for only a short time.

It is anticipation of future needs that is contemplated here. I see nothing wrong with anticipation of future needs. I hope the people will not worry because once in a while the Government does look ahead.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I simply do not see on what basis any Member of the Senate can oppose the pending resolution.

Very simply stated, the resolution merely indicates it to be the sense of the Senate that two committees, the Public Works Committee and the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, ought to receive certain information with respect to projects embodied in bills which are referred to either of them.

The resolution is but an indication of the type of information which is necessary to enable members of each of those committees to reach an honest judgment as to what to do with projects embodied in bills which come before them.

During the days I have had the honor and pleasure of serving in the Senate, I have been a member of the Committee on Public Works and of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. I believe that each of them is a great committee. I believe that each of them has outstanding Members of the Senate on

its roster. As one of the newcomers, I have been most pleased at the care with which each piece of legislation coming before either committee is weighed and with respect to which final determination is made, for or against, when the vote comes.

I congratulate the members of the committee who, in their capacities as chairmen of these two committees, responded to what the Senate told them to do, and did a good job, as did the chairmen of both subcommittees.

I believe that enough has been said by many Members of the Senate with respect to the wording of the resolution, and I shall not detain the Senate, other than to say that thus far no one has denied that the resolution would simply attach the dignity of Senate approval to a Senate resolution designed to meet the needs of two committees in an extremely important field.

Among Senators who oppose the resolution are men for whom I have the greatest respect. A very dear friend of mine, a man whom I respect, the distinguished Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS], delivered a speech against the resolution yesterday and then made a motion that the Senate recommit it.

Yesterday, when he discussed the pending resolution, he said, in part, "It fails to meet the obligation of the legislative branch to establish basic policy."

The simple answer is, that in this resolution, we are not trying to establish basic policy for Congress. What we are endeavoring to do is to demonstrate to every appropriate agency in the executive branch that the Committee on Public Works and the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of the Senate have the right to receive and must receive, if the resolution is adopted, the type of technical, specific data and information which the resolution will require.

Very quickly I wish to say that in the report which accompanied the resolution, Major General Itschner, Chief of Engineers of the Army, said, in part:

The items of information which the agencies of the executive branch would be expected to provide pursuant to Senate Resolution 148 are generally consonant with the principles and procedures for formulating and evaluating water-resources projects which have been evolved over the past several years through the cooperative efforts of the interested Federal agencies and which are currently in use by the Corps of Engineers in planning such projects. It is gratifying that the findings of the committees are in such close agreement with these practices.

I do not find very much in these comments to oppose the resolution.

Speaking for the Department of the Interior, Mr. Fred G. Aandahl, Assistant Secretary of the Interior, said, in part:

A large part of the information called for by Senate Resolution 148 is now regularly or often included in our project-planning reports. The remainder can, we believe, generally be supplied. Undoubtedly, there will be occasion from time to time to supplement even this expanded list of items or to delete from it those which prove not to be worth while.

Here, too, does it not appear that the Department of the Interior offers no basis for opposition?

On what basis do the appropriate agencies of Government today make comments concerning proposed pieces of legislation introduced in the Senate which find their way into either one of those two committees? Certainly not by law. There is no law on that subject. It is by a decision on the part of the executive branch of the Government. When the executive branch of the Government determines to change the basis or a criterion, it does so. And it has done so on many occasions in the past.

Thus we have the perfectly ludicrous situation of a project being determined feasible on the basis of one formula, one day, but measured on an entirely different basis subsequently, when the executive branch changes the basis for reporting. We who sit in judgment in the Senate ought to be able to say: We want the same type of information in 1958, in 1959, in 1960, and thereafter, until we ourselves determine that a different type of information is necessary or required.

It seems to me that if we reject the resolution, we will in effect be tying at least one hand of each of the two committees, and depriving both committees of the additional dignity which the pending resolution, if it were approved, would give to the requests that come from both of the committees when they sit in judgment on public project bills.

I conclude by repeating, that to me there is no logical basis for the Senate to refuse to approve this resolution, simply designed to promote the efficiency of two of the most important committees of the Senate.

I do not believe that we ought to sit idly by and do nothing until we are able finally to mesh our approach to a problem with that of the House of Representatives. The Senate sees many things in a different light from the House of Representatives. The Senate passes legislation upon its own ipsi dixit. The House, on the other hand, passes legislation on its own judgment and in accordance with the way it looks at things. To me, it is clear that we should approve the resolution and defeat the motion of my good friend the Senator from Utah.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN], who heads the minority members on the Committee on Public Works who do not agree with the report of the committee, is not present. I therefore ask that the minority views of those members of the Committee on Public Works be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

#### MINORITY VIEWS FROM COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS

Senate approval of Senate Resolution 148 in its present form is highly undesirable for a number of important reasons:

1. It could lead to further delay and postponement in the construction of the enormous backlog of projects now authorized but not built.
2. It would seriously weaken and undermine the economic standards necessary to the proper evaluation of the Nation's land and water resources projects.

3. It could lay the groundwork for opening the floodgates of the Public Treasury to unessential, wasteful, and unjustified projects.

4. It could provide Congress with a confusion and multiplicity of plans and alternatives that could clog the pipelines of progress on genuinely needed legislation.

5. Senate committees already can request the same information from Government agencies as is contained in Senate Resolution 148.

The stated objectives of Senate Resolution 148, with which we agree, are to improve the procedures for evaluation of land and water resources projects, and to provide a greater degree of Congressional control over resource development. Adoption of the resolution, however, will only worsen, instead of improving, the present situation. These minority views may be the foundation for saying we are not in favor of public-works programs. Such an assumption would be an erroneous one. We are interested in promoting and furthering a sound and wholesome public-works program which will merit the approval of citizens and taxpayers.

I. The most pressing problem in the water-resource development field, and the one which contributes most to loss of control by Congress, is the tremendous backlog of projects already authorized. There is now a backlog of about 470 active projects for rivers, harbors, and flood control, authorized for construction by the Corps of Engineers, which have never been started. These projects, in addition to some 400 now being built, will require an estimated \$8.3 billion to construct. At the current rate of spending (\$495 million in fiscal year 1958) it will take almost 17 years to complete them. It will take the Bureau of Reclamation more than 30 years to build its presently authorized backlog at the current spending rate. It is apparent that enough work is on hand to last a long, long time without looking for additional ways to justify more projects.

II. The real purpose of the resolution is to dilute the careful standards of projects evaluation that in the past have screened out the unfeasible, uneconomic projects. New projects can be found which meet our present careful and long-tested standards of acceptance. By relaxing these standards, added projects can secure approval; but such relaxation of standards would lead to authorization of unessential and wasteful projects.

Friends of public-works and resource-development programs, whether they be conservative or liberal in their thinking, and regardless of their political affiliation, are interested in sound and acceptable programs. Volume should not be one of the factors involved. Acceptance and approval of such projects are not measured by the taxpayers in terms of volume. The test is a more practical one of cost and feasibility.

Some of the ways in which the resolution would undermine sound economic standards in evaluation of proposed projects and lay the groundwork for unessential and unjustified projects deserve special mention:

The resolution (sec. 1 (5) (b)) would require computation of amortization upon the basis of 50 years, 100 years, or the useful life of the facilities, if less. The use of a 100-year amortization period would result in reducing annual fixed costs, and thus increase chances for annual benefits which exceed yearly costs. Writing off the cost of a project over a 100-year period will put a major share of the bill on the taxpayers of succeeding generations. This is not the heritage which we should be proud to bequeath to our children.

The resolution requests Government agencies to submit information on indirect and intangible benefits which may become part of the criteria in determining the feasibility of projects. If benefits arising from a project are greater than its cost, we have a basis for saying the project is justifiable and economically sound. The danger signal goes up

on those borderline projects where there is doubt whether the benefits will justify the cost. The indirect and intangible benefits, which at best are likely to be vague, will then be considered. Such vague standards could be the determining factor in putting the stamp of approval on many a project. Indirect and intangible benefits can be so broadly defined and far reaching that even the remotest possible benefit can be used as the standard of project evaluation.

Recreation benefits are among the indirect and intangible benefits on which information would be requested by this resolution. A bill now on the Senate Calendar, S. 1164, would make recreation considerations a direct, calculable benefit in evaluating projects. Some of the objections to that are pointed out in the minority report on the bill. They are equally applicable here. The resolution lays the groundwork for putting the Federal Government in the recreation business. It could also lead to an unwarranted expansion of Government participation in a host of fields.

Furthermore, all States do not equally share the benefits of land- and water-resources projects. Expansion of this program as contemplated in the resolution is likely to result in projects so local in nature as to arouse criticism and overwhelming opposition from people in other sections of the country.

The resolution calls for information on "future uses that may reasonably be anticipated to develop during the useful life of such projects works." This could lead to imposing on the taxpayers of tomorrow for something we have no way of knowing whether they will want or need. It could make a crystal ball as important as his slide rule to a project-development engineer.

The resolution also requires information on three methods of cost allocation. Current policies seek to secure a fair apportionment of the cost of projects among the various uses rather than to give preferential treatment to one use against another. A single method, the separable costs-remaining benefits method is generally accepted by all major agencies involved in water-resource development as being most equitable. The majority has given no reasons for requiring costly calculations on the basis of two additional methods, out of the nine available, despite their effect on the Treasury. The implication of this would be that the majority desires to approve projects on an incremental cost basis which would greatly expand the nonreimbursable Federal contribution to many projects.

III. We also question the vehicle chosen to accomplish the objectives of the majority. This resolution will not be sent to the House for its approval and yet its purpose is to aid Congress, not just the Senate. If the House of Representatives were to approve a resolution on a similar subject, but different in its terms and directions, the Government agencies would then be confronted with submitting different, and potentially conflicting, information to the Senate and House. There is no need to dwell on the difficulty Congress could have in evaluating, and properly authorizing a project in such a situation.

EDWARD MARTIN.  
NORRIS COTTON.  
ROMAN L. HRUSKA.  
CHAPMAN REVERCOMB.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, I do not intend, at this late hour, to make any extended remarks on the resolution before the Senate. What I have heard convinces me that, if there had been any flaw in the case we made yesterday, for recommitment that weakness has now been fully taken care of by the discussion we have had today. As I understand now, the disclaimer that no policies are sought to be established made in answer to the questions of the

Senator from Wyoming by the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR] put the case for the resolution practically out of court. That is true notwithstanding that in section 4 of the amended resolution, at page 6, it is provided: "That authorizations of multiple-purpose water resource projects should, first, specify the method by which the allocation of costs shall be determined."

Let us stop and look at the word "authorizations." Only Congress makes authorizations. That is what we are talking about. We are talking about authorizations which Congress makes, and will make in the future.

If there is any policy declaration in the Resolution 148, it is certainly in that sentence. In other words, with respect to any future authorization acts we pass authorizing multiple-purpose water resource projects, we "specify the method by which the allocation of costs shall be determined, the period of time allowable for repayment of the power investment, and the formula for determining the rate of interest on it that is to be returned; and, second, require that prior to the time that any major facility of such multiple-purpose project is placed in operation the construction agency shall report the allocation of costs in accordance with the criteria of section 1 of this resolution, together with its recommendations and the comments of the power marketing agency if that be other than the construction agency."

If I understand the meaning of that language and its legal effect—and I have had some experience in the legal field, as my colleagues have been kind enough to mention—it means that an attempt is made in section 4 to lay out a course of action the Senate is supposed to follow with reference to water resource development projects. Senator KERR's disclaimer contradicts the plain language of the resolution.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WATKINS. We do not have any real power to bind any future Congress, or any future Senate, because any Senate can change that language. However, if that is not a declaration of policy, I have never read one. I yield to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. As the Senator knows from my observations, I think that is a declaration of policy, so far as that is concerned. I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Utah if he does not think it is a good policy. Does not the Senator believe that Congress, in making authorizations, should specify the method by which the allocation of costs should be determined?

Mr. WATKINS. I should like to say—

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Does the Senator not think so?

Mr. WATKINS. I will ask the Senator to wait just a moment. I was only referring to what the section means. I say that actually declares a policy.

What is contained in that policy declaration requires a great deal of study. I doubt, as a matter of fact, that the resolution contains everything that



should be contained in such a policy, because in my 11 years in the Senate, I have found it very difficult to find a formula that will fit all projects, because most projects must stand on their own feet; and, necessarily, there will have to be different types of formulas applied to different projects. That is one reason why we have never had any hard and fast formula with respect to all projects.

At one time we authorized the Secretary of the Interior to go ahead with a certain class of projects, by allowing him to say: "This project comes within the law," and permit him, on that basis, to build it. Later we took that power away from him.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Would the Senator rather—

Mr. WATKINS. Just a moment; I will ask the Senator to let me finish. We thought it was not right to set up the same kind of standard, when projects differed materially.

The Colorado River has a different set of circumstances. The Columbia and other rivers have circumstances peculiar to themselves. It is difficult to establish any particular formula that will fit all water resource developments.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Does not the able Senator from Utah think that when a project is authorized, Congress exercises its judgment, in authorizing the project, in specifying the time for repayment of costs from revenues, such as the sale of power?

Mr. WATKINS. I should say that probably many of those things should be specified, but we usually do so without any direction in advance from the Senate. When all is said and done, the Congress in being at this time will fix the terms of a bill under which a project will be authorized.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. But Congress has not always done so in the past. That is why the Comptroller General wanted this provision included. There have been times when Congress has not specified the method by which the allocation of costs should be determined. There have been times when Congress did not specify the time allowable for repayment. There have been times when Congress did not spell out the formula for interest.

Mr. WATKINS. We cannot bind future Congresses.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. No, we cannot bind them, but we can declare it to be a policy that instead of legislating so loosely, as we have with respect to some projects in the past, future authorizations should spell out these requirements.

We should not be legislating on some obscure report on a bill. We should not throw upon the Comptroller General or the Bureau of the Budget the burden of determining the basis of feasibility and the intent of Congress as to how much should be repaid. Those factors should be contained in the authorization. That is a sound declaration of policy.

Mr. WATKINS. Does the Senator think those are the only factors which should be contained in authorizing legislation?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I do not know whether they are all, but I think those ought to be included.

Mr. WATKINS. Do we not exclude under rules of construction ordinarily applied all matters not mentioned in a section which attempts to name specific requirements?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. No. Congress can specify in the legislation, but it should not overlook these things, as it has done in the past.

Mr. WATKINS. My point is that the Senator has made it clear that he agrees with me. After all has been said and done, after the colloquy between the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. BARRETT] and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], they gave a policy declaration quite to the contrary.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I think we do; and I have so said consistently during the debate.

Mr. WATKINS. I think it is a very unwise thing to go ahead and try to put a limitation on us now, to a certain extent, so far as we think we can do it without study by a committee. We probably ought to provide for more criteria than are contained in the resolution. Remember this has to do with authorizations.

I shall not attempt to meet all the arguments which have been made. I thought the statement last night made it rather clear that the Committee on Public Works and the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs have the full power now to get, by resolution of the committee, any information which is needed from the executive agencies. No matter what is required, it is within the power of the committees to get it. They do not have to come before the Senate, get a resolution of the Senate, and try to bind some Senate in the future on an authorization to get information, if that is the sole purpose of the resolution.

I have been a Member of the Senate for 11 years. I have not yet seen a time when a committee which had asked for information about a specific problem or a specific bill did not get whatever information the departments already had on the subject. I have never seen that happen. I asked a question on that point last night, but I did not get an answer which indicated that the committees had ever been refused information which they wanted.

It seems to me that what we are attempting to do is rather unwise. My friends were somewhat naive last night when they said that one of the main reasons we must pass the resolution is that we cannot get the House to take similar action. We will not send a joint resolution to the House because the House will not agree with us.

We must remember that any legislation which is to be passed by Congress must have the approval of the House as well as of the Senate. We cannot get into a hassle with the House by saying to them, in effect, "You people will not go along with us on any reasonable program, so we are going to have one of our own." That seems to me to be unwise, from the standpoint of authorizing water conservation and development

projects in the future. We have got to get along with the House. It seems to me that this resolution will be considered more or less a slap in the face by the House; it will be something gratuitous; something we should not do.

After all has been said and done, I do not think any work has been done to get the House to go along with the Senate on this particular type of resolution. That is one reason why I think it is entitled to further study.

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] stated that if we do not pass the resolution, the proposal will simply die. But we still have the obligations as are set forth in Senate Resolution 282, to discharge.

This is what the motion which I offered would direct the committee to do:

That the committees—

I am referring to the two committees already named—

instruct their legal and technical staff to together prepare a synopsis of the information available relative to establishing a Federal water resources development policy adaptable to national coverage;

That takes in a wide territory, when one is talking about developing a water resources policy adaptable to national coverage. That is what I should like to see us develop. My motion continues:

with further instructions that such a synopsis be brief, although comprehensive; that it contain a summary of the objective for establishing such a policy; and that the staff, collectively, report to the committees, from time to time, on progress, on need for further instructions, and on the desirability for further Federal agency reports as well as reports from the affected States.

I should like to go one step further and suggest that after we shall have gone into this subject a little further we shall try, if we possibly can, to prepare a statement for circulation to the States and the State water departments as to the national policy. Then, when we have established a policy, it will be one which people can live with and can support.

I think that what we will get as a result of the disclaimers made here will be largely a gesture which will not mean anything, except as to one matter which the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] has mentioned. If I interpret rightly what has been said, there is not any agreement among the committee members that this is the meaning of this particular resolution. There is a dispute as to what it actually means. One declaration is that there is not any policy being established; the other is that a policy is being established.

The record has been made. So far as I am concerned, I thought it was my obligation as a Senator and as a member of the committee to call this point to the attention of the Senate, and particularly to the attention of those who are interested in some kind of water-resource development. I want to cooperate with them. I have offered what I consider to be constructive suggestions. I think we shall ignore the resolution, if it should be adopted—and it may be adopted—whenever a large project

comes along that does not fit the formula we have adopted. There is no sense in passing a resolution if we cannot live with it.

All I am asking for is a better study. I have looked through the record of the hearings which were held before the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs on Senate Resolution 148. The hearings lasted about 2 hours. Very few witnesses appeared. Some Senators appeared, and some statements were submitted.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GORE in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

The question is on agreeing to the motion to recommit.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, on this question, have the yeas and nays been ordered?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. They have not been ordered.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion to recommit. [Putting the question.]

In the opinion of the Chair, the "noes" have it.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, I ask for a division.

On a division, the motion was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution is open to further amendment.

If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on agreeing to the resolution, as amended.

The resolution (S. Res. 148), as amended, was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now is on agreeing to the amendment to the preamble, which will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. It is proposed to amend the preamble by adding at the end thereof the words "and for clearance pursuant to the provisions of the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act (68 Stat. 666, as amended)."

The amendment to the preamble was agreed to, and the preamble as amended was agreed to.

The resolution (S. Res. 148), as amended, including the preamble as amended, is as follows:

Whereas the sense of the Senate, stated in Senate Resolution 281, 84th Congress, is that the Congress will continue to exercise its constitutional powers to encourage the comprehensive conservation, development, and utilization of the land and water resources of the Nation, and that reports to the Congress in support of authorization of such projects should (a) include evaluations made in accordance with criteria prescribed by the Congress, and (b) fully disclose the results of studies and analyses of the potential utilizations, costs, allocations, pay out, and benefits, both direct and indirect; and

Whereas pursuant to said Senate Resolution 281, the Committee on Interior and

Insular Affairs and the Committee on Public Works jointly have reported to the Senate that, in order to evaluate projects proposed for authorization, certain information is needed in addition to that regularly submitted by the executive branch in support of proposed projects, such information being related to selection of plans of development, costs, benefits, reimbursements, or contributions required of local interests; and

Whereas such information is needed also for consideration by the Senate in connection with legislation to establish policies and criteria regarding allocations of project costs, and for evaluations of project benefits, which policies and criteria the Comptroller General of the United States, the Bureau of the Budget, and the Secretary of the Army have recommended should be established by the Congress; and

Whereas the program for conservation, development, and utilization of the land and water resources of the Nation is impaired by delay in the delivery to the Congress of reports on projects proposed for authorization and for clearance pursuant to the provisions of the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act (68 Stat. 666, as amended): Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that procedures for evaluation of land and water resource projects should be improved, and that the agencies of the executive branch of the Government responsible for the preparation of reports relative to the authorization of land and water resource projects be, and are hereby, requested to furnish, in connection with such reports, the following information in addition to the data now presented in support of project authorizations:

Information relative to alternative plans for the water resource projects that may reasonably be considered physically feasible of construction consistently with the advice of the Department of the Army, or the Department of the Interior, or the Department of Agriculture, including enough of the information enumerated in subparagraphs (1) to (10) inclusive to show why each alternative was dropped in favor of the recommended plan. With respect to the project recommended for authorization, the information should include, but not be limited to—

(1) Complete description of project, including an estimate of the economic life of the major project facility.

(2) Estimated costs of construction, operation, maintenance, and replacement, together with a plain and succinct statement of the basis upon which all such estimates are made.

(3) Benefit-cost ratios calculated by using total tangible benefits and total tangible costs for 100 years, and for 50 years, except where the economic life of the major project facility is less.

(4) Description and, to the extent possible, computation or other evaluation of indirect and intangible net benefits including but not limited to (a) protection of life and property; (b) improvement of transportation; (c) conservation of water, soil, and forest resources; (d) wildlife conservation; (e) recreation; (f) abatement of pollution, including salinity; (g) control of sedimentation; (h) maintenance and enhancement of the agricultural, commercial, and industrial economy of the area affected.

(5) Physical feasibility and costs of providing capacity in the project works for current needs and future uses that may reasonably be anticipated to develop during the useful life of such project works.

(6) Allocations of costs, to be calculated (a) by at least three methods, namely, the separable costs-remaining benefits method, the priority of use method, and the incremental cost method; and (b) on at least two time periods for amortization, namely, 50 years or the useful life of the facilities,

whichever is the lesser, and 100 years or the useful life of the facilities, whichever is the lesser.

(7) Description of the extent to which the Federal, State, and local governmental agencies, and nongovernmental entities have evidenced interest in participating in the construction or operation and maintenance of the potential project, or in obtaining its benefits, including, in the case of electric energy, information, relative to the preference status of governmental agencies, municipalities, and cooperatives; and the manner in which it is proposed to accomplish coordination and cooperation, and the estimated Federal costs of such participation.

(8) Estimated schedules of repayments of reimbursable costs that would be within the estimated financial resources of the potential use area, such schedules to show also the deferred repayment of the portion of the costs allocated to uses that may be anticipated to develop in the future.

(9) Probable effects of the potential project on State and local governments, including, but not limited to (a) the costs of local government services; and (b) the enhancement or reduction of tax revenues, together with the amount of potential tax revenue that would be forgone by Federal development in lieu of non-Federal development of the project. The estimated amounts of tax revenue enhancement and tax revenue forgone as a result of the project should be shown in calculations of project benefits and costs.

(10) In support of proposed increases in the authorizations of appropriations for continuation of the construction of basinwide projects, proposed schedules of investigations and construction should be supplied, including descriptions of the units to be undertaken, and deviations in schedules of construction supplied in support of prior authorizations.

Sec. 2. That reports on surveys and investigations or project reports relative to the authorization of land and water resource projects should be delivered to the Congress not later than 6 calendar months after the date on which such reports are circulated to the Federal agencies and to the affected States pursuant to section 1 of the act of December 22, 1944 (58 Stat. 887). The agencies of the executive branch responsible for preparation of such project reports be, and are hereby, requested to deliver to the Congress such reports not later than 6 months after they have been submitted for comments to the governors of the affected States.

Sec. 3. That reports on projects recommended for construction by the Secretary of Agriculture pursuant to the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act (68 Stat. 666), as amended, should be transmitted to the Congress not later than 3 calendar months after their approval by said Secretary of Agriculture, and the officials of the executive branch responsible for such transmittal pursuant to said act be, and are hereby, requested to so deliver such reports not later than 3 months after their approval by said Secretary of Agriculture.

Sec. 4. That authorizations of multiple-purpose water resource projects should (1) specify the method by which the allocation of costs shall be determined, the period of time allowable for repayment of the power investment, and the formula for determining the rate of interest on it that is to be returned; and (2) require that prior to the time that any major facility of such multiple-purpose project is placed in operation the construction agency shall report the allocation of costs in accordance with the criteria of section 1 of this resolution together with its recommendations and the comments of the power marketing agency if that be other than the construction agency.



Sec. 5. That the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and the Committee on Public Works be, and they hereby are, directed to continue the study instituted pursuant to Senate Resolution 281, 84th Congress, and to recommend to the Senate as to the cost method; and (b) on at least two early as practicable in the second session of the 85th Congress such further measures as may be appropriate to provide for full and effective conservation, development, and utilization of the Nation's land and water resources.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I wish to have the RECORD show that I voted against Senate Resolution 148.

#### INVESTIGATION OF PROBLEMS OF AMERICAN SMALL AND INDEPENDENT BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar 1204, Senate Resolution 209, to investigate the problems of American small and independent business. My purpose is to have the resolution made the unfinished business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution (S. Res. 209) to investigate the problems of American small and independent business, which had been reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration with an amendment on page 2, line 13, after the word "exceed", to strike out "\$100,000" and insert "\$90,000", so as to make the resolution read:

*Resolved*, That the Select Committee on Small Business, in carrying out the duties imposed upon it by Senate Resolution 58, 81st Congress, agreed to February 20, 1950, and Senate Resolution 272, 81st Congress, agreed to May 26, 1950, is authorized to examine, investigate, and make a complete study of the problems of American small and independent business and to make recommendations concerning those problems to the appropriate legislative committees of the Senate.

Sec. 2. For the purposes of this resolution the committee, from February 1, 1953, to January 31, 1959, inclusive, is authorized to (1) make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis, technical, clerical, and other assistants and consultants; and (3) with the prior consent of the heads of the departments or agencies concerned, and the Committee on Rules and Administration, to utilize the reimbursable services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

Sec. 3. The committee shall report its findings, together with its recommendations for legislation as it deems advisable, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date, but not later than January 31, 1959.

Sec. 4. Expenses of the committee, under this resolution, which shall not exceed \$90,-

000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

#### RECESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, pursuant to the previous order, I now move that the Senate stand in recess until tomorrow at noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 6 minutes p. m.), the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Wednesday, January 29, 1958, at 12 o'clock meridian.

#### NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate January 28 (legislative day of January 27), 1958:

##### PROMOTIONS IN THE REGULAR ARMY

The following-named officers for promotion in the Regular Army of the United States, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3284 and 3304. All officers are subject to physical examination required by law.

##### To be colonels, Army Nurse Corps

Bradley, Ruby G., N87.  
Bryant, Ruby F., N79.  
Haynes, Inez, N88.

##### To be lieutenant colonels, Army Nurse Corps

Benninger, Marion L., N1885.  
Chapman, Gracie L., N2115.  
Clark, Alice B., N1870.  
Hogan, Mary L., N2117.  
Kornfeind, Helen A., N105.  
Lassiter, Janie L., N2041.  
Park, Edna K., N1945.  
Price, Ida G., N2353.  
Ullom, Madeline M., N123.  
Vlahovich, Fanny E., N2573.

##### To be lieutenant colonels, Army Medical Specialist Corps

Davis, Helen M., R10004.  
Lee, Harriet S., M10001.  
McDaniel, Myra L., J13.  
Riley, Winifred G., R10071.  
Robinson, Ruth A., J45.  
Ryan, Barbara M., R10074.  
Sheehan, Helen R., J46.  
Snyder, Agnes P., M10003.  
Tipton, Dorothy G., M10020.  
Whitcomb, Beatrice, M10076.

The following-named officers for promotion in the Regular Army of the United States, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3284 and 3299. All officers are subject to physical examination required by law.

##### To be majors, Army Nurse Corps

Adams, Melba L., N1424.  
Adams, Phyllis W., N1019.  
Agar, Bernice J., N2257.  
Allebach, Cora L., N2175.  
Allen, Gertrude F., N251.  
Allen, Mayna R., N2106.  
Amend, Rebecca V., N2417.  
Anderson, Robena C., N2150.  
Angell, Elizabeth E., N2325.  
Ansley, Edith, N724.  
Archer, Ruby W., N1634.  
Artz, Elizabeth, N264.  
Atwood, Dorothy M., N2144.  
Autry, Della F., N2451.  
Avery, Lillian V., N1037.  
Ayer, Ida B., N2082.  
Baclor, Agnes, N1530.  
Backmann, Caroline M., N2241.  
Baggett, Ella L., N2376.  
Bailey, Margaret E., N2293.  
Bair, Cecile E., N2232.  
Baker, Catherine F., N2219.  
Baker, Julia W., N1043.  
Baker, Mescal, N109.

Baker, Nancy G., N611.  
Baker, Nina M., N594.  
Ball, Katherine, N358.  
Barber, Pauline A., N128.  
Barker, Mary R., N2382.  
Barrett, Frances M., N730.  
Barsh, Phyllis D., N1741.  
Baskin, Johanna E., N2493.  
Bauer, Anne N., N872.  
Beck, Helen I., N2271.  
Beedle, Doris I., N2235.  
Beidle, Georgia V., N1282.  
Bell, Mattie A., N694.  
Belsit, Hazel, N2122.  
Bender, Alice J., N2481.  
Benedict, Maude B., N197.  
Bennett, Anna R., N2407.  
Benson, Jenevieve I., N2239.  
Berg, Mary J., N2429.  
Berkebile, Alma J., N2470.  
Berry, Alice E., N1882.  
Best, Bonnie J., N489.  
Bevins, Loretta M., N1280.  
Blilsky, Frances J., N758.  
Bishop, Margaret N., N186.  
Bitros, Minnie L., N691.  
Bitter, Louise F., N1358.  
Blatt, Margaret E., N583.  
Blazetic, Gladys M., N2064.  
Blossman, Inez H., N1273.  
Blount, Jewell, N2327.  
Bodis, Jeannette M., N2439.  
Bodson, Goldie L., N1688.  
Boles, Catherine G., N365.  
Bonnet, Edith J., N1597.  
Boone, Ada E., N1301.  
Bourgeois, Emilene A., N2390.  
Bowen, Geneva N., N1966.  
Bowling, Pauline J., N578.  
Bradsher, Marie E., N164.  
Brandt, Bernice D., N2124.  
Brandyberry, Marcella V., N618.  
Brant, Esther E., N2288.  
Brazeal, Lucy P., N842.  
Breen, Edith R., N376.  
Breen, Frances R., N2443.  
Breneman, Ruth E., N1328.  
Bresnahan, Margaret M., N132.  
Breton, Margarita E., N2080.  
Briggs, Dorothy P., N1651.  
Briggs, Winifred M., N992.  
Brookens, Treva B., N2130.  
Brown, Helen E., N2558.  
Browne, Hannah T., N2299.  
Browning, Edna M., N1690.  
Bryan, Mary C., N2094.  
Burchfield, Muriel, N276.  
Burkhead, Florence A., N1998.  
Burleson, Gertie A., N2304.  
Buro, Bessie C., N622.  
Burrows, Mary L., N2152.  
Burton, Ethel, N207.  
Burts, Marjorie J. K., N2196.  
Bustrann, Ruth, N936.  
Butler, Monnie C., N1988.  
Butler, Rose A., N590.  
Butterworth, Virginia F., N2278.  
Butts, Sara C., N297.  
Byrd, Nelma M., N1051.  
Cahill, Virginia F., N711.  
Caldwell, Jeanette V., N2213.  
Callentine, Helen L., N2187.  
Candon, Marian W., N2381.  
Cannoles, Margaret H., N1211.  
Cannon, Margaret R., N2207.  
Carsey, Mary J., N1429.  
Carson, Lanetta I., N2238.  
Cassery, Mary A., N1572.  
Cavanaugh, Dorothy W., N2384.  
Caylor, Jennie L., N1290.  
Chadwick, Hazel C., N1289.  
Chambers, Beatrice E., N107.  
Chartrau, Dorothy M., N2099.  
Chavez, Helen A., N1903.  
Chrisman, Bertie L., N2395.  
Cindric, Rose H., N1983.  
Clark, Mary D., N755.  
Clark, Mary E., N1295.  
Clark, Mildred I., N608.  
Clarke, Gertrude R., N2387.  
Clarke, Lacadia M., N1132.

Clarke, Margaret G., N745.  
 Classen, Gertrude M., N2038.  
 Cleveland, Rita A., N2324.  
 Clymer, Barbara A., N409.  
 Coard, Louise M., N1577.  
 Coble, Frances J., N2253.  
 Coletti, Christine, N1642.  
 Collins, Esther R., N570.  
 Colyer, Betty L., N1206.  
 Comina, Marie A., N2406.  
 Connell, Florence T., N337.  
 Connor, Margaret E., N387.  
 Coover, Dora M., N1344.  
 Craig, Iris V., N2315.  
 Crate, Grace A., N1113.  
 Creaney, Tillie H., N2354.  
 Crittenden, Edna E., N2411.  
 Crosno, Gladys M., N2056.  
 Crossen, Flora B., N2397.  
 Crosswell, Myrtle A., N2053.  
 Cullom, Barbara M., N1101.  
 Cully, Irene E., N614.  
 Cundiff, Helen E., N1670.  
 Cundiff, Virginia E., N850.  
 Cunningham, Eleanor R., N2408.  
 Cunningham, Dorothy M., N1390.  
 Curley, Rytta M., N2389.  
 Curran, Isabelle R., N1984.  
 Dalrymple, Elmira, N922.  
 Dalton, Helen D., N1886.  
 Davies, Robertine E., N1263.  
 Davis, Anna L., N732.  
 Davis, Caroline, N161.  
 Davis, Hazel D., N1013.  
 Dawley, Harriet A., N644.  
 De Frane, Georgia D., N701.  
 DeHaven, Grace I. B., N317.  
 De Pollo, Helen M., N2447.  
 Dean, Kathleen M., N1596.  
 Delaney, Grace, N454.  
 Dembeck, Helen C., N1222.  
 Dennis, Anna K., N1965.  
 Derryberry, Jewell, N214.  
 Dial, Evelyn E., N2444.  
 Dickie, June M., N2113.  
 Dickson, Grova-Nell, N484.  
 Diekroeger, Luella E., N1861.  
 Dietsche, Helen F., N665.  
 Dilemuth, Rachel E., N1576.  
 Dolan, Patricia F., N573.  
 Dolemba, Catherine M., N1927.  
 Doll, Helen L., N210.  
 Domert, Lydia M., N901.  
 Donahue, Dorothy M., N621.  
 Donahue, Mary S., N2090.  
 Donnelly, Madelyn F., N1220.  
 Donnelly, Eileen E., N175.  
 Donoghue, Rose A., N877.  
 Donovan, Mary E., N301.  
 Doody, Kathryn M., N338.  
 Dooley, Helen A., N2237.  
 Dorenkemper, Dorothy G., N577.  
 Dorset, Annie M., N225.  
 Douglas, Sadie B., N2394.  
 Dragolu, Victoria R., N2156.  
 Drake, Myrtle, N837.  
 Drakulich, Georgia F., N2046.  
 Drozd, Magdalene, N257.  
 Drumm, Judith M., N2467.  
 Duffy, Catherine E., N567.  
 Duley, Clara M., N1637.  
 Dumas, Mamie, N236.  
 DuVal, Helen G., N343.  
 D'Zurko, Anna, N2200.  
 Earle, Barbara E., N773.  
 Edenfield, Ruth, N2061.  
 Edenfield, Sammie, N740.  
 Edmund, Ingrid M., N2296.  
 Egan, Margaret M., N2058.  
 Ehalt, Allene E., N2438.  
 Eldsaa, Alma O., N167.  
 Elits, Allie M., N589.  
 Elliott, Dorothy V., N2245.  
 Enquist, Vera A., N2043.  
 Eskeldson, Marian, N1678.  
 Eubanks, Mildred, N2279.  
 Evans, Hazel L., N1404.  
 Fairley, Anna E., N1304.  
 Falcone, Gaeda N., N838.  
 Faulk, Eleanor H., N458.  
 Fay, Agnes I., N2012.

Feagans, Nellie I., N1547.  
 Fehr, Dorothy M., N1997.  
 Fell, Maxine H., N1425.  
 Fels, Dorothy B., N169.  
 Fennon, Isabel, N2371.  
 Fischer, Mercedes M., N2089.  
 Fisher, Lucille C., N1922.  
 Fisher, Ruth A., N350.  
 Flavell, Elizabeth L., N1896.  
 Fleming, Janet M., N2055.  
 Fletterer, Florence L., N2428.  
 Flook, Margaret H., N702.  
 Flowers, Mary M., N180.  
 Folwell, Mary A., N2014.  
 Foor, Virginia E., N735.  
 Fore, Claudia L., N1131.  
 Foreman, Adele F., N2164.  
 Foster, Anne R., N655.  
 Fowler, Lucille I., N633.  
 Fowler, Mary M., N2484.  
 Fowle, Gladys O., N2059.  
 Frandrup, Bernadine M., N2364.  
 Franklin, Loyce I., N2264.  
 Fraser, Mildred L., N624.  
 French, Irma J., N1009.  
 Frey, Irene, N603.  
 Fries, Josephine A. G., N1894.  
 Fuller, Anne L., N587.  
 Fullerton, Jeanne T., N674.  
 Furlong, Mildred M., N1401.  
 Fusi, Bruna G., N2182.  
 Fusselman, Gladys L., N1419.  
 Gaillard, Jeanne M., N1970.  
 Galvin, Mabel, N266.  
 Garniewski, Victoria J., N2318.  
 Gattis, Margaret L., N1245.  
 Gawarecki, Julia F., N2273.  
 Gayle, Mary H., N2034.  
 Gaylord, Tynne N., N1964.  
 Geis, Rita M., N2087.  
 George, Anne, N1908.  
 Gianarakos, Anastasia E., N2005.  
 Gill, Marie A., N1971.  
 Gillard, Marjorie G., N991.  
 Gilligan, Ramona A., N1907.  
 Girard, Pauline H., N218.  
 Girarde, Lillian C., N172.  
 Goodrick, Dorothy S., N2375.  
 Goodson, Melrose C., N703.  
 Goodwin, Joyce, N1284.  
 Goodyear, Bess C., N2179.  
 Grass, Barbara A., N369.  
 Graves, Julia T., N2195.  
 Green, Josephine M., N2400.  
 Greenfield, Ruth L., N873.  
 Grenon, Jeannette D., N1002.  
 Grissom, Willie M., N1987.  
 Groh, Emma C., N1298.  
 Groh, Hortense S., N256.  
 Groh, Mary T., N2008.  
 Guest, Revella, N195.  
 Gunlogson, Alice, N2194.  
 Gustafson, Pauline A. C., N2148.  
 Hagler, Ethel I., N2007.  
 Hall, Edna F., N2284.  
 Hall, Ethel E. L., N2399.  
 Halonen, Alice M. S., N1001.  
 Hammarlund, Mabel, N2057.  
 Hardman, Mabel O., N853.  
 Hargrove, Edna, N1880.  
 Harkins, Anna Del., N1416.  
 Harnett, Helen, N2151.  
 Harper, Dorothy B., N2178.  
 Harris, Frankie D., N579.  
 Hartley, Mary E., N1375.  
 Hartman, Lulu J., N1724.  
 Haselmire, Nora C., N643.  
 Hawkins, Dale A., N1129.  
 Haydel, Juanita E., N1900.  
 Hayenga, Virginia P., N1976.  
 Hayes, Katherine E., N688.  
 Hayes, Sally C., N1231.  
 Hays, Anna M. McC., N905.  
 Hayworth, Helen G., N2128.  
 Heath, Bernice I., N1385.  
 Heide, Nargith H., N1293.  
 Heinrich, Helen M., N203.  
 Heinz, Helen D., N2065.  
 Helm, Margaret C., N2401.  
 Hendrickson, Sylvia E., N2202.  
 Henley, Nellie L., N486.

Hennies, Elma E., N401.  
 Henry, Jonike E., N1065.  
 Hentges, Elsie M. C., N390.  
 Hergert, Ione E., N2363.  
 Herrin, Jane E., N303.  
 Hester, Sue I., N442.  
 Hill, Levenia E., N2062.  
 Hines, Mary L., N1974.  
 Hogan, Ann E., N1201.  
 Hogan, Gertrude F., N2225.  
 Honeycutt, Hazel V., N1913.  
 Hoppock, Eleanor M., N2377.  
 Horan, Leona E., N2431.  
 Horne, Elizabeth R., N1277.  
 Houck, Rose E., N2141.  
 Houseknecht, Luluah Y., N154.  
 Howell, Ann E., N985.  
 Hufcut, Vira B., N2243.  
 Huffman, Lessie P., N2228.  
 Humphrey, Josephine G., N2256.  
 Hyland, Ann T., N469.  
 Infosino, Lucy M., N861.  
 Ingram, Alberta T., N391.  
 Ingram, Lemma M., N698.  
 Ingram, Sallie H., N1302.  
 Jablunovsky, Velma V., N471.  
 Jackson, Margaret E., N918.  
 Jamison, Pearl E., N2009.  
 Jamula, Cecilia P., N485.  
 Janas, Bertha K., N481.  
 Jankoviak, Angelina P., N996.  
 Jankowski, Hendrina, N2385.  
 Jarma, Luciana, N2323.  
 Jayne, Harriet J., N708.  
 Jeffreys, Alice C., N1229.  
 Jelinek, Leda E., N437.  
 Jensen, Emilie K., N60.  
 Jentgen, Carolyn M., N584.  
 Johnson, Edna L., N1909.  
 Johnson, Gladys E., N2201.  
 Johnston, Pauline V., N2140.  
 Jones, Hazel M., N944.  
 Jones, Opal M., N2404.  
 Jones, Peggy G., N363.  
 Jordan, Mary C., N987.  
 Jordan, Mary E., N756.  
 Judd, Florence E., N232.  
 Jump, Katherine R., N341.  
 Kabana, Margaret A., N1661.  
 Kaiser, Emma S., N224.  
 Kammeraad, Angie C., N1529.  
 Kauffman, Kathren L., N2127.  
 Kauffman, Mildred B., N2274.  
 Keating, Marie A., N671.  
 Keefe, Mary E., N1451.  
 Kehoe, Lelia M., N1349.  
 Keith, Catherine C., N662.  
 Kemp, Leila, N379.  
 Kennedy, Marian C. I., N2487.  
 Kent, Isabel M., N1973.  
 King, Florence H., N2427.  
 King, Helen E., N2409.  
 King, Mary L., N321.  
 Kinnaird, Ruby L., N231.  
 Kinnison, Lois F., N245.  
 Kinsey, Nancy B., N2025.  
 Kirschling, Cecelia L., N1062.  
 Knapp, Ann E., N2249.  
 Knips, Alberta H., N971.  
 Koltvet, Anna, N119.  
 Koschmeder, Julia F., N2307.  
 Koszalka, Julia E., N1562.  
 Koziol, Jean B., N1603.  
 Kraft, Idelle D., N1056.  
 Kraftschek, Dorothy E., N287.  
 Kramolls, Marie C., N2358.  
 Krchnavi, Elsie, N2188.  
 Kroll, Marilyn, N182.  
 Kronmeyer, Sylvia M., N461.  
 Krumanoeker, Josephine M., N1045.  
 Krumperman, Lucile, N1338.  
 Kruse, Joyce J., N2210.  
 Kudletz, Rose, N1560.  
 Kuhn, Mary H., N1920.  
 Kurutz, Katherine R., N1274.  
 Kydd, Marjorie W., N324.  
 Lagan, Mary M., N1028.  
 Lamb, Elizabeth V., N399.  
 Landis, Helen M., N1299.  
 Lang, Thelma L., N1979.  
 Langdon, Hazel L., N2138.



- LaPlante, Theresa S., N1917.  
 Lark, Martha L., N2418.  
 Laubacher, Harriet T., N1112.  
 Lavin, Marguerite M., N2071.  
 Lawrence, Caryl R., N1242.  
 Lawton, Elva J., N1978.  
 Lee, Mary E., N2118.  
 Leland, Helena M., N874.  
 Lenz, Adeline H., N625.  
 Lessard, Marcia M., N1079.  
 Lewis, Blanche Z., N714.  
 Lewis, Iva D., N1083.  
 Lewis, Luella R., N340.  
 Lien, Elsie M., N630.  
 Lieske, Beata M., N361.  
 Lillard, Erma L., N2276.  
 Lindau, Marjorie J., N2154.  
 Lines, L. Marguerite, N1219.  
 Linke, Jean M., N1992.  
 Linn, Edna J., N323.  
 Lionais, Irene, N1217.  
 Lipowski, Stella, N1967.  
 Little, Laura B., N1636.  
 LoCicero, Josephine A., N1296.  
 Lockwood, Esther M., N1281.  
 Lohman, Martha E., N1325.  
 Lohrmann, Agnes B., N1329.  
 Lohrmann, Imelda H., N1254.  
 Lokuta, Loretta L., N259.  
 Loman, Mamie V., N1014.  
 Lonchar, Helen T., N1012.  
 Long, Johnnie E., N1994.  
 Looper, Floy L., N744.  
 Lovin, Helen B., N2250.  
 Lozinak, Mary M., N2291.  
 Lucas, Virginia G., N1551.  
 Lund, Edythe M., N1977.  
 Lusas, Frances A., N1735.  
 Lyle, Shirley McC., N331.  
 Lyon, Irene, N2496.  
 MacDonald, Verna E., N2379.  
 Maher, Margaret L., N2319.  
 Mahn, Gertrude I., N752.  
 Mahoney, Elizabeth C., N1665.  
 Malerba, Agnes C., N1036.  
 Malone, Rhoda E., N364.  
 Manning, Ramona S., N446.  
 Mantor, Frances C., N813.  
 Marks, Alice S., N1418.  
 Martin, Mary L., N449.  
 Martin, Sarah N., N1532.  
 Martini, Marian E., N208.  
 Marwine, Beulah L., N2097.  
 Mason, Isabelle A. C., N148.  
 Massie, Myrtle D., N2446.  
 Massoni, Mary A., N927.  
 Mastroianni, Ellen, N2252.  
 Matheson, Marjorie, N928.  
 Matthias, Doris V., N2485.  
 Matthias, Edith F., N1980.  
 Maxeiner, Pauline G., N283.  
 Maxwell, Hazel M., N2010.  
 Maxwell, Mamie H., N2380.  
 Maxwell, Pauline E., N133.  
 McAndrews, Blanche M., N63.  
 McBride, Dorothy, N2004.  
 McCain, Ruby E., N252.  
 McCally, Mary J., N770.  
 McCally, Mildred A., N771.  
 McCarthy, Eileen L., N2143.  
 McClellan, Iola R., N278.  
 McCommons, Daisy M., N146.  
 McCord, Frances S., N2388.  
 McFadden, Martha A., N402.  
 McGill, Barbara R., N445.  
 McGuire, Venona M., N2136.  
 McMahon, Agnes, N1605.  
 McNeil, Esther J., N2473.  
 McQuiston, Marian R., N1567.  
 McWatt, Elizabeth H. S., N2258.  
 Mears, Anne, N2456.  
 Melton, G. Elizabeth, N1918.  
 Menold, Mary V., N1209.  
 Messersmith, Betty E., N2142.  
 Meszar, Marjorie, N675.  
 Micklick, Irene E., N388.  
 Mikowski, Florence J., N1340.  
 Miller, Eileen A., N713.  
 Miller, Kathleen F., N1253.  
 Miner, Florence Z., N672.  
 Mire, Ouida R., N2461.  
 Mizelle, Margaret B., N2463.  
 Monette, Helen D., N900.  
 Monroe, Grace E., N563.  
 Monske, Freda L., N2135.  
 Montgomery, Verlie J., N1906.  
 Montgomery, Leona L., N1981.  
 Moore, Gladys, N239.  
 Moore, Jean, N2006.  
 Moore, Vivian M., N626.  
 Morris, Marie C., N2234.  
 Morris, Mary C., N2035.  
 Morris, Mary S., N346.  
 Morrison, Ida B., N1327.  
 Morse, Mary F., N860.  
 Morse, Mary F., N1417.  
 Moultrie, Mary L., N1985.  
 Murphy, Lenore L., N2131.  
 Murphy, Margaret M., N2137.  
 Murphy, Patricia T., N2107.  
 Murray, Dorothy H., N1294.  
 Musch, Myrtle M., N2372.  
 Myers, Lottie M., N2436.  
 Neal, Ida F., N2469.  
 Nearhood, Madeline L., N856.  
 Neisig, Nadine A., N1711.  
 Nelson, Edna M., N604.  
 Newell, Nelly, N885.  
 Newman, Mary E., N975.  
 Newton, Lucille, N134.  
 Nicholas, Hazel S., N2155.  
 Niles, Evelyn J., N1656.  
 Nolan, Charlotte L., N1551.  
 Nyberg, Alma M., N1552.  
 Nyez, Walburga G., N1236.  
 Oberg, Clara R., N2024.  
 O'Dwyer, Maureen P., N425.  
 Ogden, Lily M., N173.  
 Ognibene, Josephine M., N2289.  
 Olson, D. Marguerite, N1898.  
 Olszowy, Frances F., N1061.  
 Orbin, Mary J., N2476.  
 Orsini, Clara E., N2424.  
 Osborne, Naomi I., N1225.  
 Oulmet, Mary E., N1396.  
 Pace, Lucyle M., N1905.  
 Paetzold, Alma M., N886.  
 Pagano Philomena A., N354.  
 Page, Susie W., N1438.  
 Pagels, Elizabeth A., N2262.  
 Parker, Edna M., N271.  
 Parks, Jean L., N377.  
 Patterson, Evelyn M., N339.  
 Paul, Phoebe M., N353.  
 Paulson, Isabel S., N1376.  
 Pawlowski, Irene M., N1288.  
 Peacock, Leoleen I., N831.  
 Peake, Augusta K., N820.  
 Pearce, Marie L., N2212.  
 Pearce, Martha S., N2183.  
 Pears, Maria L., N2040.  
 Pearse, Mildred C., N1951.  
 Pecora, Florence M., N359.  
 Peene, Ava L., N663.  
 Pell, Thelma I., N2088.  
 Pensinger, Barbara H., N422.  
 Percival, Hazel, N696.  
 Perfett, Constance M., N2206.  
 Perreault, Marsciene A. B., N2396.  
 Pesci, Jane C., N2449.  
 Pesut, Elizabeth A., N258.  
 Peters, Marguerite L., N1975.  
 Pettengill, Alice E., N2101.  
 Pettibone, Margaret E., N1643.  
 Pfeffer, Henrietta H., N2413.  
 Phillips, Kathleen W., N2458.  
 Phillips, Rowella N., N1212.  
 Pinckney, Gladys H., N864.  
 Pirner, Hildegard A., N2285.  
 Pittman, Flora V., N367.  
 Piemon, Evonne L., N1860.  
 Plunkett, Ollie W., N2060.  
 Pollack, Julia R., N1571.  
 Ponticello, Rose L., N2197.  
 Popcke, June H., N1297.  
 Posey, Reber L., N1067.  
 Potochnik, Anna M., N2169.  
 Potter, Eleanor M., N2287.  
 Preece, Ethelyn McI., N356.  
 Priddy, Lillian F., N1044.  
 Pritchard, Ruby E., N690.  
 Puckett, Martha A., N774.  
 Pugsley, Helen E., N1969.  
 Putnam, Helen P., N171.  
 Rabenold, Caroline L., N2374.  
 Rahm, Carolyn B., N1684.  
 Rakita, Helen J., N941.  
 Rancollita, Jean C., N253.  
 Rapp, Elizabeth F., N2366.  
 Rautkis, Helen D., N582.  
 Reed, Anna G., N2306.  
 Reed, Katherine C., N190.  
 Reed, Olie B., N1723.  
 Reeves, Ann, N974.  
 Regan, Margaret B., N2320.  
 Reutenauer, Marguerite C., N206.  
 Rheau, Julianne M., N1553.  
 Richardson, Bertha D., N1208.  
 Richardson, Helen V., N407.  
 Rime, Mabel L., N1533.  
 Robertson, Mary M., N2432.  
 Robertson, Sue H., N1244.  
 Robinette, Arty I., N453.  
 Rodeman, Charlotte R., N601.  
 Rodenboh, Florence J., N723.  
 Rogers, Theda W., N444.  
 Romeo, Nina M., N1633.  
 Rosasco, Louise C., N2450.  
 Rose, Anne, N2190.  
 Ross, Edna E., N194.  
 Ross, Mary E., N1947.  
 Rourke, Rita V., N677.  
 Rundell, Lilla B., N2392.  
 Russel, Evelyn L., N661.  
 Russell, Katherine A., N2416.  
 Russo, Jean G., N2159.  
 Ryan, Phyllis, N869.  
 Ryden, Etta L., N2422.  
 Salisbury, Helen M., N978.  
 Sandberg, Wilma K., N248.  
 Sanderson, Helen F., N220.  
 Satterfield, Ruth P., N2168.  
 Saulnier, Dorothy N., N249.  
 Scheel, Charlotte M., N2445.  
 Schelper, Anna K., N414.  
 Schild, Laura B., N1652.  
 Schloemer, Beulah, N588.  
 Schnader, Helen J., N834.  
 Schuchmann, Amanda E., N2147.  
 Schwind, Evelyn E., N2410.  
 Scofield, Afton M., N2254.  
 Scott, Frances M., N1986.  
 Sebelien, Bernice M., N242.  
 Sedor, Elizabeth F., N1972.  
 Sedor, Sophia D., N2079.  
 Selbert, Gertrude C., N255.  
 Self, Azile, N228.  
 Self, Gladys B., N2246.  
 Sellars, Jacqueline H., N931.  
 Serfass, Berneda A., N729.  
 Seymore, Dorothy L., N2268.  
 Shadewaldt, Ruth F., N673.  
 Shaw, Doris L., N2433.  
 Shepherd, Elizabeth E., N204.  
 Shorter, Frances V., N2294.  
 Siebert, Rita M., N2425.  
 Siems, Florence M., N934.  
 Simpkins, Martha A., N1265.  
 Sipple, Blanche I., N1204.  
 Sjoborg, Jeanette E., N2248.  
 Skadorva, Estelle M., N1923.  
 Skiba, Sophia C., N411.  
 Skinner, Jean E., N572.  
 Slaats, Alpharetta E., N684.  
 Slack, Ada L., N2222.  
 Smith, Estelle, N2193.  
 Smith, Frances K., N1271.  
 Smith, Geraldine S., N2084.  
 Smith, Mary B., N413.  
 Smith, Mary I., N1005.  
 Smith, Maude M., N1096.  
 Smithers, Florence R., N2158.  
 Smull, Helen K., N1993.  
 Snaadt, Corinne E., N932.  
 Snape, Connie, N1904.  
 Sordt, Marjorie E., N1676.  
 Sorini, Charlotte R., N2270.  
 Sorrells, Jessie A., N600.  
 Soto, Lila D., N1990.  
 Sox, Barbara C., N2105.  
 Spendlove, Venice, N1345.  
 Spivey, Eva K., N1897.  
 Stack, Helen A., N104.  
 Stacy, Ellnor C., N2260.  
 Stafford, Margaret C., N2204.  
 Stark, Amelia, N656.

Steenburgh, Ruth M., N2075.  
 Stevenson, Eleanor M., N1921.  
 Stewart, Blanche McR., N2003.  
 Stievenart, LaVerne, N260.  
 Still, Alice E., N2052.  
 Stivlen, Sylvia M., N1432.  
 Stohl, Dora J., N2455.  
 Stokes, Martha E., N2491.  
 Stoltz, Ruth M., N586.  
 Stone, Katrine F., N2386.  
 Stout, Carrie P., N889.  
 Stringfellow, Violet G., N2430.  
 Stroemer, Ruth M., N2104.  
 Stuwe, Kathryn C., N296.  
 Sulkowski, Cecilia A., N1420.  
 Svedirsky, Alice H., N876.  
 Swan, Eleanor J., N1901.  
 Swanson, Ruth M., N2176.  
 Swenson, Alice O., N196.  
 Tannehill, Helen C., N2172.  
 Tate, Dorothy T., N2272.  
 Taylor, Alice C., N1915.  
 Taylor, Anna L., N2163.  
 Taylor, Elizabeth P., N2077.  
 Taylor, Inez A., N2160.  
 Taylor, Ruth P., N302.  
 Teague, Madge M., N201.  
 Teasley, Agatha B., N2162.  
 Tewell, Mollie A., N333.  
 Thatcher, Margaret K., N973.  
 Thexton, Margaret A., N1034.  
 Thompson, Ida M., N373.  
 Thornton, Joyce A., N267.  
 Thurness, Elizabeth J., N436.  
 Tinkle, Evelyn F., N199.  
 Tkacik, Mary C., N1659.  
 Tollefson, Margaret E., N329.  
 Toole, Lena A., N1891.  
 Toudouze, Mary P., N467.  
 Travers, Estelle M., N314.  
 Travers, Sadye T., N2478.  
 Treacy, Jeanne M., N2093.  
 Trimmer, Mildred L., N1911.  
 Turner, Mildred, N174.  
 Tyler, Anne A., N263.  
 Urette, Fanny, N2074.  
 Van Baak, Lois H. A., N127.  
 Vaughan, Mary E., N1669.  
 Via, Lera V., N712.  
 Viedt, Doris W., N731.  
 Villamaria, Amelia, N2259.  
 Votava, Mary T., N448.  
 Wagener, Mary M., N153.  
 Waite, Eileen M., N2096.  
 Waldron, Miriam E., N1202.  
 Walker, Ada M., N2480.  
 Wallace, Joella W., N355.  
 Wallner, Margaret D., N2145.  
 Walls, Nellie E., N2070.  
 Walsh, Margaret M., N2420.  
 Ware, Aquillya M., N2435.  
 Warren, Sarah E., N2322.  
 Watry, Clara K., N700.  
 Watson, Ruth V., N416.  
 Webb, Maxine E., N2267.  
 Webber, Rebecca, N2134.  
 Weinstein, Alice E., N976.  
 Weir, Reba B., N1881.  
 Werley, Harriet H., N1241.  
 Werner, Ida B. A., N1303.  
 Wertenberger, Irene, N468.  
 West, Martha M., N1230.  
 Whalen, Louise A., N1586.  
 Wheeler, Margaret H., N2068.  
 Whitcomb, Virginia G., N2240.  
 Wickenshelmer, Virginia, N372.  
 Wilborne, Mary W., N1728.  
 Wilde, Elizabeth A., N2220.  
 Wilkinson, Jane A., N2186.  
 Williams, Agnes L., N1239.  
 Williams, Althea E., N2098.  
 Williams, Irma F., N830.  
 Williford, Sarah L., N1310.  
 Wilson, Claire A., N2495.  
 Wink, Alice R., N858.  
 Winkler, Harriet E., N2479.  
 Witczak, Ann M., N610.  
 Wuerdinger, Gertrude E., N385.  
 Yancey, Martha J., N2149.  
 Yeik, Irene L., N2383.  
 Yerger, Marguerite A., N555.  
 York, Jeraldine, N1929.

Young, Miriam E., N2081.  
 Younger, Mary M., N288.  
 Younger, Vera W., N2459.  
 Zais, Anne B., N227.  
 Zalesney, Nellie J., N1536.  
 Zuerner, Lurline V., N1673.

*To be majors, Army Medical Specialist Corps*

Arduser, Helen M., M10097.  
 Ashton, Madge, M10117.  
 Bender, Catherine M., M10024.  
 Binning, Marcel, M10011.  
 Bradley, Ruth W., M10021.  
 Brice, Virginia N., R10049.  
 Brigham, Agnes A., M10100.  
 Coeling, Ethel W., M10104.  
 Cohen, Belle K., M10059.  
 Conlon, Marcella A., M10035.  
 Desmond, Isabelle M., M10010.  
 Dillon, Edna L., M10118.  
 Douglas, Marion D., R10076.  
 Duer, Pamela E., M10105.  
 Elsele, Mabel M., J1.  
 Ellinger, Ruth W., M10025.  
 Evans, Nannie R., R10019.  
 Fowler, Elizabeth, M10077.  
 Frost, Virginia L., M10022.  
 Haag, Lucille M., R10110.  
 Harman, Thelma A., R10092.  
 Hawkins, Jean M., R10093.  
 Haxthausen, Halleene M., M10110.  
 Hook, Gladys T., R10017.  
 Huston, Nancy L., R10015.  
 Johnson, Fuchsia L., R10023.  
 Klainer, Cecelia T., R10135.  
 Lawrence, Mary S., M10103.  
 Lipscomb, Mary, R10025.  
 MacKellar, Rose M., R10097.  
 Manchester, Katherine E., R10016.  
 Miller, Elsie K., R10043.  
 Miller, Jessie L., M10072.  
 Myers, Cordelia, J62.  
 Nachod, Elizabeth M., J50.  
 Nevels, Elizabeth M., R10087.  
 Newton, Edith, M10111.  
 Parker, Doris L., R10018.  
 Petersen, Elna C., R10132.  
 Radke, Margaret E., R10024.  
 Richardson, Velma L., R10014.  
 Rizzo, Corrine C., M10043.  
 Sargent, Lois H., J63.  
 Smith, Carolyn E., R10089.  
 Stange, Carol, M10058.  
 Steele, Mada, M10044.  
 Strickland, Ida R., R10112.  
 Stuart, Margaret, R10084.  
 Thornton, Margaret J., R10077.  
 Watkins, Annabel, R10033.  
 Whitehurst, Margaret E., M10075.

The following-named officers for promotion in the Regular Army of the United States, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3284 and 3298. All officers are subject to physical examination required by law.

*To be first lieutenants*

Adair, Billy R., O77245.  
 Addison, Richard L., O73541.  
 Andrews, Donald G., O77254.  
 Applewhite, Ray, O74627.  
 Arciero, Robert G., O77255.  
 Awtrey, Sherry E., O77257.  
 Baker, Jack E., O77263.  
 Baldwin, Noland Y., O75141.  
 Barcelona, Charles B., O71640.  
 Bare, Frank L., O77264.  
 Beal, Bruce T., O78224.  
 Beaube, George P., O74635.  
 Bockman, Leonard I., O74641.  
 Bozmyski, Valentine W., O77276.  
 Bradberry, William N., Jr., O77278.  
 Bramlett, James T., O77281.  
 Broman, Ralph W., O78242.  
 Brooks, Leo A., O75154.  
 Bryan, Thomas F., O77288.  
 Bunyard, Jerry M., O77290.  
 Cameron, Duane G., O77300.  
 Campbell, William W., Jr., O71769.  
 Cardwell, Kenneth E., O77305.  
 Chapin, Gordon R., O77313.

Cleary, Arthur C., O74660.  
 Click, Edwin F., O77322.  
 Cole, Donald J., O77328.  
 Colson, Keith Q., O77330.  
 Cornell, Robert K., O77336.  
 Costino, Michel, O77338.  
 Crosby, Richard D., Jr., O77345.  
 Crouch, Harry C., O75168.  
 Cuba, Paul J., Jr., O71911.  
 Darling, Allan L., O77350.  
 Davis, Dwight A., O77352.  
 DeWitt, William W., O77353.  
 Dickinson, William G., O77358.  
 Dill, Bobby M., O77359.  
 Dimsdale, Arthur, O73317.  
 Dixon, Allen C., Jr., O77363.  
 Dunn, Earl C., Jr., O71784.  
 Engram, Edwin J., O74684.  
 Esplin, Willard B., O74686.  
 Falbo, John J., O77380.  
 Farrow, James H., O77382.  
 Felker, Dale R., O77383.  
 Fernander, Bobbie B., O77385.  
 Finehout, Arthur W., O77388.  
 Fuellhart, Joseph M., O77396.  
 Gabrielli, Robert J., O77398.  
 Garcia, Eliseo J., O72370.  
 Gminder, Russell, O77406.  
 Goldberg, Daniel J., O77407.  
 Gontarski, Joseph W., O77408.  
 Gosney, Robert R., O77410.  
 Grant, John C., O77415.  
 Green, David E., O74703.  
 Green, Donald J., O77417.  
 Greer, Richard B., O74704.  
 Hally, John E., Jr., O77423.  
 Halsted, Thomas A., O77339.  
 Hampel, Victor H., O77426.  
 Hess, Carl H., O77441.  
 Heuschkel, Donald G., O77443.  
 Higgins, Alan R., O74722.  
 Hilbert, Donald E., O77445.  
 Hilton, Maynard E., O77446.  
 Hissong, Fred, Jr., O71518.  
 Hock, Robert C., O77450.  
 Hoffman, William J., O74727.  
 Hornish, William E., O77458.  
 Hough, Henry A., O77460.  
 Hymes, Morris A., O72390.  
 Imholz, Robert E., O77472.  
 Jackson, Tracy H., O77478.  
 Jarrett, Richard S., O77480.  
 Johnson, Jack O., O77484.  
 Jones, Thomas S., 3d, O75220.  
 Jordan, Horace E., O77492.  
 Justiss, Robert E., O77493.  
 Kanamine, Theodore S., O77494.  
 Kelly, Edward J., 3d, O77499.  
 Kinney, Philip R., O77474.  
 Kolditz, Walter, O77512.  
 Komarow, Ronald M., O75383.  
 Krengel, Thomas F., O72339.  
 Lizardo, Alex R., O74922.  
 Lloyd, Joseph W., O77533.  
 Lloyd, Luther R., O77534.  
 LoRe, Jesse D., O71935.  
 Lowery, George B., O71828.  
 Lyles, Jesse D., O77545.  
 Lynn, Charles T., Jr., O78410.  
 Main, Robert G., O77552.  
 March, Miles B., O71936.  
 Marshall, Thomas W., 3d, O77557.  
 McLaughlin, Thomas J., O74772.  
 McLay, Orville K., O75019.  
 Mendenhall, Robert L., O74773.  
 Merrick, Philip B., O74775.  
 Miller, Raymond H., O77264.  
 Miluszusky, Raymond J., O77580.  
 Momeler, John L., O75255.  
 Moore, David R., O77589.  
 Morton, Bryan D., O72526.  
 Mueller, Frederick W., Jr., O71847.  
 Oakley, Howard H., O77605.  
 Oblock, Louis W., O71944.  
 O'Leary, Arthur J., O77608.  
 Osborn, Phillip C., O77613.  
 Palermo, Frank J., Jr., O74799.  
 Pattakos, Arion N., O72635.  
 Perrin, Everett I., Jr., O75264.  
 Perschetz, Gerald, O77622.  
 Pettit, Lewis W., O71855.  
 Philbrook, Wilbur W., Jr., O77625.



Phillips, Clyde W., O75267.  
 Pierce, Wilbur R., Jr., O71950.  
 Pratt, Willis G., O77627.  
 Pryor, James M., Jr., O72776.  
 Purdy, Harry E., Jr., O72380.  
 Quinn, James R., O75273.  
 Ragains, Robert L., O74818.  
 Rajski, Daniel J., O72398.  
 Randolph, James W., O77637.  
 Rapkoch, James M., O77638.  
 Regan, John P., O77641.  
 Reid, Robert L., Jr., O77643.  
 Rice, Harley E., O77648.  
 Rider, James D., O77651.  
 Rogers, Roland B., O74827.  
 Roop, John R. C., O77656.  
 Rose, Ronald J., O75280.  
 Rowe, Richard H., O77662.  
 Rutledge, Howard L., O77665.  
 Savoldi, William R., O75284.  
 Schaefer, Rolland M., O77670.  
 Schneider, Finis E., O77674.  
 Senay, David C., O71887.  
 Sessions, Jerrald M., O77681.  
 Seward, John M., O77682.  
 Sherron, Gene T., O74841.  
 Smith, John A., O74846.  
 Spry, Alfred E., O74853.  
 Stein, Albert E., O77703.  
 Stevenson, Thomas A., O74855.  
 Stone, Leon H., Jr., O77711.  
 Street, Clover B., Jr., O72359.  
 Strom, Roy M., O77713.  
 Sullivan, Roy F., O77717.  
 Swanson, Robert L., O75302.  
 Talbot, Bailey M., 4th, O71964.  
 Tandy, Donald F., O72794.  
 Terzopoulos, Nicholas, O77727.  
 Thames, Peter H., O71965.  
 Thompson, John U., O77732.  
 Tigh, Leland F., Jr., O77736.  
 Toner, Francis J., O77737.  
 Torbett, William C., 3d, O77738.  
 Trent, Warren T., Jr., O77740.  
 Tunmire, Dana, O74873.  
 Turner, Joseph E., Jr., O72381.  
 Valz, Darwin K., O77748.  
 Van Houten, William, 3d, O77750.  
 Van Pool, Jack L., O77751.  
 Walker, Robert L., O72801.  
 Wallace, Joel B., Jr., O72861.  
 Walther, Harry J., O71888.  
 Ward, Chester L., O71889.  
 Wharrie, Robert E., O72405.  
 Williams, Lawrence A., O74892.  
 Williamson, Rayburn L., O77780.  
 Wilson, Parks W., Jr., O74894.  
 Woods, Eugene R., O77793.  
 Zurbriggen, Donald J., O77801.

**To be first lieutenants, Women's Army Corps**  
 Albright, Ruth M., L516.  
 Shippee, Audrey B., L518.

**To be first lieutenants, Medical Service Corps**  
 Bullard, John W., O75337.  
 Evans, Billy W., O74943.  
 Glenn, Dwight W., O74945.  
 Hubert, Alexander A., O74950.  
 Isbell, Charles A., O71928.  
 Piper, Donald R., O74953.  
 Russell, James L., Jr., O74954.  
 Silvernale, Douglas J., O75428.  
 Stiles, Peter W., O74959.  
 Stover, James W., O75433.

**To be first lieutenants, Army Nurse Corps**  
 Atchison, Juanita M., N2776.  
 Berg, Ellen M., N2777.  
 Geissinger, Amy D., N2793.  
 Mimms, Barbara N., N2771.  
 Rodgers, Elizabeth I., N2806.  
 Tiernan, Pauline E., N2751.

**To be first lieutenant, Army Medical Specialist Corps**  
 Lawrence, Lucille G., R10167.

The following-named officers for appointment in the Judge Advocate General's Corps, Regular Army of the United States, in the grades specified under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 3292, and

Public Law 737, 84th Congress, subject to physical examination required by law:

**To be lieutenant colonel**

Herr, Norman Phillip, O406323.

**To be majors**

Cipriano, Noel Joseph, O420564.  
 Haefele, Joseph Lynn, O284499.

**To be captains**

DeMund, Robert John, O1051536.  
 Miller, Hubert G., O1295925.

**To be first lieutenant**

Bartelle, Talmadge Lewis, O2273216.

The following-named officers for appointment in the Medical Service Corps, Regular Army of the United States, in the grades specified under the provisions of Public Law 737, 84th Congress, subject to physical examination required by law:

**To be lieutenant colonel**

Schunior, George Emanuel, O294918.

**To be majors**

Alsup, E. Herschel, O406667.  
 DiFusco, Maurico Peter, O401935.  
 McCall, Robert George, O511768.  
 Urbine, Anthony Wayne, O1533462.  
 Van Gilder, Robert Ellis, O452294.

**To be captains**

Arima, James Kenichi, O2002390.  
 Avrett, Marion Edwin, O1686368.  
 Barker, Arthur Wilson, O2046881.  
 Beakes, Francis Cleveland, O1547529.  
 Brown, Dale Edward, O2051063.  
 Brumley, Robert Dean, O1541893.  
 Bunte, Albert George, O1540784.  
 Buto, Junichi, O379031.  
 Camp, Frank Rudolph, Jr., O992504.  
 Case, Vernon Ernest, O452162.  
 Cevey, Paul Edgar, O1544779.  
 Craig, Howard Hancock, O1321997.  
 Eddinger, Clyde Charles, O447312.  
 Fanning, William Edward, O2049542.  
 Fellerman, Erwin Kenneth, O1547289.  
 Garza, Rene Charles, O2050050.  
 Glinkowre, George James, O1582758.  
 Greene, Billy Chadwell, O1058814.  
 Haggerty, John Edward, O1533076.  
 Halladay, Theodore Joseph, O1534276.  
 Heady, Harold Thomas, O1101484.  
 Hemperly, Cecil Willis, O454117.  
 Hesford, Douglas, O1533577.  
 Holtwick, Philip Barrett, O2042978.  
 Hooker, LaRay Dennis, O2048017.  
 Hunter, Donald Homer, O529618.  
 Lada, John, O1541381.  
 Levardsen, Richard Williams, O1534073.  
 Linthicum, Seth Hance, Jr., O428336.  
 Loyd, Reginald Charles, O1997572.  
 Mihm, Homer Walter, O1541200.  
 Morgan, John Gerlach, O2047755.  
 Morris, John William, O1285627.  
 Newman, Forest Pike, Jr., O2047090.  
 Nystrom, Rudolph, Jr., O2050593.  
 O'Neill, William Brendan, O2046777.  
 Ostby, Wallace Leuman, O2051522.  
 Petrini, Bruno Anthony, O1533170.  
 Quigley, Calvin Carlyle, O1541195.  
 Ramsey, Foster Goodstein, O2027433.  
 Rand, Richard Stanley, O2011204.  
 Reinel, Anthony Adam, O1535064.  
 Rogers, O. B., O934874.  
 Rogers, Robert John, O2050935.  
 Ross, William Edward, O1542893.  
 Schongalla, William, Jr., O1534196.  
 Simmons, Tom Alton, Jr., O2047499.  
 Tarantino, Frank Salvatore, O454141.  
 Turk, Richard Peebles, O2049420.  
 Waterfield, William Mac, O2050998.  
 Williams, Lewis Henry, O968875.  
 Winkler, Harry Thomas, O2051380.

**To be first lieutenants**

Beauregard, Robert McKean, O1927596.  
 Clyde, Norman Eugene, O4006201.  
 Conley, Robert, O2271737.  
 Herwig, Lee Conrad, Jr., O4017056.  
 Rose, Gerald Sylvan, O2102749.  
 Stocks, Harold Womack, O4024259.

Weber, Charles Joseph, Jr., O1878379.  
 Woods, Clyde Thomas, O4001959.

**To be second lieutenants**

Amidon, Charles Donald, Jr., O4065811.  
 Darnauer, Paul Fredrick, O2284096.  
 Davis, Robert M., O4077196.  
 Dawes, Ronald Blaine, O2285084.  
 DePonte, Joseph Paul, O4064477.  
 Irons, Ernest Morton, Jr., O4025301.  
 Johnston, Laurence, O4025205.  
 Long, James Elton, O4048701.  
 Murrell, Dan Stewart, O4083511.  
 Neitzel, Richard Frank, O4060199.  
 Neugebauer, Donald Lee, O2277089.

The following-named officers for appointment as chaplains in the Regular Army of the United States in the grades specified, under the provisions of Public Law 737, 84th Congress, subject to physical examination required by law:

**To be captains**

Clesielski, Francis, O933326.  
 Hickey, John Jerome, O962888.  
 Paznoskas, Leonard Jerome, O997017.  
 Waldie, Thomas Edward, O514642.

**To be first lieutenants**

Brooks, Porter Harrison, O1340051.  
 Madden, James Francis, O2263865.  
 Shevlin, John Gerard, O2274695.

The following-named officers for appointment in the Women's Army Corps, Regular Army of the United States, in the grades specified, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 3311, and Public Law 737, 84th Congress, subject to physical examination required by law:

**To be captain**

Mason, Harriet May, L704149.

**To be second lieutenant**

Adams, Doris Marie, L1010897.

The following-named officers for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States in the grades specified, under the provisions of Public Law 737, 84th Congress, subject to physical examination required by law:

**To be colonel**

Lander, Quintin Scougall, O261015.

**To be lieutenant colonels**

Adams, Burr Elward, O316082.  
 Arvin, Paul Dennis, O292797.  
 Chrietzberg, William David, O304821.  
 Ewell, James T., Jr., O334235.  
 McDaniel, Wallace Allen, O361232.  
 McMains, D. M., O298618.  
 Richardson, Robert Ernest, O350316.  
 Sherlock, John Vincent, O378775.  
 Surdyk, Eugene Edward, O337702.

**To be majors**

Abarr, Robert Gene, O1041699.  
 Allen, William Martin, O1102601.  
 Armstrong, Robert Paul, O1292635.  
 Ashenbrenner, Peter Joseph, O362060.  
 Baker, Morris Lee, O339879.  
 Bennett, William, O1291565.  
 Berry, George Albert, Jr., O1574577.  
 Blackwell, Lotus Berry, O383372.  
 Brown, Lawrence Granville, O408164.  
 Buerger, Kenneth Grossjean, O1697907.  
 Burns, Oran Frank, O354709.  
 Burton, Lloyd Parsons, O1697917.  
 Byorum, Henry Moon, O346385.  
 Carpenter, Sidney Crider, O374015.  
 Cheatham, William Lucian, O352101.  
 Christin, Charles Alfred, Jr., O347151.  
 Clifford, John Woodrow, O1165168.  
 Coburn, Herbert William, O389793.  
 Coffin, Sanford, O1307511.  
 Collings, Kent Jennings, O1308106.  
 Conway, Marion Lee, O1165169.  
 Cook, Woodrow Wilson, O2055521.  
 Cory, Allan Murray, O317610.  
 Coughlin, John Calvin, O327207.  
 Cowan, Ralph Howard, O452265.  
 Crea, Robert Donkin, O507808.

Cude, Harold Eugene, Jr., O367705.  
 Dallas, Thomas Spencer, O333507.  
 Dickson, Robert Stephen, 3d, O376992.  
 Dingle, Robert Seth, Jr., O328099.  
 Dodge, Harland Laurell, O392772.  
 Donaghey, James Calvin, O403711.  
 Duncan, Harry Norman, O365335.  
 Durand, William Harris, O102618.  
 Durst, Richard Henry, O391387.  
 Eason, Sidney Seaborn, O365170.  
 Eddy, John Herman, O376397.  
 Edwards, Elmer Forrest, O419289.  
 Eichen, Harris Clark, O900008.  
 Evans, James Grady, O1284687.  
 Evans, John Thomas O343226.  
 Fink, Richard Arthur, O1041758.  
 Fiske, Robert Walter, O410381.  
 Frost, Thomas George, O452021.  
 Funke, Nathaniel Louis, O398401.  
 Gates, Quinten Lachester, O406663.  
 Gibson, Henry William, O1165293.  
 Goldenberg, Joseph, O565453.  
 Gregorie, James Bujac, Jr., O383649.  
 Gundlach, Philip James, O342498.  
 Harper, Garlyn William, O1645635.  
 Harris, Charles Eric, O749162.  
 Hillard, James Russell, O382798.  
 Holton, Russell Gilman, Jr., O464562.  
 Horloch, Fred Hugh, O1290604.  
 Horowicz, Leo Stanley, O362952.  
 Hranicka, Joseph Gosnell, O400169.  
 Hughes, William Edward, O407709.  
 Jackson, Bennett Lee, O316126.  
 Jackson, John William, O319576.  
 Jackson, Kingsbury Temple, O391677.  
 Jillson, Stuart Farnham, O341959.  
 Jones, George E., Jr., O324137.  
 Jordan, Woodrow Wilson, O390568.  
 Kampschroer, Felix, O1040253.  
 Kopschkie, Carl Edward, O346614.  
 Kovach, Frank Zboray, O407698.  
 Kuehlke, Christian Gotlob, Jr., O354079.  
 Kulp, James Minor, O325483.  
 Langham, Dwight, William, O367053.  
 Lieding, Robert Kenneth, O362730.  
 Lovell, William Frank, O1285449.  
 Lowe, William Hollinger, Jr., O1283278.  
 Lucas, William Ashley, O339661.  
 Luckenbach, Everett Alexander, O327765.  
 Mack, John Denis, O1002681.  
 Maerz, Richard Hugh, O396673.  
 Malone, William Frank, O361378.  
 Mangum, Claud Darwin, O1581948.  
 Mansfield, Herbert Viscount, O361345.  
 Marshall, Ben Fridge, O413260.  
 McAdams, James Orien, O404984.  
 McCaskill, John Calvin, O322335.  
 McFarland, Edwin Doudna, O483152.  
 McKerral, Howard Alton, O318711.  
 Medinger, John Norman, O1633406.  
 Meis, Emil Ferdinand, Jr., O339668.  
 Melcher, John Frederic, O319400.  
 Mellett, Earle Clayton, O329440.  
 Merlo, William Joseph, O1798376.  
 Merrick, Ralph Bernard, O391391.  
 Merritt, Charles Augustus, O1643124.  
 Moffett, Oren E., O1002819.  
 Molloy, William Thomas, O363930.  
 Morrissey, John Charles, Jr., O1288097.  
 Moss, Alfred Harold, O394280.  
 Moye, Ralph George, O328198.  
 Murphy, James Henry, O351306.  
 Murray, Douglas Brooks, O366936.  
 Nabors, George Allen, O1018843.  
 Nealson, Arthur Joseph, O456222.  
 O'Connor, James Francis, O398653.  
 Pahl, Irving Charles, O450625.  
 Panell, Marion Randolph, O366818.  
 Parker, Warne Richard, O1303534.  
 Parr, William Richard, O355684.  
 Parrish, Edward Lawrence, O394374.  
 Pate, Brantley Miller, Jr., O356081.  
 Porter, William Amos, Jr., O385725.  
 Pugh, Delmar Arthur, O1296578.  
 Raouls, Bernard H., O391025.  
 Rapp, Paul Chadwick, O1287059.  
 Reed, Gilbert Richard, Jr., O400215.  
 Reeder, Roger Earl, O328394.  
 Reinhard, Charles Arthur, O375508.  
 Reiter, Nathan Irving, Jr., O1994515.  
 Rice, John Lenheart, Jr., O386792.

Roberts, Robert Andrew, O361169.  
 Robichaux, Douglas Benedict, O365112.  
 Ruff, Henry, O384032.  
 Savan, Jules, O366147.  
 Scheffel, Lawrence Abraham Lowensohn, O373073.  
 Schmidt, Ronald William, O320294.  
 Sewell, Donald M., O391162.  
 Shaw, Stanley Hammond, O376448.  
 Smith, William Moffett, Jr., O341117.  
 Snow, Harold Eugene, Jr., O1633571.  
 Spagnolo, Joseph Anthony, O1038491.  
 Stoecker, John Van Dover, O453017.  
 Sunshine, George Philip, O450919.  
 Surface, Cress, Jr., O1053387.  
 Tankersley, Milton Jutson, O398981.  
 Thomas, Douglas Robert, O396347.  
 Tichenor, John Field, O454847.  
 Tjossem, Oliver Paul, O1166851.  
 Tompkins, Charles Henry, O1581428.  
 Trattner, Herbert Marvin, O1794884.  
 Traver, Paul Carlton, O342020.  
 Treneman, Robert Arthur, O343571.  
 Ulanowicz, Emil Michael, O396758.  
 Vail, Robert Edward, O1285522.  
 Van Wert, Robert Wayne, O1548157.  
 Vangen, Terrance Anthony, O1283873.  
 Vaughn, Jack Erwin, O1040634.  
 Vignes, Joseph Larose, O395132.  
 Von Sholly, Frederick William, O1557106.  
 Vuksich, Melvin Michael, O367837.  
 Wadsworth, William Franklin, Jr., O425139.  
 Ward, Ben Hunt, O465228.  
 Weaver, Earl John, O452654.  
 Westbrook, Jack Griffin, O385837.  
 Wheatley, Melford Marcelle, O375943.  
 Whitney, Carl Everett, Jr., O398275.  
 Whitt, Ralph Lee, O452098.  
 Wilkins, Wallace W., Jr., O387709.  
 Williams, Ezra Max, O375557.  
 Williams, Thomas Calvin, Jr., O1296461.  
 Wingfield, William Benjamin, O327988.  
 Winterbottom, Frederick William, O388482.  
 Wood, Starling Witt, Jr., O375055.  
 Young, Lellyn Malhorn, O389005.  
 Zebrowitz, Morris, O375533.

#### To be captains

Abrams, Lester Winfield, O2037155.  
 Adamo, Pascal, O1822972.  
 Adinero, Joseph Thomas, O1635235.  
 Aguilar, Arthur, O1582547.  
 Ahrenholz, Albert Francis, O1167716.  
 Akers, Walter William, O1846014.  
 Albanese, Archie Joseph, O1313363.  
 Allender, Nicholas Vickers, Jr., O1030541.  
 Anderson, David McClure, O1593433.  
 Anderson, Frank Ernest, O1285690.  
 Anderson, Russell Vernon, O1287813.  
 Applebee, John Elsworth, O1014618.  
 Applegate, William Gould, O1590965.  
 Arbuckle, Robert Charles, O1035310.  
 Armstrong, Russell Benjamin, Jr., O1639897.  
 Aston, David Thomas, O448981.  
 Baer, Malcolm Ridgely, O1287120.  
 Bagley, James Curry, O1285173.  
 Bahr, Herman Joseph, O1641984.  
 Bailey, Kenneth Lee, O495178.  
 Baker, Claude, W., O1289856.  
 Balaker, Basil Charles, O1104725.  
 Balmforth, Edmund Elliott, O2200103.  
 Banse-Fay, Frederick Vincent, O1332045.  
 Barnett, Clarence Charles, O1300439.  
 Barnhizer, Harry Joseph, O1573723.  
 Barone, Sandro Armando, O1334531.  
 Barrett, Frederick Taylor, O1651942.  
 Barton, Deforest Allen, O1337917.  
 Bauknight, George William, O1286767.  
 Beahler, Lee Edward, Jr., O1106582.  
 Beaman, Milburn Frank, O1004734.  
 Beaty, Edward Robert, O1012384.  
 Becraft, Clarence William, O1335103.  
 Bell, Ernest Lee, O1283008.  
 Bell, Raymond Eugene, O1036753.  
 Bell, Thomas Lewis, O1946910.  
 Bender, Keith Gordon, O1041963.  
 Benge, Charles Johnnie, O1284085.  
 Benson, Robert Charles, O2055465.  
 Benson, Theodore Nelson, O516913.  
 Berg, Jacob James, O1062663.  
 Berger, Rayfield Robert, O1044759.

Berger, Roy Harold, O1036847.  
 Berkshire, Harry George, O2008606.  
 Berlin, Walter Irvin, O1292995.  
 Berridge, William Joseph, O1845339.  
 Berris, Michael Thomas, Jr., O1003669.  
 Berry, Fred Parke, O583061.  
 Bess, Victor Eugene, O1281482.  
 Betit, Joseph Washington, O2020705.  
 Bickford, Robert Joseph, O1797936.  
 Biersack, Christian Matthew, O1116331.  
 Bishop, Clarence Edwin, O1317261.  
 Bishop, John Henry, O1062468.  
 Black, Charles Samuel, O1117362.  
 Black, James Robertson, Jr., O2274638.  
 Blackman, Edward Bonner, O441493.  
 Blackwell, Roy Vail, O1585861.  
 Blair, Bruce Everett, O1583892.  
 Bohn, William Walter, O109820.  
 Bolke, Francis Gene, O1043574.  
 Bond, James Joseph, O1044179.  
 Borges, Richard Anthony, O1948696.  
 Botchin, Philip, O456600.  
 Bowles, Alvin Hoyt, O1037405.  
 Bowman, Harvey Rowland, Jr., O1295988.  
 Bowman, Joseph Carlock, O1280922.  
 Boyd, William Edward, O1290536.  
 Boyer, Ray Yeager, O1573737.  
 Bradley, Robert Weston, O1329209.  
 Brady, Robert Walter, O1304636.  
 Brady, Walter, O1166912.  
 Branham, Milton Gelwicks, O1548654.  
 Brant, William Allen, O1048693.  
 Braun, William Francis, O1826122.  
 Brickell, Grant Rice, O1037413.  
 Bridenbaugh, Donald Davis, O1166234.  
 Brigandi, Joseph, O540530.  
 Britten, Roland Leon, O1551806.  
 Brooks, George, O450807.  
 Brown, David William, O1337539.  
 Brown, Guy Wilson, O1326975.  
 Brown, John George Carleton, O1010305.  
 Brown, Kitchen Neville, O1326134.  
 Brown, Lloyd Winfield, O1325122.  
 Brubeck, David Lindley, O392968.  
 Brugge, Robert Otto, O1118172.  
 Bryant, Oren Wayne, O520817.  
 Buckingham, James Stewart, O1186172.  
 Buckles, Ronald J., O372058.  
 Bullock, Baxter Mangum, O1799235.  
 Bunton, Raymond Barnard, O104534.  
 Burch, Robert Leonard, O1334096.  
 Burgess, James Martin, O1327711.  
 Burke, Donald Dean, O1169445.  
 Burke, James Rogers, O2055215.  
 Burnette, Thomas Nelson, O1032195.  
 Burns, Patrick James, O1010461.  
 Burton, Edward Kearney, O1947471.  
 Bush, Leonard Raymond, O2000539.  
 Butler, David Clifford, O1293544.  
 Butler, Frank Lawrence, O1186504.  
 Cadmus, George William, O679826.  
 Callinan, Patrick Michael, O397053.  
 Campbell, James William, O1010317.  
 Cannon, Clinton Carlisle, Jr., O1548675.  
 Cantaral, Raymond Hugh, O1548676.  
 Carlson, Carsten Douglas, O1306812.  
 Carpenter, Clyde Pershing, O400802.  
 Carroll, Edward Francis, O2007004.  
 Carson, John Lee, O425262.  
 Cassell, John William, O870684.  
 Cassias, Clarence Eugene, O1183485.  
 Castrale, James, O1286438.  
 Catania, Alfred John, O1584371.  
 Caudell, Louis, O1306702.  
 Causgrove, Bernard Thomas, O1183325.  
 Cellucci, Loreto, O1634605.  
 Chase, Jack Powers, O1599099.  
 Cheek, Leon Blakely, Jr., O1165596.  
 Child, Thomas Waring, Jr., O1633118.  
 Christian, Averill Lee, O409721.  
 Christiansen, Donald Andrew, O1169897.  
 Church, Charlie Roller, O1290716.  
 Citrak, Michael, O2000516.  
 Clare, George Frederick, O1645170.  
 Clark, Stephen, O450107.  
 Clavio, James Dominic, O1556397.  
 Cline, Edbert Clayton, O465506.  
 Cloutier, Francis McCormick, O1638882.  
 Coates, Charles Everett, O1016737.  
 Coburn, Dick, O437068.  
 Coffey, William Wagner, O1280815.



- Coggins, Clyde Alton, O1308604.  
 Collins, Gilbert Richard, O1012814.  
 Collins, Philip Russell, O1822963.  
 Colt, John Boyd, O1165600.  
 Colvocoresses, Alden Partridge, O390093.  
 Compton, Jack Emil, O1290902.  
 Cook, Bruce Kingsbury, O518863.  
 Cooke, Raymond Warren, O1172813.  
 Coombs, Richard Brown, O1575878.  
 Cooper, William Reed, O1584076.  
 Copp, Duport Mauro, O1182088.  
 Corcoran, Edward William, O383433.  
 Corneli, Robert Wesley, O1183045.  
 Cortez, Clyde Amado, O1318385.  
 Costa, Leonard LeRoy, O1017590.  
 Costilla, Fred, O1998721.  
 Crain, Charles Leland, O1297166.  
 Crane, Ray Thomas, O1589773.  
 Cranford, Jack, O1046403.  
 Curtis, Lawrence Brabson, O1575892.  
 Dague, Robert Victor, O1100067.  
 Dallinga, Hyrum, O1017302.  
 Dalton, Dermot Patrick, O1170697.  
 Dalton, Elvin, O1038952.  
 Davino, Louis, O1329331.  
 Davis, Charles Emil, O1322978.  
 Davis, Dale Ervin, O1579544.  
 Davis, Frank Brownie, O1015356.  
 Dayton, Kenneth Goodman, O1588514.  
 Debye, George Albert, O1536161.  
 De Rieux, Stanley Nell, O1634670.  
 DeSanto, Anthony Joseph, O1169925.  
 DeWitt, Richard Phillip, O1058225.  
 Dean, Gernard Daniel, O530000.  
 Derry, Hugh Augustin, O1645782.  
 Delaney, Edward Joseph, O1000734.  
 Dempster, Robert Nicol, O1341521.  
 Denhart, John Frederick, O922576.  
 Dewhurst, Sam Turner, O1685615.  
 Dezarn, Lowell Bernard, O120006.  
 Dickerson, William Rowe, Jr., O1297172.  
 Dickerson, Roy Linville, O465087.  
 Dillon, Francis Henry, Jr., O538531.  
 Dillon, Paul Cox, O389623.  
 Dixon, Billy Lee, O1341644.  
 Dodd, William Ray, O1179371.  
 Dodson, Arthur William, O1290044.  
 Donaldson, Kenneth Colvin, O449156.  
 Doppel, Leroy, O1057721.  
 Dorr, Colgate, O558622.  
 Douglas, Wayne Minshull, O2042810.  
 Dover, Donovan Carl, O1043319.  
 Dowden, Richard Leon, O540438.  
 Downie, John William, O1295845.  
 Drake, Oscar, O1325482.  
 Drozd, Walter Marjan, O1045719.  
 Dul, Peter A., O1321110.  
 Dunbar, Philip H., Jr., O1184806.  
 Duncan, William Lyle, O1289880.  
 Dunlap, Jack Alexander, O1294635.  
 Dunlop, John, O2036904.  
 Dunn, Horace Bonsey, Jr., O1548201.  
 Dunn, Richard James, Jr., O1634702.  
 Dupart, William Louis, O1328682.  
 Durham, James Thomas, O1586548.  
 Dwyer, Robert Charles, O1844738.  
 Dye, Laverne E., O1016660.  
 Dye, Thomas Addison, Jr., O1030556.  
 Ecklon, Leland Christian, O1845030.  
 Eggleston, Edmond Overton, O1114469.  
 Eiler, William Robert, O2026311.  
 Eliasson, Arne Holger, O1061377.  
 Elkins, Robert Davis, O425497.  
 Elliott, John William, O663879.  
 Ellis, Walter Graham, O1020404.  
 Ellison, Milton Herbert, O885520.  
 Ellison, Paul Parks, Jr., O1335910.  
 Elwell, Raymond Garrett, O1633831.  
 Emerick, James Clayton, O1332589.  
 Ensor, John Oscar, O1329340.  
 Erickson, John Donald, O1171135.  
 Etchemendy, Leon, O444709.  
 Evans, Edward Spaulding, O1294114.  
 Evans, James Anderson, Jr., O1634729.  
 Evans, Luther, Jr., O1040022.  
 Evers, Raymond Russell, O417491.  
 Farkash, Eugene Jack, O1633842.  
 Farnham, Kenneth Nathaniel, O1080705.  
 Felch, Robert Irving, O412567.  
 Fell, Joseph Gerard, O1339712.  
 Field, David Dudley, O1586572.  
 Filby, Robert Arthur, O1997789.  
 Finlayson, Hugh Stewart, Jr., O553369.  
 Fischer, Leonard Jack, O1634750.  
 Fish, Frederick James, O1041760.  
 Fisher, Paul M., O1011309.  
 Fleck, Harold John, O1011737.  
 Fleming, William, Jr., O1588556.  
 Flynn, Joseph Vincent, O1325745.  
 Flynn, Thomas Beury, O1036524.  
 Foley, Francis Edward, O2200119.  
 Foley, Richard Francis, O1011943.  
 Ford, Clifford Haun, O521821.  
 Forrester, Charles Tucker, Jr., O1575985.  
 Forsyth, George Edward, O1588560.  
 Fourt, Herbert John, O1179070.  
 Fowler, Philip James, O1797984.  
 Fox, Archie Carl, O2027542.  
 Frame, Golden James, O1582729.  
 Franzek, Theodore Daniel, O1703949.  
 Freda, Thornton George Embree, O442456.  
 Freeman, Herman Oliver, O1557150.  
 Frol, Anthony Belmore, O540892.  
 Furr, James Homer, O1058519.  
 Furth, Norman Joseph, O1169969.  
 Gabella, George Theodore, O1013229.  
 Gaffney, Leo Francis, O1534490.  
 Gandy, William Frederick, O1107968.  
 Garr, Arthur Sylvester, O1119059.  
 Garrett, O. G., O1305568.  
 Gentry, Clarence E., O1118377.  
 Gettman, Richard Phillip, O477012.  
 Gewinner, Marcus Napoleon, O1288687.  
 Giaccio, Albert Pascal, O413776.  
 Gibbs, Cyrus Leroy, O1178162.  
 Gill, Harvey Eugene, O544496.  
 Giltner, Gustav John, O2020719.  
 Gioia, Joseph Frank, O1178812.  
 Glaser, Robert Donovan, O1313594.  
 Glass, Malvin Franklin, Jr., O1037503.  
 Gleason, James Keith, O1640488.  
 Godfrey, Wayne Richard, O550633.  
 Goldrick, Robert Newton, O1639082.  
 Goley, Byron Hayward, O2036926.  
 Goodwin, Guy Russell, Jr., O387919.  
 Goodwin, James Maurice, O483712.  
 Gordner, Henry Louis, O1318782.  
 Goss, Donald Franklin, O1280910.  
 Gould, Harold Alan, O1101012.  
 Grandelli, Charles Michael, O1332596.  
 Graser, Harry Carl, O1593597.  
 Greene, George Victor, Jr., O1948141.  
 Greer, Herman Earl, O1179870.  
 Gregg, George Francis, O1059795.  
 Gresick, Bernard Alexander, O1012739.  
 Gribble, Lee Roy Waldon, O1637566.  
 Griffin, Robert William, O1287866.  
 Griffith, Robert Elmon, O1593600.  
 Gritz, Sidney, O1101467.  
 Grodin, Richard Adrian, O1895363.  
 Gulang, Marcelino Colorado, O1896858.  
 Guice, Billy Milton, O1303880.  
 Guild, Donald Edmund, O1012189.  
 Gursky, Alex Peter, O2025959.  
 Gwynn, John Edward, O1573247.  
 Gysin, Thomas William, O1057083.  
 Hack, Sidney, O1061413.  
 Hacker, Frederick, O1179876.  
 Haen, Clifford Leo, O439507.  
 Hagar, Bailey Warren, O442471.  
 Haight, Chauncy Price, O1171172.  
 Hale, Albert Carson, O1598405.  
 Hall, George Ross, O405726.  
 Hall, Ohio Columbus, O1051583.  
 Hallanan, George Henry, Jr., O454135.  
 Hamer, George Richard, O1697960.  
 Hamilton, Joseph, Jr., O1302647.  
 Hamilton, Robert Brendon, O1051584.  
 Hand, Clifton Earl, O1050699.  
 Hanna, Nathaniel Phillip, O466721.  
 Hanna, Thomas Gerald, O1171574.  
 Haralson, Browning Roy, O1332812.  
 Harbin, Darwin Dougherty, O1305578.  
 Hardin, George Blaine, Jr., O1287706.  
 Harrigan, Thomas York, O1823442.  
 Harris, Earl Donovan, O1634855.  
 Harris, Leon Milton, O1000577.  
 Harris, Neal Wesley, O391447.  
 Harris, Peter James, O1169560.  
 Harris, Roland, O571956.  
 Harrison, James Jacoby, O1316291.  
 Hartline, John David, O1637622.  
 Harvey, William Thomas, O1040935.  
 Hassinger, Robert Wayne, O1688340.  
 Hawk, Edwin Louis, O1649681.  
 Hawke, Willard Wesley, O1302462.  
 Hawley, George Richmond, Jr., O2012195.  
 Hayes, Lincoln Richards, O1041355.  
 Hayes, Stephen Hawley, O1591183.  
 Haymaker, Gerald LeRoy, O1041164.  
 Haynes, Chester Harold, O1308640.  
 Hearn, William Monroe, O1319207.  
 Hecklinger, Henry Donald, O1062380.  
 Helterbran, David Joseph, O1000782.  
 Henderson, John Ray, O405831.  
 Hendricson, Harold Maris, O1012772.  
 Henry, Charles Onis, O1293050.  
 Henry, John Frank, O377094.  
 Herrington, Rupert Couthbert, O1589000.  
 Hessler, Robert John, O1292698.  
 Hetzel, Foster Greer, Jr., O1118387.  
 Higgins, Robert Francis, O1585617.  
 Hill, Ralph Edward, O1647081.  
 Himic, Sieve Paul, O1296032.  
 Hinrichs, Frank Anton, O390975.  
 Hipley, Fred Francis, O1335788.  
 Hirsch, Edward, O437855.  
 Hlsaka, Masakatsu, O1331946.  
 Hockaday, Spencer Thurston, O449046.  
 Hoffman, Robert Lee, O1176669.  
 Holt, Paul Ensley, O2020155.  
 Holt, Robert Bandy, O1288746.  
 Honeman, Donald Edwin, O456140.  
 Hooks, Walter Allen, O1000381.  
 Hopkins, Paul Everet, O1594242.  
 Hopkinson, Harry Lowe, O1035285.  
 Hopper, Harold Winthrop, O1031098.  
 Hosemann, Joseph Francis, Jr., O1048417.  
 Hostetter, Charles Alfred, O1039044.  
 Houston, Frank Wilmer, O2014907.  
 Howard, Hubert Carroll, O1000043.  
 Howard, John Andrew, O467323.  
 Howard, Norman Farlow, O1685646.  
 Hubble, James Everett, O2020646.  
 Hughes, Harold Lloyd, O1011453.  
 Hughes, Richard W., O1315447.  
 Hummel, Atlee Vorce, O1826008.  
 Hurd, James William, O1003763.  
 Hursh, Donald Gordon, Jr., O1591608.  
 Hyde, Thomas Irvin, O728214.  
 Hyndman, James Hugh, O1797467.  
 Ilston, William George, O452412.  
 Ireland, Robert Abner, Jr., O1551033.  
 Irish, Ralph Giles, O1642222.  
 Israelson, John Arthur, O1102127.  
 Jachens, Richard Charles, O1636994.  
 Jacks, John Lyles, Jr., O1588066.  
 Jackson, Charles Austin, O394902.  
 Jackson, Henry Taylor, O1341342.  
 Jacobs, Bruce Melburn, O1554213.  
 Jacobson, Arthur John, O1318044.  
 Jameson, Malcolm MacGregor, O400182.  
 Jardon, Eldo Beard, O1338241.  
 Jennings, Dan Duval, Jr., O1283077.  
 Jewell, Jack Frederick, O1283969.  
 Jobst, John William, O1314785.  
 Johnson, James William, O962678.  
 Johnson, Richard Stephen, O1645700.  
 Jones, Cecil Reginald, O1336223.  
 Jones, Harold Irvin, O1297204.  
 Jones, Harry Lane, O2038882.  
 Jones, Homer Hardaway, O461025.  
 Jones, Hubert Rex, O1553481.  
 Jones, Murray Gillen, O1310604.  
 Jones, Robert Douglas, O1001817.  
 Judd, Donald Stowe, O1165747.  
 Jung, Gordon Clifford, O1333221.  
 Kantz, Robert John, O378459.  
 Karr, Guy Atchinson, Jr., O131408.  
 Kasdorf, Walter William, O1690748.  
 Katagiri, Taro, O1019927.  
 Kattner, Stanley James, O1579855.  
 Kay, Herbert Jack, O394936.  
 Kearns, Patrick Frank, O2046279.  
 Keefer, Robert Joseph, O447300.  
 Keet, Robert Tyler, O448790.  
 Keith, James Edgar, O468527.  
 Kelley, Peter E., O1322926.  
 Kelsey, Philip Richard, O1796965.  
 Kemp, Neal Raymond, O1031733.  
 Kennedy, Maurice Joseph, O1328044.  
 Kennedy, Richard Joseph, Jr., O1289271.  
 Kerker, Edward Lawrence, O435577.  
 Kern, William Russell, O1000142.  
 Kiernan, James Aloysius, O1313418.  
 Kies, Robert Herman, O1338609.

Kilbourne, Charles Alexander, O1307831.  
 Kim, Young Oak, O1309572.  
 Kimball, George Edward, O436358.  
 Klaver, Clarence Arle, O1646322.  
 Klundt, Roland Eugene, O2024460.  
 Knepp, Lester Johnston, O404220.  
 Knoeller, Frank Oree, O1284716.  
 Knox, Thomas James, O398392.  
 Knudson, Wade Estrem, O754016.  
 Koehl, Leonard Henry, O2034889.  
 Kramer, David Oscar, O1341173.  
 Krometis, August Angelo, O1183908.  
 Kulhanek, Bernard Joe, O465939.  
 Ladson, Robert Nash, O874296.  
 Lambertus, Willard Leslie, O1290439.  
 Lane, Robert Wilson, O389069.  
 Lansford, Jack Perry, O1010516.  
 Lassiter, George Linvie, O1062772.  
 Laughlin, Lorenzo Dow, Jr., O1949831.  
 Lawless, Raymond Bernard, O1648208.  
 Lawless, Roger Edwin John, O455315.  
 Lecomte, Roger Laurant, O1540842.  
 Ledbetter, William Russell, O389559.  
 Lennon, Eugene Francis, Jr., O1036602.  
 Le Vant, William Spitzer, O538041.  
 Leonard, Robert Theodore, O1052860.  
 Leonard, Robert William, O1283451.  
 Lesniak, Walter John, O2035347.  
 Lewelling, Billy Reed, O1168777.  
 Lewey, Merle Creighton, O1641509.  
 Lewin, Edward Harrison, O1799460.  
 Lewis, Jack Keaton, O1535934.  
 Lind, Ralph William, O1015027.  
 Lindsey, Clifton Shelby, O377868.  
 Link, Roger John, O1640676.  
 Linn, William Erwin, O1169619.  
 Linrothe, Robert Nelson, O1177057.  
 Lipscomb, John Robert, O1997272.  
 Little, John Thomas, O887923.  
 Litton, Andrew LaRoe, O1951016.  
 Lockhart, Wilson Laverne, O1648360.  
 Lofland, William O., Jr., O1587419.  
 Logan, Douglas Kyle, O1340667.  
 Londner, Bernard, O1944514.  
 Long, William Fred, Jr., O453203.  
 Longbotham, Ralph Maynard, Jr., O1332982.  
 Loomis, Robert Kalman, O1170836.  
 Lopez, Fernando, O643714.  
 Lowe, Laddie Langford, O1557041.  
 Lowry, Leonard, O1302026.  
 Luick, Alton La Vern, O1282735.  
 Lumia, Salvatore Albert, O404788.  
 Lunceford, Roy Lorenza, O2037566.  
 Lyle, Paul Brown, O1170066.  
 Lytle, Elmer Edwin, O1167522.  
 Mabry, J. P., O1172153.  
 MacFarland, James Clark, O1576321.  
 MacIntyre, Ellsworth Thomas, O1578799.  
 MacKenzie, Douglas Alexander, O1305805.  
 MacLean-Kennedy, Donald Smith, O1688812.  
 Mader, William Peter, O1168350.  
 Madigan, William, O1032749.  
 Mahr, Warren Carney, O1338833.  
 Majeske, Arthur, O1174942.  
 Mangones, Robert Joseph, O1342092.  
 Marcelle, David Arthur, O397220.  
 Marin, Sebastian, Jr., O1327556.  
 Marks, Joseph Ward, O1288921.  
 Marksteiner, John Anthony, O2037629.  
 Marnoch, Gabriel Wilson, Jr., O518508.  
 Marshall, George Wilson, O1291850.  
 Marshall, Robert Bruce, O390594.  
 Martin, Doyme King, O1645179.  
 Martin, James Ellis, O1342093.  
 Martin, James Joseph, O1998114.  
 Martin, James Mahlon, O1823321.  
 Martin, Paul Edwin, O1339189.  
 Mathews, Morgan Howard, O743360.  
 Mattison, William Renhart, O396533.  
 Maxa, Rudolph Joseph, O1548102.  
 Mayer, Merle William, O1338258.  
 McAvoy, Donald Wayne, O454201.  
 McCaffrey, Donald Joseph, O1338259.  
 McCandless, Clarence Edwin, O1593067.  
 McClain, Wallis Eperson, O1010425.  
 McClellan, John Anthony, O1576351.  
 McClung, Boniface Dotson, O1316769.  
 McConnell, Donald Horace, O1100673.  
 McCoy, Joseph, O2006186.  
 McCue, Rufus Glenn, Jr., O1328276.

McDonough, Charles James, O1054705.  
 McHugh, John Joseph, O1590646.  
 McIntire, Ralph Walton, O1043166.  
 McKenna, Warren Earl, O2024336.  
 McKenzie, James Edward, O1283104.  
 McKenzie, William Edwin, O1318063.  
 McKiernan, John Thomas, O1639384.  
 McLaughlin, George Robert, O404264.  
 McLeod, Glenwood Paul, O1081485.  
 McMinn, John Henry, O1339901.  
 McNeill, William Edgar, O1341810.  
 McTague, Norman Scott, O1177085.  
 Melton, Charles Allen, O469856.  
 Menefee, Robert Gould, Jr., O1169649.  
 Mergler, Vernon Tilson, O1288270.  
 Merrell, J. Sterling, O453240.  
 Meyer, Warren Jay, O2037492.  
 Midgett, Garland Hugh, O1332398.  
 Miles, James Stewart, O442892.  
 Millar, Donald Bruce, O1046203.  
 Miller, Donald Edward, O1846036.  
 Miller, Francis Donald, O538342.  
 Miller, Frederic George, O1822169.  
 Miller, John Erven, O1288093.  
 Miller, William Bert, O1018307.  
 Miller, William Robert, O887374.  
 Mills, Edgar Frank, O1015941.  
 Mishtowt, Basil Ilarion, O1284553.  
 Mitchell, Erwin McLeod, O803732.  
 Mitchell, Wyatt James, O956058.  
 Mittenzwei, Francis Xavier, O1004812.  
 Mize, James Clifford, O1176437.  
 Mock, Alfred James, O410520.  
 Monroe, Howard Eugene, O2206103.  
 Moon, Robert Stanley, O1283464.  
 Moore, Charles Elmer, O1329272.  
 Moore, Clarence A., O1014846.  
 Moore, Ernest Lloyd, O1699968.  
 Moore, Harold Lane, O1340794.  
 Moore, Robert Kenneth, O1181700.  
 Moranda, George Edward, O454886.  
 Morefield, William John, O1280555.  
 Morgan, John Pierpont, O1577593.  
 Morgan, John William, O1165918.  
 Morris, James Henry, O401525.  
 Morris, Robert Charnelle, O498281.  
 Morrow, Thomas Otto, O1172436.  
 Mosgrove, George Gordon, O1039809.  
 Mosser, Richard Bucks, O1649559.  
 Mumford, Elmer Stitt, O423485.  
 Munson, Orville Oscar, O1101594.  
 Munt, Francis Randolph, O1588765.  
 Murphy, James Malcolm, O1598848.  
 Muttoni, Donald Sylvester, O2018735.  
 Myers, Chester Lavern, O1648859.  
 Nash, Leonard Charles, O1100264.  
 Naughton, Francis Edward, O2288940.  
 Neitz, Ravellan Henry, O1578920.  
 New, Charles Joseph, O1032545.  
 Nicholson, Charles Albert, O497518.  
 Nicholson, Tom Mercer, O1639872.  
 Nielsen, Carl Harvey, O1330847.  
 Nietman, Charles Frederick, O1316191.  
 Nightingale, Gardner Swift, O1042897.  
 Nishimura, Bert Noboru, O398791.  
 Noll, John Valentine, Jr., O1045866.  
 Nolph, William Harold, O1057836.  
 Nottage, Paul Edward, O494665.  
 Novy, James Frederick, O888950.  
 Oakes, Edward Everett, Jr., O1281348.  
 O'Brien, John Ashley, O1001868.  
 Odom, Alton Chafin, O1321726.  
 O'Donohue, Thomas Joseph, O1051313.  
 Okawachi, Toru Michael, O1339304.  
 Okazaki, Saige, O935285.  
 Oliver, George Sylvester, O1312212.  
 Olsen, Raymond Malcolm, O2055312.  
 Olson, Clifford Arthur, O887474.  
 Olson, Harry Harper, O1557509.  
 Olszewski, Walter John, O1560445.  
 Orchel, Stanley, O1300699.  
 Orlando, John Anthony, O1308693.  
 Orr, Lawrence E., Jr., O438606.  
 Orrick, Richard Roscoe, O2024408.  
 Osburn, Wayne Edwin, O2020195.  
 Oswell, Gorman Stanley, O1169276.  
 Owen, Tom Hubbard, O555588.  
 Padgett, Jerry Ervin, O1646479.  
 Pagel, Willis George, O441284.  
 Pahl, Gaylord George, O1821762.  
 Pardee, Robert Everett, O1536371.  
 Parker, Brandon Lamar, O1334009.

Parker, Woodrow Wilson, O1286880.  
 Parks, Marion Wilcox, Jr., O1169279.  
 Patterson, Dallas Melvin, O408938.  
 Patterson, David Thomas, O1648659.  
 Patterson, John Allen, O1102417.  
 Paull, Joseph Kelly, O453831.  
 Pearcey, Harold Wilson, O1290652.  
 Pechacek, Melvin Lee, O2001025.  
 Pennington, William Yancey, O388688.  
 Pennino, John Langendorf, O425152.  
 Peoples, Robert Howarth, O518706.  
 Peterson, Palmer Adolph, O1018037.  
 Pfeiffer, John Victor, O1010407.  
 Phaneuf, Philip Edmond, O446670.  
 Phillips, David Everitt, O1044063.  
 Phillips, Warren Byron, O447536.  
 Pickell, George William, O1297583.  
 Pierce, Walter Raleigh, Jr., O1337336.  
 Pietrzyk, Mitchell, O1062044.  
 Pilant, Joseph Lewis, O1054753.  
 Pinkstone, Hueston Longcor Joseph, O1548282.  
 Pooley, Nardeth Wayne, O2035492.  
 Post, Harold Nelson, O1580179.  
 Poteat, William Daniel, O538385.  
 Potter, Carleton Frederick, O1651395.  
 Potter, Jack Conrad, O1312794.  
 Poulin, Paul Raymond, O1638292.  
 Praeger, Herman Albert, Jr., O414085.  
 Prather, Eugene Calahan, O410184.  
 Prawitz, Leeland Robert, O465152.  
 Prewett, James Franklin, O1168870.  
 Price, Herbert Hickham, O415997.  
 Proudfoot, Robert James, O1558321.  
 Pye, William Sherwood, O1312107.  
 Quig, Clayton Anthony, O1291329.  
 Quisenberry, Joe Fowler, O1587555.  
 Radcliff, Joseph Anthony, O1309606.  
 Raleigh, Edward Coblentz, O1040459.  
 Ramsburg, Charles Everett, O1325108.  
 Rasula, George Arthur, O1323171.  
 Rateau, Munro Anthony, O1583543.  
 Rau, William Anton, O1011048.  
 Rawlings, Richard Jackson, Jr., O453593.  
 Ray, Charles Guthrie, O1324651.  
 Redding, William Vaughn, O456627.  
 Reeder, James Robert, O1284396.  
 Reese, Alfred J., Jr., O1341292.  
 Reeve, John Daniel, O1170934.  
 Reidenbaugh, Charles Henry, O1794987.  
 Reynolds, Chester Alexander, Jr., O1947811.  
 Reynolds, Clifford Henry, O2035145.  
 Reynolds, Eugene Franklin, O1946601.  
 Reynolds, Harry Edward, Jr., O1076384.  
 Rice, Delbert Edmond, O1535519.  
 Rice, Herman Richard, O1020242.  
 Richey, Ralph David, Jr., O1320480.  
 Riddler, Garth Arthur, Jr., O454840.  
 Riek, Justus Robert, O1314190.  
 Rimlinger, James Louis, O1305833.  
 Rippey, George Ellsworth, O387861.  
 Risen, Everett Lee, O1650714.  
 Robbins, Phillip Walter, O2006615.  
 Roberts, David Richard, O1308182.  
 Robertson, James Clifford, O1584805.  
 Robinson, Gerald Edward, O1080902.  
 Rock, Warren Vanderveer, O2048758.  
 Rogers, Joseph John, O1036358.  
 Rollison, Howard Elmer, O1045226.  
 Rood, Gordon Dunlop, O4010833.  
 Rosoff, Martin, O1285119.  
 Rowley, Hobart Laverne, O1174128.  
 Ruby, William Francis, O2032902.  
 Rudolph, Louis Frederick, Jr., O1640894.  
 Russell, Lester Franklyn, O1948216.  
 Rutledge, Walton Albert, O549633.  
 Sadove, Aaron Solomon, O1001044.  
 Sager, Perry Ashby, O1299477.  
 Samson, Jack, O1293841.  
 Sanders, Frederick Jefferson, O1287954.  
 Sanders, William Oscar, Jr., O2019653.  
 Sandsmark, Albert Ivan, O520263.  
 Scanlon, William Edward, O1324664.  
 Scherberger, Richard Jerome, O1647257.  
 Schmiedel, Robert Alfonse, O1550047.  
 Schneider, Richard Ernst, O662096.  
 Schofield, Frank Curtis, O2020841.  
 Schuknecht, Lloyd Charles, Jr., O1648145.  
 Schwank, Bernard Joseph, O1294026.  
 Scott, Harvey, O1014168.  
 Serbousek, George, O2017133.



Setzer, Allen Lee, O2036838.  
 Sevdry, Lawrence Martin, O1169331.  
 Shaper, William, O1576633.  
 Sheppard, Orval Hubertus, O1166604.  
 Sheriff, Herman Willard, O1036732.  
 Sherman, Frederick William, Jr., O1118807.  
 Sherman, Gerald, O386005.  
 Shroyer, James Lewis, O2015708.  
 Siegel, Leon Selwyn, O1650329.  
 Sillin, William Elwyn, O1010947.  
 Simmet, Kenneth Donald, O404005.  
 Sims, Howard Russell, O1547795.  
 Sims, Morton David, O2069400.  
 Sine, Robert Roy, O1323750.  
 Singleton, John Edwin, O1054414.  
 Sitler, Henry Oliver, O1580328.  
 Skaith, LeRoy James, O1314558.  
 Skapik, Richard Lee, O1325678.  
 Skelley, James Leo, O404213.  
 Skidmore, William Frank, O2033135.  
 Skiffington, Edward Henry, O441720.  
 Slate, Francis Taylor, O1295446.  
 Sly, George Washington, O1177980.  
 Small, Ballard Burton, Jr., O538082.  
 Smith, John Andrew, 3d, O535039.  
 Smith, Joseph Patrick, O449245.  
 Smith, Kenneth Joseph, O1648163.  
 Smith, Paul Eugene, O2033037.  
 Smith, Raymond Howard, Jr., O1058687.  
 Smith, Temple Christian, O1584939.  
 Smith, Wilbur Bell, O1826064.  
 Snyder, Arthur Frank, Jr., O1011877.  
 Snyder, Harry Alan, O385631.  
 Sobel, Harold, O455917.  
 Sollosi, John S., O410583.  
 Sovern, Charles, O1638562.  
 Sowers, Harold Norman, O1323228.  
 Sparano, James William, O2017470.  
 Spies, George Henry, Jr., O1012650.  
 Spittler, Charles Richard, O1338872.  
 Spitzer, Joseph Bernard, O1579163.  
 Sprague, Francis Ort, O1316682.  
 Stahelski, Anthony Francis, O1167648.  
 Stam, Charles William, O1291535.  
 Stankovich, Albert Anton, O1699987.  
 Starke, William Stewart, Jr., O1019080.  
 Starr, John Bernard, O447822.  
 Stephens, Travis Jimmie Lee, O1598251.  
 Still, Edgar Earl, O1171000.  
 Stillo, Frank Guy, O429738.  
 Stofflet, Lawrence Merlin, O1014887.  
 Street, Harold Leroy, Jr., O1643374.  
 Strever, John Eberly, Jr., O1060987.  
 Sullivan, Daniel Edward, Jr., O1055168.  
 Sullivan, John Francis, O430034.  
 Sullivan, John Francis, O1574350.  
 Sutherland, Warren Freeman, Jr., O1114771.  
 Sutton, Jimmy Clarence, O2033102.  
 Svilar, Matthew, O1552604.  
 Sweeney, Francis Sherlock Patrick, O2000749.  
 Syverson, Douglas Wayne, O1304304.  
 Tabor, Harry Elsworth, O1638640.  
 Tadich, Dmitri Jovo, O1326118.  
 Tarnell, Benedict Alexander, O1290839.  
 Taylor, William Wesley, O1577940.  
 Telke, Frederick William, O1334648.  
 Tencza, Anthony John, O1297274.  
 Terry, Lawrence Duryea, O453069.  
 Terry, Walter Carl, O1596830.  
 Tessieri, Philip John, O452573.  
 Thomas, Charles Martin, O1106475.  
 Thomas, Eldridge, O1951064.  
 Thomas, Gordon Franklin, O387204.  
 Thomes, George Edward, O1949670.  
 Thompson, Alfred Francis, O497304.  
 Thompson, Benjamin Howard, O2026920.  
 Thompson, John Griffith, O1015715.  
 Thompson, John Raymond, O1171394.  
 Thornton, Samuel Beaver, Jr., O541583.  
 Thying, Lunsford, O1287788.  
 Tidler, Calvin Leroy, O2029757.  
 Tiller, Norman Layton, Sr., O1339826.  
 Tillotson, John Adams, O1015919.  
 Todd, Robert Grant, O1018380.  
 Tomme, Henry Henington, O2048175.  
 Toppin, Joseph Douglas, O1327684.  
 Torrence, Bryce Joseph, O1586976.  
 Towson, William Joseph, O1295318.  
 Trammell, Howard Aubrey, O1295797.  
 Tribble, Harold Carleton, Jr., O1042452.

Tryon, Frank Harold, O2017778.  
 Tuttle, Lawrence Dana, O1796380.  
 Uchima, Unkel, O1330879.  
 Uhland, Ray Gordon, O547792.  
 Ungerleider, Alvin David, O1322738.  
 Van Buskirk, Lawrence Edward, O1557230.  
 Van Hazel, George James, Jr., O1285089.  
 Ver Hey, William Jacob, O1690725.  
 Waldman, Myron, O1638733.  
 Walker, Marvin Albert, O1646905.  
 Walker, Robert George, O1171408.  
 Wallace, James Lewis, O1554110.  
 Walter, Jesse Lawton, O1010455.  
 Waltz, Floyd Randall, Jr., O390191.  
 Warner, Jack Winfred, O432904.  
 Warrick, Fred Allen, O1304298.  
 Wary, William Daniel, O1558359.  
 Washbourne, Kenneth Worth, O1845258.  
 Watson, Charles Leslie, O2017153.  
 Watts, Eugene Augustus, O374849.  
 Webb, Harold James, O1583819.  
 Webster, Donald Curtis, O1636792.  
 Weible, Oscar Joseph, O1329139.  
 Welch, George Peters, O412848.  
 Wendt, Irving Robert, O1332215.  
 Westman, John Phillip, O1326070.  
 Weston, John Moore, Jr., O1294755.  
 Whalen, Donald Edward, O374479.  
 Whalen, Thomas Francis, O1329772.  
 Whisler, John Larkin, O2025617.  
 Whitaker, Howard Kenneth, O1844534.  
 White, John Dalrymple, O2017625.  
 Whitlock, Charles Theodore, O1552825.  
 Wietek, Donald William, O2019399.  
 Wilkin, John Marc, O1332454.  
 Wilkins, Robert Morton, O1823901.  
 Willets, Robert Taber, O1103468.  
 Williams, Charles Claude, O518771.  
 Williams, Jay Bass, O1298963.  
 Williams, Robert Harry, O531621.  
 Wilson, Albert Fielding, Jr., O1168525.  
 Wilson, Charles Edward, O2016325.  
 Willson, Daniel Schlossberg, O1559279.  
 Wilson, Raymond J., Jr., O390461.  
 Wilson, Roy Lee, O1642730.  
 Wilson, William Vickers, O444693.  
 Wiltse, Woodrow Wendell, O537540.  
 Winder, William Joseph, O404523.  
 Winkler, Robert, O1288660.  
 Winsted, Ray Hamilton, O1013715.  
 Winstead, Richard Skinner, O1646715.  
 Woods, John Owen, O1012355.  
 Woodson, Eugene Albert, O1487784.  
 Worthing, Leigh Willson, O378316.  
 Wright, Lyle Henry, O1170608.  
 Wynne, Albert Knowles, O1061289.  
 Yount, James Francis, O1304302.  
 Yunk, Richard Theodore, O1338172.  
 Zanin, John Baptist, O1307610.  
 Zell, Quentin Le Verne, O494993.  
 Zolner, Charles Leroy, O1170613.  
 Zufelt, Dick, O1340526.  
 Zurek, Charles Michael, O1174486.

#### To be first lieutenants

Ackermann, William Anthony, O2265897.  
 Alexander, Lyle King, O4044204.  
 Amaki, Satoru, O4014562.  
 Apuna, Samuel Kamakaipolani, Jr., O1692467.  
 Arnold, Henry Raeburn, O1695171.  
 Arnold, Thomas Heaton, O1875479.  
 Bailey, Richard Redfern, O1928580.  
 Bain, John Ralph, O1940556.  
 Ball, Charles Field, Jr., O1891883.  
 Barksdale, Clifford Bailey, O4026423.  
 Barnes, Robert Stephen, O1930078.  
 Bauer, Daniel Henry, O4002335.  
 Bauerband, Edward Henry, Jr., O1882965.  
 Bellis, William Harry, O1931452.  
 Blanche, John Goodman, 3d, O1880674.  
 Blank, Jay Paul, O262215.  
 Blichmann, Donald James, O1930511.  
 Boster, Philip Leroy, O4026568.  
 Bostian, Robert Eugene, O1890598.  
 Boyle, Dean Gerard, O4002158.  
 Boyle, William Patrick, O4001588.  
 Brannon, William Weldon, Jr., O1937948.  
 Brenton, James Odell, O2104679.  
 Brinton, John Robert, O4006754.  
 Brocato, Cyrus Vincent, O2265293.  
 Brodeur, Alfred Francois, O4014926.

Burchell, Troy Doyle, O4024745.  
 Burkert, Alfred, Jr., O980093.  
 Callinan, William Francis, O4020716.  
 Campbell, Harold Thomas, O4012711.  
 Cannon, Archie Samuel, Jr., O2203137.  
 Challis, Arthur James, O1881557.  
 Chapman, Allen Ray, O1927480.  
 Churchill, Ralph Thomas, O1879660.  
 Clark, Dallas Wade, O4011960.  
 Coates, Fred Andrew, O4014798.  
 Corey, John Douglas, O1935626.  
 Cosgrove, William Charles, O4023843.  
 Cramer, Eugene George, O4013117.  
 Crisp, William Headly, O4011600.  
 Curtis, Robert Linwood, O2103038.  
 Daley, Edmund Koehler, Jr., O4033018.  
 Davis, Albert John, O4001633.  
 De Sonier, Harold Leo, Jr., O1925165.  
 Delaney, Robert Francis, O4036955.  
 Depue, Robert Hemphill, Jr., O4000515.  
 Dermatis, Walter George, O2028679.  
 Detwiler, Harvey Carl, Jr., O4001052.  
 Dews, Robert William, O997543.  
 Dietderich, Wallace Raymond, O2265762.  
 Doust, Arol Raymond, O4026933.  
 Drumm, Donald Raymond, O4001393.  
 Duffy, William John, O1924907.  
 Duncan, Jack Leon, O4026445.  
 Duran, John, O1927483.  
 Dyer, Gerald D., O4016728.  
 Ellis, Mike, O4023705.  
 Faubion, James Lorn, Jr., O4024471.  
 Fellows, Robert Louis, O4009512.  
 Ferullo, Generoso James, O4009343.  
 Finley, John Lovins, O1929715.  
 Foster, Edward Harold, O1916324.  
 Foster, Robert Walker, O2030499.  
 Frechette, Joseph Paul, O999645.  
 Freeman, William Curtis, O4024126.  
 Fricke, Charles Joseph, O2003851.  
 Fuerst, Werner Francis, O4011122.  
 Furlong, George Patrick, O4010251.  
 Gardner, William Sam, O4011798.  
 Gausvik, Donald Edward, O1926923.  
 Gavin, David Charles, O4029383.  
 Gazlay, John Collins, O4000848.  
 Gebelt, Henry Ferdinand Clark, O4010153.  
 George, Manuel John, O2004848.  
 Gillespie, Vernon Walter, Jr., O4030588.  
 Glenn, Stewart William, O4013980.  
 Goode, Ralph Wiley, Jr., O4002185.  
 Goodman, Frank Bernard, O2104302.  
 Goodman, Wilbur Garland, O4012228.  
 Gorden, Charles Frederick, Jr., O2030423.  
 Greeley, John Michael, O4016827.  
 Green, Alford Wayne, O1880918.  
 Grimes, Donald Baldwin, O2268911.  
 Hallenbeck, David Roth, O4000850.  
 Halsted, Robert Edward, O4006093.  
 Halvorson, John Andrew, O2021627.  
 Hannaway, Harold Charles, O4020060.  
 Harrison, Robert Charles, O1937180.  
 Hausman, Conrad Karl, O2263762.  
 Hill, Houston Chambers, O4024835.  
 Hoagland, David Ott, O4033594.  
 Hoey, Stanislaus John, O4029384.  
 Hoey, William Rodney, O1923575.  
 Holder, John Baker, O1880907.  
 Holland, David Kenneth, O2203207.  
 Holler, John Charles, O4019940.  
 Ingram, Harvie Thomas, O1932311.  
 Ivy, James Morrow, 4th, O1916233.  
 Jarvis, Ronald Joseph, O1885923.  
 Jones, Cecil Paul, O4029192.  
 Jones, George Erwin, Jr., O4005808.  
 Jones, John Ralph, O4006345.  
 Kause, Kaye, Donald, O4031957.  
 Kelly, William Jarmleh, Jr., O1701171.  
 Knight, Emmett Floyd, O4013949.  
 Knox, Robert Rodger, Jr., O4007137.  
 Kovach, James Henry, O3042005.  
 Kurtz, John Jacob, O1873774.  
 Lackey, Marvin Edwin, O1940544.  
 Ladner, Theron Gaston, O1877780.  
 Landau, Bernard Myer, O4016995.  
 Landkammer, Theodore Edward, O4027850.  
 Lelsner, Herbert William, O1892140.  
 Leslie, George William, O4030682.  
 Leva, Neil I., O4006903.  
 Lewis, Thomas Milton, O4010015.  
 Mangold, Clarence Albert, Jr., O1939587.  
 Martin, George William, O1881347.

Matheney, Harold Dean, O2203859.  
 Maxwell, William Stephen, O1940398.  
 McCollum, Richard James Whitworth, O4019834.  
 McDuffee, David Perry, O1878550.  
 Mendenhall, Thomas Deal, O4027297.  
 Mikula, Joseph George, O4036780.  
 Miller, Harry William, 2d, O1877632.  
 Miller, Thomas Arlo, O4013102.  
 Minix, Thomas Ernest, O4011607.  
 Mino, Paul Lewis, O4033505.  
 Mix, James Edward, O4026514.  
 Morrill, Donald Prentiss, O1940766.  
 Murdoch, William Langmuir, Jr., O4009631.  
 Murphy, Clyde Lawrence, O4026868.  
 Myers, Sammy Don, O2002944.  
 Newbold, Robert Miller, O4004437.  
 Nolan, John Redner, O4012021.  
 Olsen, Edmund John, Jr., O4005024.  
 Openchowski, Kenneth Frazier Alexander, O4009718.  
 Osborn, Robert Bruce, O19931221.  
 Ottomeyer, Donald James, O1915405.  
 Page, Harold Ray, O2263014.  
 Page, Louis Vincent, O4038727.  
 Parchinski, Edward Stanley, O4037759.  
 Pascarella, Pascal William, O4019909.  
 Pfaller, Eberhard Wilhelm, O4010520.  
 Pole, Freddie Ray, O4026556.  
 Porter, Covington Baskin, Jr., O1940028.  
 Porter, Howard Carlyle, Jr., O1930831.  
 Potter, Floyd Eugene, O2208944.  
 Ralph, James Robert, Jr., O4006679.  
 Randels, Dale Kenneth, O1437580.  
 Reisling, Glenn Mickle, Jr., O4001711.  
 Rhoads, Arthur Abel, O1878948.  
 Ruiz, Ronald Robert, O4013669.  
 Schouman, Hazen C., Jr., O4010180.  
 Schult, Arthur Edmond, O1892751.  
 Schultz, Arthur Herman, O1933407.  
 Scott, Hugh Alan, O4001753.  
 Serio, Frank Elmo, O1924927.  
 Shaughnessy, Thomas James, O4016249.  
 Shinn, Charles Earl, O1887685.  
 Sinoff, Alvan Charles, O4007118.  
 Small, Eugene Fleming, O1890291.  
 Smith, Lawrence Ralph, O1886207.  
 Smith, Richard Hunter, O1932355.  
 Smith, Robert Winsor, O1876114.  
 Sorbo, William Paris, O2030495.  
 Spain, Harold Dean, O4024924.  
 Spegele, John August, O4037773.  
 Steckbauer, Curtis John, O4023861.  
 Stedman, William Richardson, O4002882.  
 Stephens, Richard Barber, O4015003.  
 Stewart, Israel Wagner, Jr., O4044409.  
 Stewart, Robert Roy, O4016737.  
 Stoll, Henry Rodney, O4038923.  
 Sullivan, William Francis, O4014684.  
 Sveiven, Desmond Dean, O2263664.  
 Swanger, Thomas Niel, O4009650.  
 Sweede, Jack Eugene, O1894202.  
 Taylor, James Richard, O2004242.  
 Thomas, John Donald, O4006475.  
 Thomason, David Arthur, O2028755.  
 Ubrig, Richard Anton, O4003100.  
 Valentine, William Lyle, O4032935.  
 Vose, Donald Marvin, O4006077.  
 Voetsch, John Alexander, 3d, O4031850.  
 Walker, Joe K., Jr., O1894005.  
 Wallsten, Richard Edmund, O4027763.  
 Wash, William Bishop, O4001290.  
 Watts, James Robert, O4038424.  
 West, Kenneth Lee, O1889191.  
 Whaley, Zachary, O4019886.  
 Whitehead, Ruby Lee, 3d, O4002255.  
 Wilde, Forrest Bunnell, O4019235.  
 Williams, Billie Gene, O4005867.  
 Williams, James Elliott, O1928563.  
 Williamson, Thomas Lloyd, O4023417.  
 Wise, Lynn Julian, O4013850.  
 Wood, Hector, O4025080.  
 Wright, Elden Harvey, O4000661.  
 Wright, William Joseph, O2266299.  
 Wyatt, Lloyd Lee, O4013293.  
 Young, Clifford Edward, O1879320.  
 Zeleznikar, Louis Joseph, O4016690.  
 Zwicker, Ralph Lathrop, O1925002.

*To be second lieutenants*  
 Adsit, Charles Carroll, O4045729.  
 Adsit, John Milley, O4057763.

Allanach, Jack Walter, O4050619.  
 Allen, Wayne Cecil, O4029533.  
 Allison, Robert Myer, O4066236.  
 Anderson, David Robert, O4028305.  
 Armstrong, Hart Reed, O4061485.  
 Arnold, Thomas William, O4029224.  
 Auth, Donald Leo, O4004306.  
 Baker, Richard Eugene, O4004886.  
 Bauer, Philip Otis, O4032474.  
 Bean, Robert Harold, O4030485.  
 Beckhoff, Otto Frederick, O4046603.  
 Bedsaul, Clare Donovan, O4010439.  
 Beers, Thomas Whitney, O4031034.  
 Bennett, Donald Gilman, O4031192.  
 Berg, Robert John, O4076655.  
 Berlioz, Francis Christy, O4064774.  
 Blank, James Nicholas, O4068916.  
 Boyd, William Albert, Jr., O4062819.  
 Bradshaw, John Edward, O4071225.  
 Brassett, Charles Alexander, Jr., O4074239.  
 Bray, Lynn Burnell, O4025570.  
 Brickman, Robert Lee, O2028549.  
 Brown, Edward Merwin, O4037788.  
 Brown, George Albert, O4030537.  
 Bruner, Robert Jewell, O4061530.  
 Bruno, Vito Joseph, O4037039.  
 Bryant, Lloyd Dean, O4057182.  
 Carey, Calvin Carleton, O4059260.  
 Cate, George Melton, O4071525.  
 Chamberlin, Michael Aloysius, O4052063.  
 Clark, Gary Lee, O4049050.  
 Cockrell, William Fred, Jr., O4063022.  
 Coe, David Hubbard, O4020015.  
 Collins, Marion Herbert, O4042974.  
 Collins, Patrick Warren, O4040894.  
 Collison, John MacLean, O4048405.  
 Cook, John Heber, O4047863.  
 Cook, Thomas Joseph, O4010403.  
 Correll, John EH, O4018028.  
 Counihan, Jeremiah Michael, O4046370.  
 Cox, William Edward, O4046407.  
 Cramblet, Thomas Ralph, O4042458.  
 Crosby, Glenwood Leighton, O1874724.  
 Crum, Luther G., Jr., O4025634.  
 Davis, Thomas Griffin, O4042965.  
 Dean, Leon Clarence, Jr., O4028992.  
 Dedrick, Warren Frederick, O4047328.  
 Deetjen, Roy Frederick, O4060691.  
 Del Camp, Adrian LeRoy, O4074257.  
 Delaney, Donald Grant, O2028485.  
 Di Cenzo, Edward Francis, O1931740.  
 Disbrow, David Carlyle, O4040847.  
 Dixon, Malcolm Ray, O1936839.  
 Doiron, Nicholas H., O4052676.  
 Donohue, John Edward, O4010492.  
 Downey, Robert Haarer, Jr., O2275972.  
 Duffie, Richard Rankin, O4071663.  
 Duncan, Dewitt David, O4071630.  
 Edmiston, Charles H., Jr., O4044807.  
 Edwards, Emmet Dee, Jr., O1935229.  
 Estabrook, Robert Taylor, O4010888.  
 Evans, Walter Clifford, O4070162.  
 Eysaman, Kenneth John, O4052198.  
 Fallon, Peter Edgerton, O4035263.  
 Fern, James Richard, O4050070.  
 Flanagan, Carl Pultz, Jr., O4069158.  
 Frye, Ray Edwin, Jr., O4059282.  
 Gannon, Martin Anthony, O4036119.  
 Gibbons, Gerald George, O4040918.  
 Gilbert, George Washington, O4042542.  
 Golde, Walter Harold, Jr., O4042922.  
 Goodyear, Clyde Edward, O4035621.  
 Gorman, Jay Richard, O4057715.  
 Gotte, Jack Edward, O4041176.  
 Gramly, Pyne Arthur, Jr., O4025563.  
 Green, George Oran, Jr., O4017786.  
 Griffith, Gerald Souley, O4044636.  
 Hall, Norman Monroe, Jr., O4017659.  
 Hancock, Don Fredric, O4042738.  
 Hangren, Richard Francis, O4030564.  
 Hanks, Willis Clark, O4028157.  
 Harnish, Albert Guilford, Jr., O4051428.  
 Hatcher, Walter Lee, O4041135.  
 Haupt, Cecil Alvin, O4025176.  
 Hayes, Franklin Dennis, O4061196.  
 Healy, Robert William, O4051836.  
 Herb, Charles Donald, O4032929.  
 Hix, Preston Duane, O4048299.  
 Hoffman, Robert Leonard, O4041253.  
 Holub, Donald James, O4032569.  
 Howard, Roger Earl, O4015909.

Howe, Robert Crozier, O4047832.  
 Huggins, Edward Bernard, O4042893.  
 Hurley, William Patrick, O4042274.  
 Husted, Frank Richard, O4053135.  
 Hyde, Jerry Leon, O4042518.  
 Janet, Stanley Andrew, O4039260.  
 Jenks, George Von, O4047663.  
 Jessen, Jon Robert, O4076396.  
 Jeter, Munford Scott, O4075414.  
 Johnson, James Harold, Jr., O4046805.  
 Johnson, Jesse Gene, O4059121.  
 Johnson, William Earle, 3d, O4058750.  
 Joiner, Carey Preston, Jr., O4075653.  
 Jones, Samuel Hugh, Jr., O4044429.  
 Keener, Eugene Franklin, O4010615.  
 Kelly, Alan Carlyle, O4033599.  
 Knoll, Bruce Frederick, O4056941.  
 Kuykendall, George Boles, Jr., O4071502.  
 Lamb, Donald Stuart, O4021070.  
 Lamey, Robert Eugene, O4034755.  
 Lathrop, Lloyd William, O4017557.  
 Laudati, Roger Carmen, O1889746.  
 Lawson, Lawrence Levern, O4025656.  
 Leger, Jean Constant, O4010507.  
 Lins-Morstadt, Juan Joaquin, O4010729.  
 Little, Warren Masters, O4074514.  
 Lodewick, Richard Ballard, O4055525.  
 Lox, Richard Edward, O4031405.  
 Ludolph, Anthony Augustine, Jr., O4025085.  
 MacDonald, Donald Loomis, O4065321.  
 MacDonald, Frank Herbert, O4026617.  
 Major, Dorrance Davenport, O4010900.  
 Marhefsky, Louis Anthony, O4038964.  
 Mark, James Caylor, O4036273.  
 Marshall, Charles McLean, O4042817.  
 Marshall, Richard Hugh, O402871.  
 Martin, Richard Carrier, O4036139.  
 Maupin, Joe Scott, O4010733.  
 Maynard, Eugene Earl, O4040209.  
 Meisel, Karl H., Jr., O4010860.  
 Mial, Robert Paul, O4010704.  
 Moorhead, Lisle William, O4035342.  
 Morse, James Whitcomb, O4025764.  
 Muck, Gilbert Paul, O4028108.  
 Mungovan, Robert Walter, O4006036.  
 Murphy, Thomas Joseph, O4036690.  
 Mushroe, Earl Edward, O4066201.  
 Nack, John Martin, O4051878.  
 Nolan, William James, Jr., O4049761.  
 Norris, James Byron, O4065979.  
 O'Bryan, William Patrick, O4053162.  
 O'Neil, Joseph Robert, Jr., O4045400.  
 Oyler, Leo Edwin, Jr., O4017681.  
 Pearlman, James Thomas, O4059493.  
 Perry, John Fincher, O4042725.  
 Pierce, Fred Washburn, Jr., O4040787.  
 Pisanelli, Ralph Anthony, O4004842.  
 Polashock, Michael Stephen, O4074421.  
 Powel, Ben F., Jr., O4044196.  
 Power, John Allen, O4044801.  
 Pruniski, Stephen Andrew, Jr., O2021498.  
 Rains, Robert Paul, O1925552.  
 Randall, Donald Autrey, O4044365.  
 Rigrish, Ernest Earl, O4036573.  
 Risteter, Vincent Andrew, O4023228.  
 Robb, Marion Glenn, O4025722.  
 Robinson, James Hill, Jr., O4051956.  
 Rosendahl, Richard Charles, O2269730.  
 Ross, Donald Howard, O4058762.  
 Ruffie, Ronald Harrison, O4037416.  
 Savard, Ronald Simpson, O4045085.  
 Savukinas, John Bernard, O4059360.  
 Schnabel, Robert Harold, O4029838.  
 Schwoppe, Edwin Gust, Jr., O4061147.  
 Secord, John Willis, O4026145.  
 Sedar, David Richard, O4040398.  
 Seguin, Raymond Joseph, O4037127.  
 Shows, Newton Wesley, Jr., O4048015.  
 Smith, Glenn Norman, O4032604.  
 Smith, Leland De, Jr., O4024503.  
 Smith, Robert Frazier, O4010529.  
 Smith, Thomas Arthur, O4030841.  
 Spilman, Charles Christopher, O4052528.  
 Stevens, Charles Thomas, O4057369.  
 Stevenson, Harry Knopf, O4034762.  
 Stricklin, Roger Brown, Jr., O4063690.  
 Swallow, Joseph Patrick, O4056934.  
 Taylor, Joseph John, Jr., O4031438.  
 Thomas, Billy Jack, O1941241.  
 Thomas, Daniel Harrison, Jr., O4044247.  
 Tindall, Asa Warner, Jr., O4042823.



Tucker, Llewellyn Bryant, Jr., O4010712.  
 Tyler, Charles Sumner, O4052755.  
 Verdin, Jimmie Wallace, O4062578.  
 Wall, Harold Robert, O4025484.  
 Wall, Kary Darrell, O4024804.  
 Walsh, Gordon Powers, O4010713.  
 White, Henry Leslie, O4050517.  
 White, William Thomas, Jr., O4063118.  
 Whiting, Jon K., O4050533.  
 Wickware, Argle Wesley, O2028358.  
 Willcox, Lester Andrew, O4048440.  
 Williamson, Robert Linn, O4041189.  
 Wilson, Richard Albert, O4025351.  
 Winnicki, Philip Walter, O4056506.  
 Witt, Harry Gene, O4058817.  
 Witt, Malcolm David, O2268583.  
 Works, Bobby, O4036313.  
 Wyatt, David Lee, O4010441.  
 Zimmerman, Fred Russell, O4029818.

The following-named officers 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, section 3294, as amended by Public Law 497, 84th Congress; title 10, United States Code, section 3291, as amended by Public Law 85-155, 85th Congress.

#### To be majors

Fitzpatrick, Jack C., MC, O63832.  
 House, Royce E., MC, O391211.

#### To be captains

Brookover, Ella L., ANC, N729025.  
 McConnell, Amy L., ANC, N792222

#### To be first lieutenant

Harrison, Richard E., MC, O5407610.

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 Public Law 737, 84th Congress:

Blumenfeld, Stan, O4085213.  
 Bratcher, Dewey F., Jr., O5302761.  
 Campbell, James F., Jr.  
 Hamilton, David L., O5202698.  
 Kosmowski, Jerome A.  
 Kvederas, Robert A., O4085310.  
 Langan, Eugene W.  
 Lowe, John C.  
 Morgan, Clarold F.  
 Pompian, Richard O.  
 Roessner, Norbert J.  
 Rogan, Robert E.  
 Sanford, Brian W.  
 Whitehead, Richard K., Jr., O5302358.

The following-named officer for appointment as professor of electrical engineering, United States Military Academy, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 4333:

Cutler, Elliott C., Jr., O24649.

### CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate January 28 (legislative day of January 27), 1958:

#### NATIONAL MEDIATION BOARD

Leverett Edwards, of Oklahoma, to be a member of the National Mediation Board for the term expiring February 1, 1961.

#### PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

The following candidates for personnel action in the Regular Corps of the Public Health Service, subject to qualifications therefor as provided by law and regulations: For appointment:

#### To be senior surgeon

George Brecher

#### To be senior sanitary engineer

Lewis A. Young

#### To be scientist

Robert R. Omata

CIV—76

#### To be assistant scientist

Clarence J. Weinmann

#### To be nurse officer

Jessie M. Scott  
 For permanent promotion:

#### To be assistant sanitary engineer

Morton D. Sinkoff  
 For confirmation of recess appointment:

#### To be senior surgeons

Bohdan G. Giel William F. Mayes

#### To be surgeons

Daniel M. Bloch Thayer M. Mackenzie  
 Maurice F. Herring, Jr. Alfred S. Nelson

#### To be senior assistant surgeons

Gordon Allen Mark H. Lane  
 Clement P. Cotter William C. Mohler  
 John L. Getz, Jr. Joseph J. Noya  
 Lloyd Guth Jacob Robbins  
 Martin D. Hicklin William L. Walter  
 William M. Jackson Harry W. Weller

#### To be assistant surgeon

John R. S. Remsburg

#### To be dental surgeon

John M. Frankel

#### To be senior assistant dental surgeon

F. D. Morse, Jr.

#### To be senior sanitary engineer

Thomas H. Seltzer

#### To be scientist

George E. Jay, Jr.

#### To be assistant pharmacists

Mark H. Barnett  
 Wesley R. Gladhart, Jr.  
 Paul J. Le Sage

#### To be sanitarian

Donald R. Johnson.

#### To be senior assistant nurse officers

Lucile G. Buderer  
 Harriett Hick  
 Virginia D. Hines

#### To be senior dietitian

Janet E. Stroupe

For confirmation of recess permanent promotion:

#### To be senior assistant dental surgeon

Christopher E. Kennemer

#### To be senior assistant veterinarian

Paul Arnstein

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, JANUARY 28, 1958

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.  
 The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Matthew 6: 33: *Seek ye first the Kingdom of God and His righteousness.*

Eternal God, our Father, earnestly and humbly, we are beseeching Thee that the hours of this day may be filled with joyous and helpful service.

Thou hast made known unto us Thy great and beneficent purpose of establishing upon the earth a kingdom whose foundation stones are the virtues and principles of righteousness and justice, of love and friendship, of peace and good will.

We rejoice that Thou dost graciously condescend to use our poor human efforts and energies in building that kingdom and in breaking down the dividing walls between the nations.

Grant that here in this council chamber the Members of the Congress may be inspired with a vision of that glorious time when the King of Kings and Lord of Lords shall reign supremely in the mind and heart of all mankind.

To Thy name we ascribe the glory and the praise. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

### MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. McGown, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 5938. An act to amend section 812 (e) (1) (D) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1939 with respect to certain decedents who were adjudged incompetent before April 2, 1948;

H. R. 7762. An act to amend section 223 of the Revenue Act of 1950 so that it will apply to taxable years ending in 1954 to which the Internal Revenue Code of 1939 applies;

H. R. 8865. An act relating to the administration of certain collected taxes; and

H. R. 9035. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the basis of stock acquired by the exercise of restricted stock options after the death of the employee.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 8216. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to prevent unjust enrichment by precluding refunds of alcohol and tobacco taxes to persons who have not borne the ultimate burden of the tax.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 2920. An act to provide for small-business disaster loans in areas affected by excessive rainfall.

The message also announced that the Vice President has appointed Mr. JOHNSON of South Carolina and Mr. CARLSON members of the joint select committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of August 5, 1939, entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of certain records of the United States Government," for the disposition of executive papers referred to in the report of the Archivist of the United States numbered 58-27.

### TAXING INCOME OF LIFE-INSURANCE COMPANIES

Mr. THORNBERRY from the Committee on Rules reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 456, Rept. 1299) which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

*Resolved*, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 10021) to provide that the 1955 formula for taxing income of life-insurance companies shall also apply to taxable years beginning in 1957. After general debate, which shall be confined