SENATE

MONDAY, MAY 8, 1961

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by the Honorable JOHN O. PASTORE, a Senator from the State of Rhode Island.

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

Eternal God, who art the center and soul of every sphere, we, Thy children, on this wandering island in the sky, a speck amid the vastness of space, look to Thee, Lord of all being, whose glory flames from sun and star.

Let us not be confounded by the empty spaces, or affrighted by world beyond world unfathomable.

As this day we join the chorus of praise for one daring explorer of unknown space, and for the thousands whose cooperation made his exploit possible, help us with our finite minds to see behind the bewildering universe in which Thou, great God, hast put us. Lift up our hearts to say, like our fathers in times past, "Before the mountains were brought forth, or ever Thou hadst formed the earth and the world, even from everlasting to everlasting, Thou art God."

In this day, as man probes for expanded knowledge of space without, make real to us the universe within, and that there lies our fortune and our destiny—for there truth may walk in shining garments and goodness grow glorious, and beauty be beautiful, indeed.

Give us to see the empty futility of any attempt to export evil to some other star, when the same evil has spoiled so much of the music of life on this terrestrial ball. Make plain to all mankind that the kingdom all good and just men seek is within, and must be regnant there before the kingdom for which we pray can cover the earth.

May an abiding sense of Thy presence and guidance rest upon the President of this body, our Nation's Vice President, as he goes on his far journey to tell nations in confusion and commotion that America's might—material, moral, and spiritual—is pledged to men of good will everywhere who unite to insure a just world peace for our children and theirs.

We ask it in the name of the Prince of Peace. Amen.

DESIGNATION OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, D.C., May 8, 1961.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. JOHN O. PASTORE, a Senator from the State of Rhode Island, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

CARL HAYDEN,
President pro tempore.

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

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. METCALF, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, May 4, 1961, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILLS

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on May 4, 1961, the President had approved and signed the act (S. 1027) to amend title I of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed a bill (H.R. 6713) to amend certain laws relating to Federal-aid highways, to make certain adjustments in the Federal-aid highway program, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

Mr. METCALF subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that House bill 6713, the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1961, this day received from the House of Representatives, be considered as having been read twice; that it be referred to the Committee on Public Works, for the consideration by that committee of title I, the Federal-aid highway program; that when reported by that committee to the Senate, it be immediately referred to the Committee on Finance, for the consideration by that committee of title II, the Internal Revenue Code and highway trust amendments; and that when reported by the latter committee, the bill be placed on the calendar.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. YOUNG of Ohio in the chair). Is there objection?

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, does the Senator from Montana request that the bill be immediately processed, without complying with the usual procedure?

Mr. METCALF. No. My request is that the bill be processed in the usual way by the two committees; that, first, the Committee on Public Works consider title I of the bill; that when the bill is reported by that committee to the Senate, it be immediately referred to the Committee on Finance, for its consideration of title II of the bill; and that when the bill is reported to the Senate by the latter committee, the bill be placed on the calendar. In other words, my request is that the bill be considered in the regular order, just as if there were two separate bills, and that thereafter the bill be placed on the calendar, to be available for consideration by the Senate.

Let me say that this request is concurred in by the chairmen of both of the committees.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Has the request the approval of the chairman of the Finance Committee?

Mr. METCALF. That is correct.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Very well.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana? Without objection, it is so ordered.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE LEGISLATIVE BUSINESS

As in legislative session, and by unanimous consent, the following routine legislative business was transacted:

ORDER DISPENSING WITH CALL OF THE CALENDAR

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the call of the calendar be dispensed with.

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

LIMITATION OF DEBATE DURING MORNING HOUR

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

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

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. METCALF, and by unanimous consent, the Subcommittee on Flood Control, Rivers, and Harbors, of the Committee on Public Works was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

PROPOSED TRANSFER OF BATTLESHIP TO STATE OF NORTH CAROLINA

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Navy (Installations and Logistics), reporting, pursuant to law, on the proposed transfer of the battleship *North Carolina* to the State of North Carolina; to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON ARMY, NAVY, AND AIR FORCE PRIME CONTRACT AWARDS TO SMALL AND OTHER BUSINESS FIRMS

A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary of Defense (Installations and Logistics), transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on Army, Navy, and Air Force prime contract awards to small and other business firms, for the month of February 1961 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

RECOMMENDATIONS OF ADVISORY COMMISSION ON INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS, RELATING TO MASS TRANSPORTATION IN METROPOLITAN AREAS

A letter from the Chairman, Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, Washington, D.C., transmitting recommendations of that Commission, relating to mass transportation in metropolitan areas (with

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Government Operations.

WAIVER OF COLLECTION OF CERTAIN ERRONEOUS PAYMENTS MADE BY THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

A letter from the Postmaster General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the waiver of collection of certain erroneous payments made by the Federal Government to certain civilian and military personnel, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

AUDIT REPORT OF THE AMERICAN SOCIETY OF INTERNATIONAL LAW

A letter from the Executive Director, the American Society of International Law, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report of the financial transaction of that society, for the period April 1, 1960, to March 31, 1961 (with an accompanying report)); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

A letter from the Acting Administrator, General Services Administration, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a list of papers and documents on the files of several departments and agencies of the Government which are not needed in the conduct of business and have no permanent value or historical interest, and requesting action looking to their disposition (with accompanying papers); to a Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore appointed Mr. JOHNSTON and Mr. CARLSON members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

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

By the ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore:

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

"ASSEMBLY JOINT RESOLUTION 30

"Joint resolution relative to the Camp Matthews Marine Corps rifle range

"Whereas the Legislature of the State of California is deeply interested in the development of a general campus of the University of California at San Diego surrounding the present site of the Scripps Institution of Oceanography; and

"Whereas the land comprising the marine training center at Camp Matthews, now held by the Federal Government, is necessary for the complete development of this new campus; and

"Whereas plans have been proposed to transfer the activities of Camp Matthews to the marine base at Camp Pendleton; and

"Whereas, under the current program for the transfer, the work and the cost are being spread over 2 fiscal years commencing with 1962; and

"Whereas it is desirable that the change be made more rapidly if possible, and that the present rifle range site at Camp Matthews be made available for development as part of the University of California campus in that area: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Assembly and the Senate of the State of California (jointly), That the Legislature of the State of California respectfully requests the President and the Congress of the United States to accelerate the program to transfer the activities of Camp Matthews to Camp Pendleton by increasing the proposed appropriation of $6.1 million to the total estimated cost of $12.5 million for the 1962 fiscal year, and to enact legislation to authorize the transfer of the rifle range site at Camp Matthews to the board of regents of the University of California; and be it further

"Resolved, That the chief clerk of the assembly is directed to transmit a copy of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States."

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

"SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 32

"Joint resolution relative to an international exposition in 1966

"Whereas, in the past, four international expositions have been held in California, two in San Diego and two in San Francisco, but none in Los Angeles; and

"Whereas no more fitting and appropriate site than the modern, dynamic Los Angeles area could be named for an exposition dedicated to the unity of the peoples of all nations and the dignity of man, and to the promotion of trade and industry in our new age of space; and

"Whereas the consummation of an international exposition in Los Angeles in 1966 will bring renown, prestige, and innumerable economic advantages to our entire State, and particularly to the Los Angeles area; and

"Whereas no greater contribution to peace and international good will could be made than to demonstrate to the world that the people of the State of California are dedicating the next 5 years to the preparation and consummation of the greatest exhibition of peaceful pursuits ever held in the history of the world: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate and Assembly of the State of California (jointly), That the Legislature of the State of California respectfully memorializes the President and the Congress of the United States to designate Los Angeles County as the site of an international exposition in 1966; and be it further

"Resolved, That this resolution shall not be construed to commit, nor to imply that a commitment may be forthcoming from, the State of California, or any agency or political subdivision thereof, for any financial support, contributions, or assistance for such international exposition; and be it further

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

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Hawaii; to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

"HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 43

"Whereas Hawaii occupies a uniquely pivotal position in United States-Pacific relations, commercially as well as culturally, because of the location, the history, the ethnic composition and the enviable high level of human relations in this 50th State; and

"Whereas the groundwork for a great educational facility for the advancement of East-West understanding in the form of the East-West Center having been laid, it is now timely and desirable to advance a parallel institution to promote closer East-West commercial and business ties in bulwarking the cause of freedom; and

"Whereas the proposal for the establishment on Sand Island, in Hawaii, by the Federal Government, of a Pacific International House and Trade Mart has been advanced by Lorrin P. Thurston, president of the Advertiser Publishing Co., Ltd., and other leaders; and

"Whereas this proposed trade center would undertake to help the businessmen of the entire Pacific area by providing facilities for complete merchandise display areas located in suitable and beautiful permanent buildings, featuring every product of the workers of the entire Pacific area; and

"Whereas to expedite the buying and selling of this merchandise in Hawaii's friendly environment, assistance in the currency, language, shipping, legal, and the many other problems would be cheerfully furnished by outstanding experts; and

"Whereas the location of a Pacific International House here in Hawaii—the bridge between the United States and the countries of the Pacific—would be of the greatest service in cutting costs and travel time of both buyers and sellers; and

"Whereas this service, if provided by the U.S. Government, would be of inestimable value in stimulating the business of the Pacific area by helping to create a greater market for its merchandise, with resulting favorable effects in the well-being of businessmen, their employees and their dependents; and

"Whereas by furnishing such universal Pacific trade stimulation, the United States would be placed in the position of being a real friend to the businessmen of the Pacific, a service which through lack of a convenient location no other Nation nor State of the United States could render in a comparable manner; and

"Whereas no such cooperation in such a scale has ever been offered before by the Nation; and

"Whereas in the last session of Congress a bill was introduced by U.S. Representative DANIEL INOUYE requesting a State Department study and a report to Congress on such a project and the feasibility of the establishment on Sand Island, and a similar bill has been introduced at this session of Congress by U.S. Senator OREN E. LONG and the concept also has the support of U.S. Senator HIRAM FONG; and

"Whereas Sand Island could be devoted to no greater service to the State of Hawaii or to the United States and the lands of the Pacific: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the house of representatives of the first State legislature, general session (the senate concurring), That this honorable legislature place itself on record as highly commending this project, as being in accord with Hawaii's responsibility of fully measuring up to the challenge of statehood, and as wholeheartedly urging the Congress of the United States to authorize the requested study in the belief that through Federal underwriting of the costs of the establishment and operation of such a Pacific International House, material goodwill, understanding and friendship could be achieved in the Pacific area and the cause of world peace thereby served; and be it further

"Resolved, That certified copies of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States, the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States, the Secretary of Commerce, the Secretary of State, U.S. Representatives Daniel Inouye, U.S. Senator Oren E. Long, U.S. Senator Hiram L. Fong, and Gov. William F. Quinn."

A resolution adopted by the board of directors of the Chamber of Commerce of Denton, Tex., favoring the construction of a postal substation in Denton; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

A resolution adopted by chapter 14, Disabled American Veterans, Department of

Texas, San Antonio, Tex., relating to the location of a new Veterans' Administration building, San Antonio; to the Committee on Public Works.

COMMUNIST THREAT IN WESTERN HEMISPHERE—CONCURRENT RESOLUTION OF SOUTH CAROLINA GENERAL ASSEMBLY

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and my colleague, the senior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON] I present a resolution of the South Carolina General Assembly memorializing Congress to take positive steps immediately to alleviate the Communist threat in the Western Hemisphere. I ask that this resolution be appropriately referred.

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

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION MEMORIALIZING THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES AND THE CONGRESS TO TAKE POSITIVE STEPS IMMEDIATELY TO ALLEVIATE THE COMMUNIST THREAT IN THE WESTERN HEMISPHERE

Whereas the general assembly, as representatives of the people of the State of South Carolina, has become genuinely alarmed over the situation now existing in Cuba which presents a clear and present threat to the security of this Nation and the Western Hemisphere; and

Whereas we view with great concern the apparent growth of communism and particularly the establishing of a communistically controlled government on the island of Cuba only 90 miles from our shores; and

Whereas the general assembly believes that no expense and no effort should be spared in militantly guarding the security of our Republic and preserving the rights and freedoms of its people; and

Whereas we believe that this Nation has too long viewed the situation with extreme apathy, which attitude, if continued, could bring us to the brink of ruin; and

Whereas the general assembly believes that the Communist dictators should be brought to understand once and for all that the United States will take whatever action necessary, no matter how great the sacrifice, to insure the security of our Nation and carry out the intent and purpose of the Monroe Doctrine: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the house of representatives (the senate concurring), That the President of the United States and the Congress are memorialized to take immediate and positive action to insure the security of our Nation at all cost and sacrifice and to eliminate the growing threat of communism in this hemisphere and in the world; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States, the President of the Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives in the Congress, to each United States Senator from South Carolina, and to each Member of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States from South Carolina.

Attest:

INEZ WATSON,
Clerk of the House.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a concurrent resolution of the General Assembly of the State of South Carolina, identical with the foregoing, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

FALLOUT SHELTER POLICY—RESOLUTION OF GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF RHODE ISLAND

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, recently the General Assembly of the State of Rhode Island and Providence Plantations adopted a resolution memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States concerning "the establishment of a prompt and affirmative policy" regarding fallout shelters.

In view of the critical nature of our times and of the desirability of being prepared for a possible nuclear attack and withstanding it, on behalf of the senior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE] and myself, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be included in the RECORD.

Mr. President, this resolution also stresses the importance of our having an adequately federally supported nationwide program of civil defense training.

I am pleased to note that my fellow Rhode Islanders have expressed concern about these most important questions.

On behalf of myself, and my colleague, the senior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], I present the resolution, and ask that it be appropriately referred.

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

S. 113

Resolution memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to the establishment of a prompt and affirmative policy encouraging and assisting the citizens of the United States in constructing fallout protection shelters in the event of a nuclear attack

Whereas the Governors' Conference meeting in San Juan, P.R., in 1959 urged responsible officials at all levels of government to take immediate steps to encourage and assist people to prepare themselves for survival from nuclear attacks, by the construction of fallout shelters; and

Whereas a special committee on civil defense of the Governors' Conference in January 1960, reported that fallout protection for all citizens is a prompt reality; and

Whereas in June of 1960 the Governors' Conference, meeting in Montana urged that protective steps be taken by and for the people of every State and asked that the Federal Government take further supporting action; and

Whereas the health, the safety and the survival of the individual citizen is a matter of paramount State and National concern: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the members of the General Assembly of the State of Rhode Island and Providence Plantations now respectfully request the President and the Congress of the United States to make prompt and effective fallout protection for all of the citizens of the United States a declared national policy and to support State, local and individual efforts by measures, among other things, providing income tax deductions for the cost of shelters up to $100 per planned shelter occupant, appropriate funds for fallout protection in all existing and future Federal buildings, making fallout protection mandatory in all construction built with Federal funds or financed by Federal loans or guarantees, and direct the promulgation of a comprehensive nationwide program of nuclear protection, warning, and training; and be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of state be and he is hereby requested to transmit duly certified copies of this resolution to the President of the United States, to the Vice President of the United States and to each of the Senators and Representatives from Rhode Island in the Congress of the United States in the earnest hope that each will use every endeavor to have favorable and prompt action taken hereon.

FIRE HAZARDS ON SOIL BANK LAND—RESOLUTION

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the fire hazard that results when soil bank land is left completely untended and not clipped is a matter of serious concern in many counties of Wisconsin. The logical solution in many of these areas is to create firebreaks, which will prevent a possible fire from spreading during the months when much of the vegetation is tinder dry.

Recently the Brown County, Wis., Board of Supervisors enacted a formal resolution asking that future soil bank contracts require the establishment of fire prevention breaks.

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

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:

To the Honorable Chairman and Members of the Brown County Board of Supervisors:

Whereas many soil bank acres, grown up into tall matured grass and other vegetative growth, present a fire hazard during the spring and fall months; and

Whereas many of the rural areas are not too well equipped with fire fighting equipment; and

Whereas human lives, many farm buildings and fire equipment are endangered by fires from grass areas immediately adjacent to these buildings; and

Whereas considerable acreage of wildlife habitat and area, tree-planted areas and forest land are endangered by these potential fire hazards on soil bank lands: Therefore be it

Resolved, That—

1. A stipulation be included in future soil bank contracts that would require the establishment of fire prevention breaks according to the following specifications:

(a) Areas shall be disked at least once between August 15 and September 15 of each year. All land that was considered cropland at the time the farm was put into the soil bank shall be protected by a disked firebreak at least 50 feet in width, this firebreak being on the outside perimeter of the land in the soil bank.

(b) A firebreak of at least 50 feet in width shall be maintained by disking around all buildings, regardless of whether these buildings are on land in the soil bank or on adjoining lands.

(c) A firebreak shall also be maintained by disking at least 50 feet in width around woodlots and woods, tree-planted areas, or wildlife developed areas.

2. The county ASC committee be requested to contact all present owners of soil bank land, and ask them to comply with the above fire prevention measures.

3. That copies of this resolution be sent to the county agricultural, stabilization, and

conservation committee, the State ASC office, all members representing this area in the State legislature, and all Wisconsin Senators and Congressmen in the U.S. Legislature.

Respectfully submitted.

CECIL J. DEPEA,
HENRY MATHEYS,
MYRON LOTT,
CLETUS VANDERPERVA,
Committee on Agriculture, Reforestation and Conservation.

RESOLUTION OF WISCONSIN DEPARTMENT OF THE VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the Mid-Winter Conference of the Wisconsin Department of the Veterans of Foreign Wars adopted a formal resolution in support of the establishment of a Wisconsin moraine park, as a national park. They expressed support for the proposed Ice Age National Park, using the Kettle Moraine State Park as a nucleus.

I ask that the resolution be printed in the RECORD and referred to the appropriate committee.

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

RESOLUTION SUPPORTING ESTABLISHMENT OF WISCONSIN MORAINE PARK

Whereas the Department of Wisconsin, Veterans of Foreign Wars, has previously gone on record in favor of legislation as well as other means, to create a national park in Wisconsin, from the meandering glacial moraines located in some 26 counties of the State, the nucleus of this area being the Kettle Moraine State Park; and

Whereas it proposed that this park shall be named, Ice Age National Park: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Veterans of Foreign Wars, Department of Wisconsin, That we again go on record to enthusiastically support this project; and that we urge our representatives in Congress, the Wisconsin Legislature, county and municipal boards, to work cooperatively toward the conclusion of this proposal.

REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

The following report of a committee was submitted:

By Mr. BARTLETT, from the Committee on Commerce, with an amendment:

S. 1183. A bill to amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, in order to provide for the reimbursement of certain vessel construction expenses (Rept. No. 204).

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

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

By Mrs. NEUBERGER (for herself, Mr. GRUENING, Mr. METCALF, and Mr. CLARK):

S. 1813. A bill to extend for 4 years the period within which the Federal Government may enter into agreements with the States for controlling the erection and maintenance of outdoor advertising signs, displays and devices adjacent to the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways, and to increase from one-half to 1 percent the incentive payment under such agreements; to the Committee on Public Works.

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

By Mr. METCALF:

S. 1814. A bill to provide for the free importation of monofilament gill nets for use in fish sampling; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. HILL (for himself and Mr. Moss):

S. 1815. A bill to provide for one additional Assistant Secretary of Labor in the Department of Labor; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. CLARK:

S. 1816. A bill for the relief of Elinor Tio Salcedo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1817. A bill to provide for the desegregation of public schools, with all deliberate speed, including nationwide first-step compliance by 1963, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

S. 1818. A bill to amend part III of the Civil Rights Act of 1957; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1819. A bill to prohibit discrimination in employment because of race, color, religion, or national origin; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

S. 1820. A bill to make the Commission on Civil Rights a permanent agency in the executive branch of the Government, to broaden the scope of the duties of the Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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

By Mr. ERVIN:

S. 1821. A bill to provide for an appropriation of a sum not to exceed $35,000 with which to make a survey of a proposed national parkway from the Blue Ridge Parkway at Tennessee Ball or Beech Gap Southwest and running into the State of Georgia; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HRUSKA:

S. 1822. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code to authorize certain communications to be intercepted in compliance with State law, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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

By Mr. MUNDT (for himself, Mr. BRIDGES, and Mr. COTTON):

S.J. Res. 80. Joint resolution to authorize the President of the United States to present a medal to Comdr. Alan B. Shepard, Jr.; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

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

By Mr. CLARK:

S.J. Res. 81. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to abolish tax and property qualifications for electors in Federal elections; and

S.J. Res. 82. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to abolish literacy test qualifications for electors in Federal elections; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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

By Mr. HOLLAND (for himself and Mr. SMATHERS):

S.J. Res. 83. Joint resolution authorizing the manufacture and presentation of a galvano in commemoration of the golden anniversary of naval aviation; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

RESOLUTION

COMMENDATION OF COMDR. ALAN B. SHEPARD FOR HIS SUCCESSFUL SPACE FLIGHT

Mr. MANSFIELD (for himself, Mr. DIRKSEN, Mr. KUCHEL, and Mr. HUMPHREY) submitted a resolution (S. Res. 140) highly commending Comdr. Alan B. Shepard for his successful space flight, which was considered and agreed to.

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

EXTENSION OF HIGHWAY BILLBOARD REGULATION

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, one of the objectives of the 41,000-mile Federal Interstate Highway System program is to bring into existence a nationwide road network built essentially to uniform standards. However, unless action is taken by this Congress to extend the billboard control features of the Federal Highway Act, the sought-after uniformity will not be possible.

The Federal-Aid Highway Act, under provisions adopted in 1958, specifies July 1, 1961, as the date by which the several States and the Secretary of Commerce must conclude agreements so the States can qualify for the one-half percent bonus for fulfilling the national policy for billboard control. According to information I have received from the Bureau of Public Roads, only the State of Maryland has fully qualified thus far for the bonus. Eight other States have passed laws which may qualify them for participation. These States are Connecticut, Kentucky, New York, North Dakota, West Virginia, Wisconsin, Washington, and Virginia.

Bills dealing with billboard control have been before legislatures in Delaware, Hawaii, Illinois, Maine, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, New Hampshire, New Jersey, Ohio, Oklahoma, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, Texas, and Vermont. These and other States may act on the matter prior to the deadline date; but it now appears that 23 States or more will not have acted by that time.

President Kennedy has urged that the billboard control section be extended for 4 more years, and the amount of the incentive bonus increased to 1 percent. A portion of the President's message of February 28, 1961, on the Federal pay-as-you-go highway program reads as follows:

> The Interstate Highway System was intended, among other purposes, to enable more Americans to more easily see more of their country. It is a beautiful country. The system was not intended to provide a large and unreimbursed measure of benefits to the billboard industry, whose structures tend to detract from both the beauty and the safety of the routes they line. Their messages are not, as so often claimed, primarily for the convenience of the motorist whose view they block. Some two-thirds of such advertising is for national products, and is dominated by a handful of large advertisers to whom the Interstate System has provided a great windfall.

The Congress took a wise though very modest step in 1958 by authorizing, through section 122 of the 1958 act, the control of outdoor advertising within designated limits of the routes of the Interstate System. States electing to comply with the Federal standards promulgated under the section were to receive an incentive payment of an extra one-half of 1 percent of the cost of interstate highway projects within the State.

Unfortunately that provision expires on June 30 of this year, and a variety of pressures has prevented all but one State (Maryland) from taking advantage of this provision. I urge the Congress to extend this billboard control section for 4 more years; and to increase the incentive bonus from one-half of 1 percent of a State's allotment. Should this measure still prove to be insufficient, it may be necessary to adopt more direct means of control, or to at least charge the billboard owners for the benefits they are receiving.

Extension of the billboard control provision is necessary, lest the highway system created by expenditure of $41 billion of public funds end up as a hodgepodge, with billboard jungles intermingled with scenic roadways. The States must be given every reasonable opportunity to enact legislation needed to qualify under the Federal standards for signboard regulation.

To carry out the President's program, I introduce, for myself, the junior Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], the junior Senator from Montana [Mr. METCALF], and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], a bill to extend for 4 years the period within which the Federal Government may enter into agreements with the States for controlling the erection and maintenance of outdoor advertising signs, displays, and devices adjacent to the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways, and to increase from one-half to 1 percent the incentive payment under such agreements.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. YOUNG of Ohio in the chair). The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1813) to extend for 4 years the period within which the Federal Government may enter into agreements with the States for controling the erection and maintenance of outdoor advertising signs, displays, and devices adjacent to the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways, and to increase from one-half to 1 percent the incentive payments under such agreements, introduced by Mrs. NEUBERGER (for herself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Works.

CIVIL RIGHTS

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, last September then Senator, now President, Kennedy asked Representatives EMANUEL CELLER and me to prepare civil rights bills embodying the civil rights commitments of the 1960 Democratic platform.

This we have done.

Mr. President, today I introduce, for appropriate reference, six proposals designed to implement the pledges contained in the civil rights plank of the Democratic platform.

The measures include the following:

First. A constitutional amendment to eliminate payment of poll taxes as a requirement of voting in Federal elections, which I ask to have referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Second. A constitutional amendment to eliminate literacy tests as a requirement for voting, which I ask to have referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Third. A bill to require every school board operating a racially segregated public school to adopt a desegregation plan within 6 months of the date of enactment of the bill and to file the plan with the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. The plan would state how the board intended to achieve desegregation with all deliberate speed in each of its schools and include a schedule showing the time and the manner in which desegregation would be achieved in each class and school. To meet the requirements of the act, the plan would have to provide for first-step compliance not later than the commencement of the 1963–64 school year. Technical and financial assistance would be given under the bill to desegregating school districts, and court enforcement would be authorized in the cases of school boards which violated the duties set forth in the act.

I ask to have this bill referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

Fourth. A bill to authorize the Attorney General to initiate civil injunction suits in the Federal courts to prevent the denial of any civil right on grounds of race, creed, or color, which I ask to have referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Fifth. A fair employment practice bill to provide administrative and court remedies for those persons discriminated against as a result of race or color. The bill would make it an unfair employment practice for any business or labor union employing more than 50 persons to discriminate in its hiring, promoting, or firing practices on the basis of race, color, religion, or national origin, which I ask to have referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

Sixth. A bill to make the Civil Rights Commission, which is due to expire on September 9, 1961, a permanent Federal agency with strengthened fact-finding powers and a new directive to act as a national clearinghouse for civil rights information, which I ask to have referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

We have received invaluable assistance in the drafting of these proposals from civil rights experts who testified before our committee last fall and constitutional law experts in the Department of Justice and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

One of the Nation's primary goals in the sixties must be to assure to each American his full constitutional rights and to make equal opportunity a living reality. The achievement of this goal requires both executive and legislative action. President Kennedy has already taken a number of far-reaching steps to promote civil rights, particularly in the field of equal job opportunity in Government employment and in Government contract work.

Mr. President, on Saturday the Attorney General made a stirring address on civil rights in Georgia. I ask unanimous consent that the text of the address may be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

TEXT OF ROBERT KENNEDY'S ADDRESS IN GEORGIA ON CIVIL RIGHTS

For the first time since becoming Attorney General, over 3 months ago, I am making a formal speech, and I am proud that it is in Georgia.

Two months ago, I had the very great honor to present to the President Donald Eugene McGregor of Brunswick, Ga. Donald McGregor came to Washington to receive the Young American Medal for bravery. In 12 bad hours, he led a family of four to safety from a yacht which broke up in high seas off the Georgia coast.

He impressed all of us who met him with his quiet courage. And, as the President said, Donald McGregor is a fine young American—one of a long line of Georgians who have, by their courage, set an outstanding example for their fellow Americans.

They have told me that when you speak in Georgia, you should try to tie yourself to Georgia and the South, and even better, claim some Georgia kinfolk. There are a lot of Kennedys in Georgia. But as far as I can tell, I have no relatives here and no direct ties to Georgia, except one. This State gave my brother the biggest percentage majority of any State in the Union and in this last election that was even better than kinfolk.

PRESIDENT QUOTED

We meet at this great university, in this old State, the fourth of the Original Thirteen, to observe Law Day.

In his proclamation urging us to observe this day, the President emphasized two thoughts. He pointed out that to remain free the people must "cherish their freedoms, understand the responsibilities they entail, and nurture the will to preserve them." He then went on to point out that law is the strongest link between man and freedom.

I wonder in how many countries of the world people think of law as the link between man and freedom. We know that in many, law is the instrument of tyranny, and people think of law as little more than the will of the state, or the party, not of the people.

And we know too that throughout the long history of mankind, man has had to struggle to create a system of law and of government in which fundamental freedoms would be linked with the enforcement of justice. We know that we cannot live together without rules which tell us what is right and what is wrong. What is permitted and what is prohibited. We know that it is law which enables men to live together, that creates order out of chaos. We know that law is the glue that holds civilization together.

And, we know that if one man's rights are denied, the rights of all are endangered. In our country the courts have a most important role in safeguarding these rights. The decisions of the courts, however much we might disagree with them, in the final analysis must be followed and respected. If we disagree with a court decision and, thereafter, irresponsibly assail the court and defy its rulings, we challenge the foundations of our society.

STATE COURT'S VIEW

The Supreme Court of Georgia set forth this proposition quite clearly in 1949 in the case of *Crumb* v. *The State* (205 Ga. 547–552). The court, referring to U.S. Supreme Court decisions, said there and I quote:

"And whatever may be the individual opinion of the members of this court as to the correctness, soundness, and wisdom of these decisions, it becomes our duty to yield thereto just as the other courts of this State must accept and be controlled by the decisions and mandates of this court. This being a government of law and not by men, the jury commissioners in their official conduct are bound by the foregoing ruling of the Supreme Court of the United States, notwithstanding any personal opinion, hereditary instinct, natural impulse or geographical tradition to the contrary."

Respect for the law—in essence that is the meaning of Law Day—and every day must be Law Day or else our society will collapse.

The challenge which international communism hurls against the rule of law is very great. For the past 2 weeks I have been engaged for a good part of my time in working with General Taylor, Admiral Burke, and Mr. Dulles to assess the recent events in Cuba and determine what lessons we can learn for the future.

It already has become crystal clear in our study, as the President has stated so graphically, we must reexamine and reorient our forces of every kind—not just for our military forces, but all our techniques and outlook here in the United States.

We must come forward with the answer of how a nation, devoted to freedom and individual rights and respect for the law, can stand effectively against an implacable enemy who plays by different rules and knows only the law of the jungle. With the answer to this rests our future—our destiny—as a nation and as a people.

The events of the last few weeks have demonstrated that the time has long since passed when the people of the United States can be apathetic about their belief and respect for the law and about the necessity of placing our own house in order. As we turn to meet our enemy, to look him full in the face, we cannot afford feet of clay or an arm of glass.

Let me speak to you about three major areas of difficulty within the purview of my responsibilities that sap our national strength, that weaken our people, that require our immediate attention.

In too many major communities of our country, organized crime has become big business. It knows no State lines. It drains off millions of dollars of our national wealth, infecting legitimate businesses, labor unions, and even sports. Tolerating organized crime promotes the cheap philosophy that everything is a racket. It promotes cynicism among adults. It contributes to the confusion of the young and to the increase of juvenile delinquency.

It is not the gangster himself who is of concern. It is what he is doing to our cities, our communities, our moral fiber. Ninety percent of the major racketeers would be out of business by the end of this year if the ordinary citizen, the businessman, the union official and the public authority stood up to be counted and refused to be corrupted.

This is a problem for all America, not just the FBI or the Department of Justice. Unless the basic attitude changes here in this country, the rackets will prosper and grow. Of this I am convinced.

The racketeers, after all, are professional criminals. But, there are the amateurs—men who have law-abiding backgrounds and respectable positions, who, nevertheless, break the law of the land. We have been particularly concerned lately in the Department of Justice about the spread of illegal price fixing. I would say to you, however, it is merely symptomatic of many other practices commonly accepted in business life.

Our investigations show that in an alarming number of areas the country, businessmen have conspired in secret to fix prices, made collusive deals with union officials, defrauded their customers and even in some instances cheated their own government.

Our enemies assert that capitalism enslaves the worker and will destroy itself. It is our national faith that the system of competitive enterprise offers the best hope for individual freedom, social development, and economic growth.

Thus, every businessman who cheats on his taxes, fixes prices or underpays his labor, every union official who makes a collusive deal, misuses union funds, damages the free enterprise system in the eyes of the world and does a disservice to the millions of honest Americans in all walks of life.

Where we have evidence of violation of laws by these "respectables," we will take action against the individuals involved, as well as against their companies. But in the end, this also is not a situation which can be cured by the Department of Justice. It can be cured only by the businesses and unions themselves.

The third area is the one that affects us all the most directly—civil rights.

The hardest problems of all in law enforcement are those involving a conflict of law and local customs. History has recorded many occasions when the moral sense of a nation produced judicial decisions, such as the 1954 decision in *Brown* v. *Board of Education*, which required difficult local adjustments.

I have many friends in the U.S. Senate who are southerners. Many of these friendships stem from my work as counsel for the Senate Rackets Committee, headed by Senator JOHN MCCLELLAN, of Arkansas, for whom I have the greatest admiration and affection.

If these southern friends of mine are representative southerners—and I believe they are—I do not pretend that they believe with me on everything or that I agree with them on everything. But, knowing them as I do, I am convinced of this:

POLICIES OUTLINED

Southerners have a special respect for candor and plain talk. They don't like hypocrisy. So, in discussing this third major problem, I must tell you candidly what our policies are going to be in the field of civil rights and why I come to you in that spirit.

First let me say this: The time has long since arrived when loyal Americans must measure the impact of their actions beyond the limits of their own towns or States. For instance, we must be quite aware of the fact that 50 percent of the countries in the United Nations are not white; that around the world, in Africa, South America, and Asia, people whose skins are a different color than ours are on the move to gain their measure of freedom and liberty.

From the Congo to Cuba, from South Vietnam to Algiers, in India, Brazil, and Iran, men and women and children are straightening their backs and listening—to the evil promises of Communist tyranny and the honorable promises of Anglo-American liberty. And those people will decide not only their own future but ours—how the cause of freedom fares in the world.

In the United Nations we are striving to establish a rule of law instead of a rule of force. In that forum and elsewhere around the world our deeds will speak for us.

In the worldwide struggle, the graduation at this university of Charlayne Hunter and Hamilton Holmes will without question aid and assist the fight against Communist political infiltration and guerrilla warfare.

When parents send their children to school this fall in Atlanta, peaceably and in accordance with the rule of law, barefoot Burmese and Congolese will see before their eyes Americans living by the rule of law.

CONFLICT UNDERSTANDABLE

The conflict of views over the original decision in 1954 and our recent move in Prince Edward County, Va., is understandable. The decision in 1954 required action of the most difficult, delicate, and complex nature, going to the very heart of southern institutions.

I know a little of this. I live in Virginia. I studied law at the University of Virginia. I have been privileged to know many able southern soldiers, scholars, lawyers, jurists, journalists, and political leaders who have enriched our national life. From them I have drawn some understanding of the South, but my knowledge is nothing to yours.

It is now being said, however, that the Department of Justice is attempting to close all public schools in Virginia because of the Prince Edward situation. This is simply not true, nor is the Prince Edward suit a threat against local control.

We are maintaining the orders of the courts. We are doing nothing more and nothing less. And if any one of you were in my position you would do likewise, for it would be required by your oath of office. You might not want to do it, you might not like to do it, but you would do it, because it would be required.

For I cannot believe that anyone can support a principle which prevents more than a thousand of our children in one county from attending public school—especially when this step was taken to circumvent the orders of the Court.

Our position is quite clear. We are upholding the law. Our action does not threaten local control. The Federal Government would not be running the schools in Prince Edward County any more than it is running the University of Georgia or the schools in my State of Massachusetts.

In this case, in all cases, I say to you today that if the orders of the Court are circumvented, the Department of Justice will act.

We will not stand by and be aloof. We will move.

Here on this campus, not half a year ago, you endured a difficult ordeal. And when your moment of truth came, the voices crying "force" were overridden by the voices pleading for reason.

GEORGIANS SALUTED

And for this, I pay my respects to your Governor, your legislature and most particularly to you, the students and faculty of the University of Georgia. And I say that you are the wave of the future—not those who cry panic. For the country's future you will and must prevail.

I happen to believe that the 1954 decision was right. But, my belief does not matter—it is now the law. Some of you may believe the decision was wrong. That does not matter. It is the law. And we both respect the law. By facing this problem honorably, you have shown to all the world that we Americans are moving forward together—solving this problem—under the rule of law.

An integral part of all this is that we make a total effort to guarantee the ballot to every American of voting age—in the North as well as in the South. The right to vote is the easiest of all rights to grant. The spirit of our democracy, the letter of our Constitution and our laws require that there be no further delay in the achievement of full freedom to vote for all. Our system depends upon the fullest participation of all its citizens.

The problem between the white and colored people is a problem for all sections of the United States. And, as I have said before, I believe there has been a great deal of hypocrisy in dealing with it. In fact, I found when I came to the Depart-

ment of Justice that I need look no further to find evidence of this.

I found that very few Negroes were employed above a custodial level. There were 950 lawyers working in the Department of Justice in Washington and only 10 of them were Negroes. At the same moment the lawyers of the Department of Justice were bringing legal action to end discrimination, the same discrimination was being practiced within the Department itself.

At a recent review for the visiting leader of a new African state, there was only one Negro in the guard of honor. At the Bureau of the Budget, Negroes were used only for custodial work.

The Federal Government is taking steps to correct this.

Financial leaders from the East who deplore discrimination in the South belong to institutions where no Negroes or Jews are allowed and their children attend private schools where no Negro students are enrolled. Union officials criticize southern leaders and yet practice discrimination within their unions. Government officials belong to private clubs in Washington where Negroes, including Ambassadors, are not welcomed even at mealtime.

My firm belief is that if we are to make progress in this area, if we are to be truly great as a nation, then we must make sure that nobody is denied an opportunity because of race, creed or color. We pledge, by example, to take action in our own backyard—the Department of Justice—we pledge to move to protect the integrity of the courts in the administration of justice. In all this, we ask your help—we need your assistance.

I come to you today and I shall come to you in the years ahead to advocate reason and the rule of law.

It is in this spirit that since taking office I have conferred many times with responsible public officials and civic leaders in the South and continue to do so. I don't expect them always to agree with my view of what the law requires, but I believe they share my respect for the law. We are trying to achieve amicable, voluntary solutions without going to court. These discussions have ranged from voting and school cases to incidents of arrest which might lead to violence.

We have sought to be helpful to avert violence and to get voluntary compliance. When our investigations indicate there has been a violation of law, we have asked responsible officials to take steps themselves to correct the situation. In some instances this has happened. When it has not, we have had to take legal action.

The conversations have been devoid of bitterness or hate. They have been carried on with mutual respect, understanding, and good will. National unity is essential and before taking any legal action, we will where appropriate invite the southern leaders to make their views known in these cases.

We, the American people, must avoid another Little Rock or another New Orleans. We cannot afford them. It is not only that such incidents do incalculable harm to the children involved and to the relations among people. It is not only that such convulsions seriously undermine respect for law and order and cause serious economic and moral damage. Such incidents hurt our country in the eyes of the world. We just can't afford another Little Rock or another New Orleans.

For on this generation of Americans falls the full burden of proving to the world that we really mean it when we say all men are created free and are equal before the law. All of us might wish at times that we lived in a more tranquil world, but we don't. And if our times are difficult and perplexing, so are they challenging and filled with opportunity.

To the South, perhaps more than any other section of the country, has been given the opportunity and the challenge and the responsibility of demonstrating America at its greatest—at its full potential of liberty under law.

WILL ENFORCE STATUTES

You may ask: Will we enforce the civil rights statutes?

The answer is: Yes, we will.

We also will enforce the antitrust laws, the antiracketeering laws, the laws against kidnaping, and robbing Federal banks, and transporting stolen automobiles across State lines, the illicit traffic in narcotics, and all the rest.

We can and will do no less.

I hold a constitutional office of the U.S. Government, and I shall perform the duty I have sworn to undertake—to enforce the law, in every field of law and every region.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, regardless of present legislative priorities, the time will come in the not too distant future when the Congress will enact these civil rights measures. In the meantime, we shall do our utmost to push for prompt hearings and favorable reports to both Houses on the bills I have introduced today.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the texts of the measures I am introducing today may be printed in the RECORD, together with brief statements summarizing them.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolutions and bills will be received and will be referred as suggested by the Senator from Pennsylvania; and, without objection, the bills and statements will be printed in the RECORD.

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

To the Committee on the Judiciary:

S.J. Res. 81. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to abolish tax and property qualifications for electors in Federal elections.

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two-thirds of each House concurring therein), That the following article is hereby proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, and the said article shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution if ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within seven years from the date of its submission by the Congress:

"ARTICLE—

"SECTION 1. The right of citizens of the United States to vote in any primary or other election for President or Vice President, for electors for President or Vice President, or for Senator or Representative in Congress, shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or any State by reason of failure to pay any poll tax or other tax or to meet any property qualifications.

"SEC. 2. Nothing in this article shall be construed to invalidate any provision of law denying the right to vote to paupers or persons supported at public expense or by charitable institutions.

"SEC. 3. The Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation."

S. J. Res. 82. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to abolish literacy test qualifications for electors in Federal elections.

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two-thirds of each House concurring therein), That the following article is hereby proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, and the said article shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution if ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within seven years from the date of its submission by the Congress:

"ARTICLE —

"SECTION 1. The right of citizens of the United States to vote in any primary or other election for President or Vice President, for electors for President or Vice President, or for Senator or Representative in Congress, shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State by reason of failure to pass any literacy test.

"SEC. 2. The Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation."

The summary accompanying Senate Joint Resolutions 81 and 82 is as follows:

SUMMARY OF CLARK-CELLER CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENTS TO ELIMINATE LITERACY TESTS AND THE PAYMENT OF POLL TAXES AS REQUIREMENTS FOR VOTING

The first two pledges in the civil rights plank of the 1960 Democratic Party platform promise the removal of literacy tests and poll tax payments as requirements for voting:

"We will support whatever action is necessary to eliminate literacy tests and the payment of poll taxes as requirements for voting."

Two constitutional amendments proposed by Senator CLARK and Congressman CELLER would carry out these pledges.

The first would prohibit the denial or abridgment by the United States or any State of the right of citizens of the United States to vote in any Federal election "by reason of failure to pass any literacy test." Nineteen States now require that voters demonstrate their literacy according to data compiled by the Civil Rights Commission in its 1959 report, in which Chairman Hannah and Commissioners Hesburgh and Johnson joined in recommending the elimination of literacy test passage as a requirement for voting in Federal elections by enactment of a constitutional amendment. In the report the Commissioners stated:

"In its investigations, hearings and studies the Commission has seen that complex voter-qualification laws, including tests of literacy, education, and interpretation, have been used and may readily be used arbitrarily to deny the right to vote to citizens of the United States."

The second Clark-Celler amendment would forbid the denial or abridgment of the right to vote in Federal elections "by reason of failure to pay any poll tax or other tax or to meet any property qualification." The amendment, which would make unconstitutional the poll tax laws now in force in five States, is identical in form to the amendment which passed the Senate by a vote of 72 to 16 on February 2, 1960.

To the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

S. 1817. A bill to provide for the desegregation of public schools, with all deliberate speed, including nationwide first-step compliance by 1963, and for other purposes.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Public School Desegregation Act".

TITLE I—DEFINITIONS

SEC. 101. As used in this Act—

(a) "Desegregation" means the assignment of all students to public schools irrespective of their race or color. No assignment system in which race or color is a factor in the initial assignment of students to particular

public schools shall be deemed to have achieved desegregation even though placement or other tests or transfers or other options may be available to change such assignment.

(b) "Public school" means any elementary or secondary educational institution operated by a State, subdivision of a State or governmental agency within a State, or operated principally or substantially from or through the use of governmental funds, or funds derived from a governmental source.

(c) "School board" means any agency or agencies, the members, agents and employees thereof, and any other person or persons, authorized to determine, control, or direct the institutions, structures or places at which particular students are assigned to or attend public school.

(d) First-step compliance means the affording of desegregated education to a substantial number of students at each public school within the jurisdiction of the school board, not later than the commencement of the 1963–64 school year.

TITLE II—DUTY TO ADOPT AND IMPLEMENT DESEGREGATION PLANS

SEC. 201. Every school board which, on the date of the enactment of this Act, has failed to achieve desegregation in all public schools within its jurisdiction, shall adopt a desegregation plan as provided in section 202 and shall file said plan, within 180 days of the date of enactment of this Act with the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

SEC. 202. Every desegregation plan required under section 201 shall:

(1) provide for achieving desegregation in all public schools within the jurisdiction of the school board with all deliberate speed, pursuant to a schedule setting forth the time when and the manner in which desegregation is to be achieved for each class, grade, school and district within the jurisdiction of the school board involved; and

(2) provide for at least first-step compliance not later than the commencement of the 1963–64 school year.

SEC. 203. Every school board required to adopt a desegregation plan pursuant to section 201 shall forthwith implement the same in accordance with its terms immediately upon its adoption and thereafter continue its implementation in good faith and with all deliberate speed until desegregation is fully achieved in all public schools within its jurisdiction.

SEC. 204. Whenever any school board subject to the requirements of this title loses or relinquishes any of its authority over public schools formerly within its jurisdiction or its authority to assign students to schools within its jurisdiction, the duties prescribed in this Act shall immediately devolve upon the person or persons to whom such authority has been transferred or relinquished.

SEC. 205. Wherever, because of overlapping or complementary jurisdiction, more than one school board is subject to the requirements of this title with respect to the same schools or students, the boards concerned shall exercise their obligations hereunder jointly.

SEC. 206. The requirements of this title shall not apply to any public school which, on the date of enactment of this Act, is subject to a court order providing for or approving a desegregation plan for the said school.

TITLE III—TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE BY SECRETARY OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE TO FACILITATE DESEGREGATION

SEC. 301. The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare shall upon application render technical assistance to school boards by such means as he deems appropriate in the preparation, adoption and implementation of desegregation plans required by this title. Technical assistance may include, but shall not be limited to, such matters as the assembling, publishing and distributing of information, including successful case histories of desegregation, the planning, calling and holding of conferences, the appointment of advisory councils and the assisting by such other means as the Secretary deems appropriate of progress toward desegregation in the public schools of the Nation.

TITLE IV—FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE BY SECRETARY OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE TO FACILITATE DESEGREGATION

SEC. 401. Every plan submitted to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare pursuant to section 201 of this Act shall be reviewed by the Secretary to determine whether it conforms with the requirements of this Act. Whenever the Secretary determines that a desegregation plan submitted to him meets the requirements of this Act, he is authorized for the purpose of facilitating the carrying out of any such desegregation plan and upon receipt of application therefor to make grants to school boards, States, municipalities, school districts and other governmental units to assist in meeting costs he determines to be reasonably necessary for the implementation of such desegregation plan. Grants may be made under this section for:

(1) the cost of employing additional schoolteachers.

(2) the cost of giving to teachers and other school personnel inservice training in dealing with problems incident to desegregation;

(3) the cost of employing specialists in problems incident to desegregation and of providing other assistance to develop understanding by parents, schoolchildren, and the general public of desegregation in order to reduce the possibility of community hostility or resistance to such desegregation;

(4) the cost of replacement of funds to schools or schoolteachers withheld because such schools or schoolteachers have undertaken or may undertake desegregation;

(5) the cost of construction, enlargement, or alteration of school facilities when the Secretary finds that lack or inadequacy of existing facilities makes the carrying out of a desegregation plan impracticable or materially more difficult; and

(6) other costs directly related to the process of eliminating segregation in public schools.

SEC. 402. The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare is further authorized for the purpose of facilitating the carrying out of desegregation in accordance with any court-approved desegregation plan not subject to the requirements of title II of this Act, to make grants to school boards, States, municipalities, school districts and other governmental units to assist in meeting costs he determines to be reasonably necessary for the implementation of such desegregation plan in the same manner and for the same purposes as provided for in the foregoing section of this title.

SEC. 403. Each application made for a grant under this title shall provide such detailed breakdown of the measures for which financial assistance is sought as the Secretary may by regulations prescribe. Each grant under this section shall be made in such amounts and on such terms and conditions as the Secretary shall prescribe, which may include a condition that the applicant expend certain of its own funds in specified amounts for the purpose for which the grant is made. In determining whether to make a grant, and in fixing the amount thereof and the terms and conditions on which it will be made, the Secretary shall take into consideration the amount available for grants under this section and the other applications which are pending before him; the financial condition of the applicant and the other resources available to it; the nature, extent, and gravity of its problems incident to desegregation; and such other factors as he finds relevant.

SEC. 404. Payments of grants under this title may be made in advance or by way of reimbursement, and at such intervals as the Secretary may determine.

SEC. 405. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year in process at the date of enactment of this Act and for each succeeding fiscal year, such sums, not exceeding $40 million for any fiscal year, as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this title.

TITLE V—ENFORCEMENT OF DUTY TO ADOPT AND IMPLEMENT DESEGREGATION PLANS

SEC. 501. In the event that a school board, or its successor as provided in section 204, subject to the requirements of title II of this Act has violated any of the obligations prescribed therein, the Attorney General is authorized to institute for in the name of the United States in the United States district court for the district weherein such school board or its successor is located or meets, a civil action or other proceeding for preventive relief including an application for an injunction or other order, against such school board or its successor. The court wherein such action is instituted is authorized, upon finding that there has been a violation of title II of this Act, without limitation upon the grant of such other relief as may be appropriate under the circumstances, to require the school board or its successor (1) to adopt and implement a plan of school desegration pursuant to the requirements of title II of this Act, (2) to implement any other school desegregation plan which the court may find appropriate and consistent with the requirements of this Act, or (3) to issue such other orders and grant such other relief as will most expeditiously achieve first-step compliance and desegregation with all deliberate speed in the public schools under the jurisdiction of the school board or its successor.

SEC. 502. The district courts of the United States shall have jurisdiction over proceedings instituted under section 501 of this Act, and shall exercise the same without regard to whether any administrative or other remedies that may be provided by law shall have been exhausted, and in a manner calculated to achieve desegregation in accordance with the requirements of this Act.

TITLE VI—MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

SEC. 601. Nothing in this Act shall be construed to impair any right guaranteed by the Constitution or laws of the United States or any remedies already existing for their protection or enforcement, nor to prevent any individual or private organization from acting to enforce or safeguard any constitutional right in any manner now or hereafter permitted by law.

SEC. 602. If any provision of this Act or the application of such provision to any person or circumstance is held invalid, the remainder of this Act or the application of such provision to persons or circumstances other than those to which it is held invalid, shall not be affected thereby.

The statement accompanying Senate bill 1817 is as follows:

SUMMARY OF CLARK-CELLER SCHOOL DESEGREGATION BILL

The 1960 Democratic Party platform promises legislative action to promote compliance with the constitutional requirement that racial discrimination be ended in public education in these words:

"We believe that every school district affected by the Supreme Court's school desegregation decision should submit a plan providing for at least first-step compliance by 1963, the 100th anniversary of the Emancipation Proclamation.

"To facilitate compliance, technical and financial assistance should be given to school districts facing special problems of transition."

The Clark-Celler bill seeks to fulfill the cited provisions of the platform by placing a duty on each school board which has failed to achieve desegregation for all students in the schools within its jurisdiction, to adopt a desegregation plan and file it with the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare within 180 days of the date of enactment. To meet the requirements of the proposed law the plan would have to set forth a schedule showing the time and manner in which desegregation with all deliberate speed would be achieved for each class, grade, school and district within the jurisdiction of the Board, and provide for at least first-step compliance not later than the commencement of the 1963–64 school year. Technical and financial assistance would be provided for desegregating school districts. The Attorney General would be authorized to bring a civil action or other proceeding for preventive relief against a school board failing to adopt or implement a desegregation plan as required in the proposed law.

SECTION-BY-SECTION ANALYSIS OF CLARK-CELLER BILL, ENTITLED "PUBLIC SCHOOL DESEGREGATION ACT"

TITLE I—DEFINITIONS

Section 101(a): "Desegregation" is achieved only when race or color is completely eliminated as a factor in assigning students to public schools.

(b) "Public school" is defined to include any elementary or secondary school operated principally or substantially from or through the use of governmental funds, or funds derived from a governmental source.

(c) "School board" includes any agency or person that controls or directs the assignment of pupils to public schools.

(d) "First-step compliance" means the affording of desegregated education to a substantial number of students at each public school within the jurisdiction of the school board, not later than the commencement of the 1963–64 school year.

TITLE II—DUTY TO ADOPT AND IMPLEMENT DESEGREGATION PLANS

Section 201 requires every school board which, on the date of enactment of this act, has failed to achieve desegregation in all public schools within its jurisdiction to adopt a desegregation plan and file it within 180 days after enactment of this act with the Secretary of Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Section 202: Such a desegregation plan must provide for two things:

1. A program of ultimate desegregation to be attained with all deliberate speed, pursuant to a schedule setting forth the time when and the manner in which desegregation is to be achieved for each class, grade, school and district within the jurisdiction of the school board, and

2. A program for "first-step compliance" not later than the commencement of the 1963–64 school year.

Section 203 requires every school board adopting a desegregation plan pursuant to this act to implement it in good faith and with all deliberate speed until desegregation is fully achieved in its district.

Section 204 provides that the duties required of a school board under this act shall devolve immediately upon any successor should the school board's authority be relinquished. This is aimed at obviating slowdowns resulting from the resignation of school boards or from the elimination of such boards. It means that any public body, local or State, that assumes control over local schools, can be made subject to the provisions of this bill.

Section 205 provides for the joint exercise of obligations under the bill by school boards, the jurisdiction of which might overlap. Prevents a situation arising where nothing would be done under this bill because neither of two school boards would desire to exercise its jurisdiction.

Section 206 provides that this bill shall not apply to any public school which on the date of enactment of this bill, is subject to a court order providing for or approving a desegregation plan for said school.

TITLE III—TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE BY SECRETARY OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE TO FACILITATE DESEGREGATION

Section 301 authorizes the Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare, upon application therefor, to render technical assistance to school boards in preparing, adopting, or implementing desegregation plans required by this bill. Such assistance might include dissemination of information, appointment of advisory councils, the holding of conferences, etc.

TITLE IV—FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE BY SECRETARY OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE TO FACILITATE DESEGREGATION

Section 401 requires the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to review every desegregation plan filed under this bill to ascertain that it complies with the provisions of the bill. Permits the Secretary, in the case of such plans that qualify and upon application therefor, to make grants to school boards, States, etc., to assist in meeting costs which the Secretary determines to be reasonably necessary for the implementation of a desegregation plan. Grants can be made to meet the costs of (1) employing additional personnel such as teachers and community counselors, (2) in-service training programs for school personnel, (3) replacing funds withheld from schools or teachers by local or State authorities because of desegregation, (4) construction or alteration of school facilities, and (5) other costs directly related to the process of eliminating segregation.

Section 402 authorizes the Secretary to provide grants to school boards, States, etc., to assist in meeting costs he determines to be reasonably necessary for the implementation of court-approved desegregation plans not subject to the requirements of this bill.

Section 403 requires the Secretary to prescribe regulations governing the granting of funds under this title and requires each application for such a grant to conform to the requirements of the Secretary. Provides that the Secretary might require that a grant be conditioned upon the local authority contributing similarly of its own funds.

Sets forth criteria to guide the Secretary in making the grants funds available, financial condition of applicant, etc.

Section 404 provides that grants can be paid by way of reimbursement for expenses already undertaken by a school district, or in advance for expenses to be undertaken.

Section 405 authorizes the appropriation of $40 million each fiscal year to carry out the grant provisions.

TITLE V—ENFORCEMENT OF DUTY TO ADOPT AND IMPLEMENT DESEGREGATION PLANS

Section 501 provides that when a school board or its successor violates any of the obligations required by this bill (filing desegregation plans and implementing them), the U.S. Attorney General is authorized to institute in the local U.S. district court, in the name of the United States, a civil action or other proceeding for preventive relief against such school board or its successor. Upon finding that there has been a violation of title II of this bill, the court may require the school board or its successor to adopt a school desegregation plan or to implement any other school desegregation plan which the court may find appropriate and consistent with the terms of this bill, or to issue such other orders or grant such other relief as will most expeditiously achieve first-step compliance and desegregation.

Section 502 provides that the jurisdiction of U.S. district courts shall extend to such proceedings regardless of whether administrative or other remedies provided by law have been exhausted.

TITLE VI—MISCELLANEOUS

Section 601 provides that nothing in the bill shall be construed to impair any right guaranteed by the Constitution or laws nor prevent individuals or private organizations from acting to enforce or safeguard any constitutional right or remedy.

Section 602: Saving clause in the event any provision is held invalid.

To the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. 1818. A bill to amend part III of the Civil Rights Act of 1957.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That part III of the Civil Rights Act of 1957 (71 Stat. 637) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"SEC. 123. (a)(1) Whenever the Attorney General receives a signed complaint that any person or group of persons is being deprived of, or is being threatened with the loss of, the right to the equal protection of the laws by reason of race, color, religion, or national origin, and the Attorney General certifies that, in his judgment, such person or group of persons is unable for any reason to seek effective legal protection for the right to the equal protection of the laws, the Attorney General is authorized to institute for or in the name of the United States a civil action or other proceeding for preventive relief, including an application for an injunction or other order, against any individual or individuals who, under color of any statute, ordinance, regulation, custom, or usage, of any State or territory or subdivision or instrumentality thereof, deprives or threatens to deprive such person or group of persons of the right to equal protection of the laws by reason of race, color, religion, or national origin and against any individual or individuals acting in concert with them.

"(2) A person or group of persons shall be deemed unable to seek effective legal protection for the right to the equal protection of the laws within the meaning of paragraph (1) of this subsection not only when such person or group of persons is financially unable to bear the expenses of the litigation, but also when there is reason to believe that the institution of such litigation would jeopardize the employment or economic standing of, or might result in injury or economic damage to, such person or group of persons or their families or their property.

"(b) The Attorney General is authorized to institute for or in the name of the United States a civil action or other proceeding for preventive relief, including an application for injunction or other order, (1) against any person or persons preventing or hindering, or threatening to prevent or hinder, or conspiring to prevent or hinder, any Federal, State, or local official from according any person or group of persons the right to the equal protection of the laws without regard to race, color, religion, or national origin, or (2) against any person or persons preventing or hindering, or threatening to prevent or hinder, or conspiring to prevent or hinder the execution of any court order protecting the right to the equal protection of the laws without regard to race, color, religion, or national origin.

"(c) The Attorney General is authorized, upon receipt of a signed complaint, to institute for or in the name of the United States, a civil action or other proceeding for

preventive relief, including an application for injunction or other order, against any individual or individuals who, under color of any statute, ordinance, regulation, custom, or usage, of any State or territory or subdivision or instrumentality thereof, deprives or threatens to deprive any person or group of persons or associations of persons of any right guaranteed by the fourteenth amendment of the Constitution, because such person or group of persons or association of persons has opposed or opposes the denial of the equal protection of the laws to others because of race, color, religion, or national origin.

"(d) The district courts of the United States shall have jurisdiction of proceedings instituted under this section and shall exercise the same without regard to whether the party or parties aggrieved have exhausted any administrative or other remedies that may be provided by law. In any proceeding under this section the United States shall be liable for costs the same as a private person.

"(e) Nothing contained in this section shall be construed to deny, impair, or otherwise affect any right or authority of the Attorney General under existing law to institute, maintain, or intervene in any action or proceeding."

The summary accompanying Senate bill 1818 is as follows:

SUMMARY OF CLARK-CELLER BILL AUTHORIZING CIVIL RIGHTS SUITS BY ATTORNEY GENERAL

The fourth civil rights legislative pledge in the Democratic Party 1960 platform reads:

"For the protection of all—constitutional rights of Americans, the Attorney General should be empowered and directed to file civil injunction suits in Federal courts to prevent the denial of any civil right on grounds of race, creed, or color."

The Clark-Celler bill to implement this pledge amends part III of the Civil Rights Act of 1957 in the following respects:

(a) Gives the Attorney General upon signed complaint, in addition to all other rights which he now has, the right to institute a civil action or other proceeding for preventive relief, including an action for an injunction, on behalf of persons who are being deprived of, or threatened with the loss of the right to equal protection of the laws by reason of race, religion, or national origin and who are unable for any reason to seek effective legal protection for themselves;

(b) Provides that persons shall be deemed unable to seek effective legal protection not only when they are financially unable to bear the expenses of litigation, but also when there is reason to believe that the institution of such litigation would jeopardize the employment or economic standing of such persons or their families;

(c) Authorizes the Attorney General to bring an action for preventive relief against any persons preventing or hindering, or threatening or conspiring to prevent or hinder, any Federal, State or local official from according to any person equal protection of the laws without regard to race, color, religion or national origin, or the execution of any court order under the same conditions;

(d) Authorizes the Attorney General to institute an action against persons who under cover of any statute, ordinance, regulation, custom or usage of any State or territory or subdivision thereof threaten to deprive any person of any right guaranteed by the 14th amendment to the Constitution because of race, color, religion or national origin; and

(e) Gives the district courts jurisdiction of such actions regardless of whether or not administrative or other remedies have been exhausted.

To the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

S. 1819. A bill to prohibit discrimination in employment because of race, color, religion, or national origin.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SHORT TITLE

SECTION 1. This Act may be cited as the "Federal Fair Employment Practice Act".

FINDINGS OF FACT AND STATEMENT OF PURPOSE

SEC. 2. The Congress hereby finds that large numbers of qualified persons in the United States are discriminated against in employment because of their race, color, religion, or national origin, and that such discrimination interferes with the normal flow of commerce and with the full production of articles and commodities for commerce. It is the purpose of this Act, in order to promote the full flow of commerce and the full production of articles and commodities for commerce, to prohibit discrimination in employment because of race, color, religion, or national origin, and to provide administrative and court remedies for persons injured by such discrimination.

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 3. As used in this Act—

(a) The term "person" includes one or more individuals, partnerships, associations, corporations, legal representatives, trustees, trustees in bankruptcy, receivers, or any organized group of persons and any agency or instrumentality of the United States, including the District of Columbia, or of any territory or possession thereof.

(b) The term "employer" means a person engaged in commerce or in operations affecting commerce having in his employ fifty or more individuals; any agency or instrumentality of the United States, including the District of Columbia, or of any territory or possession thereof; and any person acting in the interest of an employer, directly or indirectly; but shall not include any State or municipality or political subdivision thereof, or any religious, charitable, or educational corporation or association, not organized for private profit. Such term includes, for purposes of the provisions of this Act relating to employers, a labor organization which has fifty or more individuals in its employ.

(c) The term "labor organization" means any organization, having fifty or more members employed by any employer or employers, which exists for the purpose, in whole or in part, of collective bargaining or of dealing with employers concerning grievances, wages, hours, terms or conditions of employment, or for other mutual aid or protection in connection with employment.

(d) The term "commerce" means trade, traffic, commerce, transportation, or communication among the several States; or between any State, territory, possession, or the District of Columbia and any place outside thereof; or within the District of Columbia or any territory or possession; or between points in the same State but through any point outside thereof.

(e) The term "territory" includes the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico.

(f) The term "possession" means all possessions of the United States, and includes the trust territories which the United States holds as administering authority under the United Nations trusteeship system, and the Canal Zone, but excludes other places held by the United States by lease under international arrangements.

(g) The term "Commission" means the Fair Employment Practice Commission, created by section 6 hereof.

EXEMPTION

SEC. 4. This Act shall not apply to any employer with respect to the employment of aliens outside the several States, the District of Columbia, and the territories and possessions.

UNLAWFUL EMPLOYMENT PRACTICES DEFINED

SEC. 5. (a) It shall be an unlawful employment practice for an employer—

(1) to refuse to hire, to discharge, or otherwise to discriminate against any individual with respect to his terms, conditions, or privileges of employment, because of such individual's race, color, religion, or national origin; or

(2) to utilize in the hiring or recruitment of individuals for employment any employment agency, placement service, training school or center, labor organization, or any other source which discriminates against such individuals because of their race, color, religion, or national origin.

(b) It shall be an unlawful employment practice for any labor organization to discriminate against any individual or to limit, segregate, or classify its membership in any way which would deprive or tend to deprive any individual of equal employment opportunities, or would limit his employment opportunities or otherwise adversely affect his status as an employee or as an applicant for employment, or would affect adversely his wages, hours, or employment conditions, because of such individual's race, color, religion, or national origin.

(c) It shall be an unlawful employment practice for any employer or labor organization to discharge, expel, or otherwise discriminate against any person, because he has opposed any unlawful employment practice or has filed a charge, testified, participated, or assisted in any proceeding under this Act.

THE FAIR EMPLOYMENT PRACTICE COMMISSION

SEC. 6. (a) There is hereby created in the executive branch of the Government a commission to be known as the Fair Employment Practice Commission, which shall be composed of five members who shall be appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. One of the original members shall be appointed for a term of one year, one for a term of two years, one for a term of three years, one for a term of four years, and one for a term of five years, but their successors shall be appointed for terms of five years each, except that any individual chosen to fill a vacancy shall be appointed only for the unexpired term of the member whom he shall succeed. The President shall designate one member to serve as Chairman of the Commission, and one member to serve as Vice Chairman. The Chairman shall be responsible on behalf of the Commission for the administrative operations of the Commission. The Vice Chairman shall act as Chairman in the absence or disability of the Chairman or in the event of a vacancy in that office. Any member of the Commission may be removed by the President, upon notice and hearing, for neglect of duty or malfeasance in office, but for no other cause.

(b) A vacancy in the Commission shall not impair the right of the remaining members to exercise all the powers of the Commission and three members thereof shall constitute a quorum.

(c) The Commission shall have an official seal which shall be judicially noticed.

(d) The Commission shall, at the close of each fiscal year, make a report in writing to the Congress and to the President stating in detail its activities during such fiscal year, including the number and types of cases it has handled and the decisions it has rendered; and shall report to the President from time to time on the causes of and means of eliminating discrimination and make such recommendations for further legislation as may appear desirable.

(e) Each member of the Commission shall receive a salary of $20,000 a year, except that

the Chairman shall receive a salary of $22,500 a year.

(f) The principal office of the Commission shall be in the District of Columbia, but it may meet or exercise any or all of its powers at any other place and may establish such regional offices as it deems necessary. The Commission may, by one or more of its members or by such agents as it may designate, conduct any investigation, proceeding, or hearing necessary to its functions in any part of the United States. Any such agent, other than a member of the Commission, designated to conduct a proceeding or a hearing shall be a resident of the judicial circuit, as defined in title 28, United States Code, section 41, within which the alleged unlawful employment practice occurred.

(g) The Commission shall have power—

(1) to appoint, in accordance with the Civil Service Act, rules, and regulations, such officers, agents, and employees, as it deems necessary to assist it in the performance of its functions, to appoint, without regard to the Civil Service Act, rules, and regulations, such attorneys as it deems necessary to assist it in the performance of its functions, and to fix the compensation of such officers, agents, employees, and attorneys in accordance with the Classification Act of 1949, as amended;

(2) to cooperate with regional, State, local, and other agencies;

(3) to pay to witnesses whose depositions are taken or who are summoned before the Commission or any of its agents the same witness and mileage fees as are paid to witnesses in the courts of the United States;

(4) to furnish to persons subject to this Act such technical assistance as they may request to further their compliance with this Act or any order issued thereunder;

(5) upon the request of any employer acting in good faith, whose employees or some of them refuse or threaten to refuse to cooperate in effectuating the provisions of this Act, to assist in such effectuation by conciliation or other remedial action;

(6) to make such technical studies as are appropriate to effectuate the purposes and policies of this Act and to make the results of such studies available to interested governmental and nongovernmental agencies; and

(7) to create such local, State, or regional advisory and conciliation councils as in its judgment will aid in effectuating the purpose of this Act, and the Commission may authorize them to study the problem or specific instances of discrimination in employment because of race, color, religion, or national origin, and to foster through community effort or otherwise good will, cooperation, and conciliation among the groups and elements of the population, and make recommendations to the Commission for the development of policies and procedures in general and in specific instances. Such advisory and conciliation councils shall be composed of representative citizens, residents of the area for which they are appointed, who shall serve without compensation, but shall receive transportation and per diem in lieu of subsistence as authorized by section 5 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 73b–2) for persons serving without compensation; and the Commission may make provision for technical and clerical assistance to such councils and for the expenses of such assistance.

PREVENTION OF UNLAWFUL EMPLOYMENT PRACTICES

SEC. 7 (a) The Commission is empowered, as hereinafter provided, to prevent any person from engaging in any unlawful employment practice as set forth in section 5. This power shall be exclusive, and shall not be affected by any other means of adjustment or prevention that has been or may be established by agreement, code, law, or otherwise: *Provided,* That the Commission is empowered, by agreement with any agency of any State, Territory, possession, or local government, to cede to such agency jurisdiction over any cases even though such cases may involve charges of unlawful employment practices within the scope of this Act, unless the provision of the statute or ordinance applicable to the determination of such cases by such agency is inconsistent with the corresponding provision of this Act or has received a construction inconsistent therewith.

(b) Whenever a sworn written charge has been filed by or on behalf of any person claiming to be aggrieved, or a written charge has been filed by a member of the Commission or by an officer, agent, or employee of the Commission specifically authorized by it to file charges pursuant to this section, that any person subject to the Act has engaged in any unlawful employment practice, the Commission shall investigate such charge and if it shall determine after such preliminary investigation that probable cause exists for crediting such written charge, it shall endeavor to eliminate any unlawful employment practice by informal methods of conference, conciliation, and persuasion. Nothing said or done during and as a part of such endeavors may be used as evidence in any subsequent proceeding. Any written charge filed pursuant to this section must be filed within one year after the commission of the alleged unlawful employment practice.

(c) If the Commission fails to effect the elimination of such unlawful employment practice and to obtain voluntary compliance with this Act, or in advance thereof if circumstances so warrant, it shall cause a copy of such written charge to be served upon such person who has allegedly committed any unlawful employment practice, hereinafter called the respondent, together with a notice of hearing before the Commission, or a member thereof, or before a designated agent, at a place therein fixed, not less than ten days after the service of such charge.

(d) The respondent shall have the right to file a verified answer to such written charge and to appear at such hearing in person or otherwise, with or without counsel, to present evidence and to examine and cross-examine witnesses.

(e) The Commission or the member or designated agent conducting such hearing shall have the power reasonably and fairly to amend any written charge, and the respondent shall have like power to amend its answer.

(f) All testimony shall be taken under oath and a verbatim transcript of all testimony shall be made.

(g) The member of the Commission, or the officer, agent, or employee of the Commission, who filed a charge shall not participate in a hearing thereon or in a trial thereof, except as a witness.

(h) At the conclusion of a hearing before a member or designated agent of the Commission, such member or agent shall transfer the entire record thereof to the Commission, together with his recommended decision. The Commission, or a panel of three qualified members designated by it to sit and act as the Commission in such case, shall afford the parties an opportunity to be heard on such record at a time and place to be specified upon reasonable notice. In its discretion, the Commission upon notice may take further testimony.

(i) With the approval of the member or designated agent conducting the hearing, a case may be ended at any time prior to the transfer of the record thereof to the Commission by agreement between the parties for the elimination of the alleged unlawful employment practice on mutually satisfactory terms.

(j) If upon the record, including all the testimony taken, the Commission shall find that any person named in the written charge has engaged in any unlawful employment practice, the Commission shall state its findings of fact and conclusions of law and shall issue and cause to be served on such person an order requiring him to cease and desist from such unlawful employment practice and to take such affirmative action, including reinstatement or hiring of employees, with or without back pay, as will effectuate the policies of the Act: *Provided, however,* That interim earnings or amounts earnable with reasonable diligence by the person or persons discriminated against shall operate to reduce the back pay otherwise allowable. If upon the record, including all the testimony taken, the Commission shall find that no person named in the written charge has engaged or is engaging in any unlawful employment practice, the Commission shall state its findings of fact and shall issue an order dismissing the said complaint.

(k) Until a transcript of the record in a case shall have been filed in a court, as hereinafter provided, the case may at any time be ended by agreement between the parties, approved by the Commission, for the elimination of the alleged unlawful employment practice on mutually satisfactory terms, and the Commission may at any time, upon reasonable notice and in such manner as it shall deem proper, modify or set aside, in whole or in part, any finding or order made or issued by it.

(l) The proceedings held pursuant to this section shall be conducted in conformity with the standards and limitations of sections 5, 6, 7, and 8 of the Administrative Procedure Act.

JUDICIAL REVIEW

SEC. 8. (a) The Commission shall have power to petition any United States Court of Appeals or, if the court of appeals to which application might be made is in vacation, any district court or other U.S. court of the territory or place within the judicial circuit wherein the unlawful employment practice in question occurred, or wherein the respondent transacts business, for the enforcement of such order and for appropriate temporary relief or restraining order, and shall certify and file in the court to which petition is made a transcript of the entire record in the proceeding, including the pleadings and testimony upon which such order was entered and the findings, conclusions, and order of the Commission. Upon such filing, the court shall conduct further proceedings in conformity with the standards, procedures, and limitations established by section 10 of the Administrative Procedure Act.

(b) Upon such filing, the court shall cause notice thereof to be served upon such respondent and thereupon shall have jurisdiction of the proceeding and of the question determined therein and shall have power to grant such temporary relief or restraining order as it deems just and proper and to make and enter upon the pleadings, testimony, and proceedings set forth in such transcript a decree enforcing, modifying, and enforcing as so modified, or setting aside in whole or in part the order of the Commission.

(c) No objection that has not been urged before the Commission, its member, or agent shall be considered by the court, unless the failure or neglect to urge such objection shall be excused because of extraordinary circumstances. The findings of the Commission with respect to questions of fact, if supported by substantial evidence on the record considered as a whole, shall be conclusive.

(d) If either party shall apply to the court for leave to adduce additional evidence and shall show to the satisfaction of the court that such additional evidence is material and that there were reasonable grounds for the failure to adduce such evidence in the hearing before the Commission, its member, or agent, the court may

order such additional evidence to be taken before the Commission, its member, or agent and to be made a part of the transcript.

(e) The Commission may modify its findings of fact and conclusions of law, or make new findings and conclusions, by reason of additional evidence so taken and filed, and it shall file such modified or new findings and conclusions and its recommendations, if any, for the modification or setting aside of its original order.

(f) The jurisdiction of the court shall be exclusive and its judgment and decree shall be final, except that the same shall be subject to review by the appropriate United States court of appeals, if application was made to the district court or other United States court as hereinabove provided, and by the Supreme Court of the United States as provided in title 28, United States Code, section 1254.

(g) Any person aggrieved by a final order of the Commission may obtain a review of such order in any United States court of appeals of the judicial circuit wherein the unlawful employment practice in question was alleged to have been engaged in or wherein such person transacts business, by filing in such court, within sixty days after the issuance of such order, a written petition praying that the order of the Commission be modified or set aside. A copy of such petition shall be forthwith served upon the Commission and thereupon the aggrieved party shall file in the court a transcript of the entire record in the proceeding certified by the Commission, including the pleadings and testimony upon which the order complained of was entered and the findings, conclusions, and order of the Commission. Upon such filing, the court shall proceed in the same manner as in the case of an application by the Commission under subsection (a), and shall have the same exclusive jurisdiction to grant to the petitioners or the Commission such temporary relief or restraining order as it deems just and proper, and in like manner to make and enter a decree enforcing, modifying and enforcing as so modified, or setting aside in whole or in part the order of the Commission.

(h) Upon such filing by a person aggrieved, the reviewing court shall conduct further proceedings in conformity with the standards, procedures, and limitations established by section 10 of the Administrative Procedure Act.

(i) The commencement of proceedings under subsection (a) or (g) of this section shall not, unless specifically ordered by the court, operate as a stay of the Commission's order.

INVESTIGATORY POWERS

SEC. 9. (a) For the purpose of all investigations, proceedings, or hearings which the Commission deems necessary or proper for the exercise of the powers vested in it by this Act, the Commission, or any member thereof, shall have power to issue subpenas requiring the attendance and testimony of witnesses and the production of any evidence relating to any investigation, proceeding, or hearing before the Commission, its member, or agent conducting such investigation, proceeding, or hearing.

(b) Any member of the Commission, or any agent designated by the Commission for such purposes, may administer oaths, examine witnesses, and receive evidence.

(c) Such attendance of witnesses and the production of such evidence may be required, from any place in the United States, including the District of Columbia, or any territory or possession thereof, at any designated place of hearing.

(d) In case of contumacy or refusal to obey a subpena issued to any person under this Act, any district court of the United States as constituted by chapter 5, title 28, United States Code (28 U.S.C. 81 et seq.), or the United States court of any territory or other place subject to the jurisdiction of the United States, within the jurisdiction of which the investigation, proceeding, or hearing is carried on or within the jurisdiction of which said person guilty of contumacy or refusal to obey is found or resides or transacts business, upon application by the Commission shall have jurisdiction to issue to such person an order requiring him to appear before the Commission, its member, or agent, there to produce evidence if so ordered, or there to give testimony relating to the investigation, proceeding, or hearing.

ENFORCEMENT OF ORDERS DIRECTED TO GOVERNMENT AGENCIES AND CONTRACTORS

SEC. 10 (a) The President is authorized to take such action as may be necessary (1) to conform fair employment practices within the Federal establishment with the policies of this Act, and (2) to provide that any Federal employee aggrieved by any employment practice of his employer must exhaust the administrative remedies prescribed by Executive order or regulations governing fair employment practices within the Federal establishment prior to seeking relief under the provisions of this Act. The provision of section 8 shall not apply with respect to an order of the Commission under section 7 directed to any agency or instrumentality of the United States, or of any territory or possession thereof, or of the District of Columbia, or any officer or employee thereof. The Commission may request the President to take such action as he deems appropriate to obtain compliance with such orders.

(b) The President shall have power to provide for the establishment of regulations to prevent the committing or continuing of any unlawful employment practice as herein defined by any person who makes a contract with any agency or instrumentality of the United States (excluding any State or political subdivision thereof) or of any territory or possession of the United States, or of the District of Columbia. Such regulations shall be enforced by the Commission according to the procedure hereinbefore provided.

NOTICES TO BE POSTED

SEC. 11. (a) Every employer and labor organization shall post and keep posted in conspicuous places upon its premises a notice to be prepared or approved by the Commission setting forth excerpts of the Act and such other relevant information which the Commission deems appropriate to effectuate the purposes of the Act.

(b) A willful violation of this section shall be punishable by a fine of not more than $500 for each separate offense.

VETERANS' PREFERENCE

SEC. 12. Nothing contained in this Act shall be construed to repeal or modify any Federal, State, territorial, or local law creating special rights or preference for veterans.

RULES AND REGULATIONS

SEC. 13. The Commission shall have authority from time to time to issue, amend, or rescind suitable regulations to carry out the provisions of this Act. Regulations issued under this section shall be in conformity with the standards and limitations of the Administrative Procedure Act.

FORCIBLY RESISTING THE COMMISSION OR ITS REPRESENTATIVES

SEC. 14. Whoever shall forcibly resist, oppose, impede, intimidate, or interfere with a member, agent, or employee of the Commission while engaged in the performance of duties under this Act, or because of such performance, shall be punished by a fine of not more than $500 or by imprisonment for not more than one year, or by both.

SEPARABILITY CLAUSE

SEC. 15. If any provision of this Act or the application of such provision to any person or circumstance shall be held invalid, the remainder of this Act or the application of such provision to persons or circumstances other than those to which it is held invalid shall not be affected thereby.

The summary accompanying Senate bill 1819 is as follows:

SUMMARY OF CLARK-CELLER FEPC BILL

The fifth civil rights pledge in the 1960 Democratic Party platform reads:

"The new Democratic administration will support Federal legislation establishing a Fair Employment Practices Commission to secure effectively for everyone the right to equal opportunity for employment."

The Clark-Celler FEPC bill would make it an unfair employment practice for any employer (business or labor union) employing more than 50 persons and engaged in interstate commerce or in operations affecting such commerce, to discriminate in hiring, promoting, or firing against any individual on the basis of race, color, religion, or national origin. Both administrative remedies, administered by a five-man Fair Employment Practice Commission, and court remedies would be available to persons subject to such discrimination in employment.

SECTION-BY-SECTION ANALYSIS OF CLARK-CELLER FEPC BILL

Section 1, short title: "Federal Fair Employment Practice Act."

Section 2, findings of fact and statement of purpose: Congress finds that large numbers of qualified persons in the United States are discriminated against in employment because of their race, color, religion, or national origin, and that such discrimination interferes with interstate commerce. The purpose of the legislation is to promote interstate commerce by prohibiting such discrimination and by providing administrative and court remedies for persons injured by such discrimination.

Section 3, definitions: The prohibition against discrimination in employment because of race, color, religion, or national origin set forth hereafter applies to employers and labor organizations. Domestic service and small business are exempted from the scope of the bill by a provision which defines "employer" as a person engaged in interstate or foreign commerce and who employs 50 or more individuals. In like manner, the only labor organizations covered are those which have 50 or more members. Also exempted from the operation of the act are State, municipalities, or political subdivisions thereof, and any religious, charitable, or educational corporation or association not organized for private profit. The agencies of the Federal Government are covered by the bill.

Section 4, exemption: The employment of aliens outside the continental United States, its territories and possessions is specifically exempted from the provisions of the act.

Section 5, unlawful employment practices defined: This section defines unlawful employment practices by employers as a "refusal to hire, or to discharge" or otherwise penalize any employee with respect to his employment because of race, color, religion or national origin. In addition, an employer is prohibited from using any employment agency or placement service which discriminates. Labor organizations are forbidden to discriminate against any individual or limit, segregate, or classify its members in any way which would deprive or limit an individual's employment opportunities because of his race, color, religion or national origin. Both employers and labor organizations are forbidden to discriminate against any individual because he "has opposed an unlawful employment practice or has filed a charge, testified, participated, or assisted in any proceeding

under this act." In short, because such individual has undertaken to effectuate the purposes of this act.

These prohibitions do not go beyond saying that there shall be no discrimination because of factors which have no real relationship to an employee's fitness or qualifications. Management remains free to determine its hiring practices, organize its internal plant policy, and discharge employees, according to any standard it may adopt so long as there is no discrimination because of prohibited irrelevant factors. Likewise, a labor organization is free to manage its internal affairs as it deems fit, except that it may not deny any of the advantages of union membership or collective bargaining to any person because of race, color, religion or national origin.

Section 6, the Fair Employment Practice Commission: The administration of the bill is entrusted to a national commission against discrimination in employment composed of five members to be appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate. The members of the Commission hold office for overlapping terms at the outset of 1 to 5 years, and their successors hold 5-year terms.

The Commission is empowered to appoint staff members; to cooperate with regional, State, and local agencies; to furnish technical assistance to persons subject to the act and to make necessary studies; and to assist employers whose employees "refuse or threaten to refuse to cooperate in effectuating the provisions of this Act." In order to foster community good will and cooperation in carrying out the purposes of the act and to help conciliate the differences and tensions between various groups and the elements of the population, provision is made for the creation on local, State, and regional levels of advisory councils.

Section 7, prevention of unlawful employment practices: The Commission is empowered to investigate the sworn written charges of any person who believes that he has been the victim of an unlawful employment practice and to eliminate the unlawful practice by conference. Provision is also made for the filing of charges of discrimination by any members of the Commission who have knowledge of an unlawful employment practice. If efforts at voluntary compliance fail, then hearings shall be held before the Commission in conformity with the Administrative Procedure Act, and it may issue an order requiring the respondent to cease and desist from such unlawful practice. If the respondent still refuses to comply with the order, the Commission may apply to the U.S. circuit court of appeals for enforcement of such order.

Recognizing the existence of State and local fair employment practice laws, the act provides that the Federal Commission may, by agrement with any agency of any State "cede to such agency jurisdiction over any cases even though such cases may involve charges of unlawful employment practices * * * unless the provision of the statute or ordinance * * * is inconsistent with the corresponding provision of the act or has received a construction inconsistent therewith."

The bill contains the traditional safeguards for separation of the prosecuting and judicial functions of the Commission, for representation by council and protection of the right of confrontation and cross-examination.

Section 8, judicial review: Judicial review of cease and desist orders is provided in conformity with the Administrative Procedures Act. The Commission's orders to cease and desist from an unlawful employment practice or to reinstate an employee with or without back pay are legally enforceable only after they have received judicial approval.

Section 9, investigatory powers: The Commission is given the customary powers to issue subpenas, administer oaths, examine witnesses, and receive evidence.

Section 10, enforcement of orders directed to Government agencies and contractors: The bill provides that if any Government agency is found to have engaged in an unlawful employment practice the Commission is required to place the matter before the President for appropriate action. The President is also empowered to establish regulations to prevent unlawful employment practices by persons entering into contracts with the U.S. Government or any of its agencies. Such Executive regulations will be enforced by the Commission.

Section 11, notices to be posted: Persons subject to the act are required to post a notice giving sufficient information about the law to inform employees and members of labor organizations of their rights.

Section 12, veterans' preferences: The bill disavows any intent to interfere with special rights or preference for veterans."

Section 13, rules and regulations: Rules and regulations may be issued by the Commission in conformity with the Administrative Procedures Act.

Section 14, forcibly resisting the Commission or its representatives: Penalties by fine of not more than $500 or by imprisonment for not more than 1 year, or by both are provided for conviction for forcibly resisting or interfering with agents of the Commission engaged in the performance of their duties.

To the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. 1820. A bill to make the Commission on Civil Rights a permanent agency in the executive branch of the Government, to broaden the scope of the duties of the Commission, and for other purposes.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Commission on Civil Rights Amendments Act of 1961".

SEC. 2. Section 101(b) of the Civil Rights Act of 1957 (42 U.S.C. § 1975(b)) is amended to read as follows:

"(b)(1) The Commission shall be composed of seven members who shall be appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. Not more than four of the members shall at any one time be of the same political party. The term of office of members appointed after the date of the enactment of the Commission on Civil Rights Amendments Act of 1961 shall be three years, except that (A) the term of office of two of the members first so appointed (as designated by the President at the time of their nomination) shall be one year and the term of office of two of the members first so appointed (as designated by the President at the time of their nomination) shall be two years, and (B) any member appointed to fill a vacancy occurring prior to the expiration of the term for which his predecessor was appointed shall serve only for the remainder of such term.

"(2) The term of office of the members of the Commission first appointed after the date of the enactment of the Commission on Civil Rights Amendments Act of 1961 shall commence on the day of the appointment of the last of such members, and the term of office of any members subsequently appointed (other than a member appointed to fill a vacancy) shall commence on the day following the day on which the term of his predecessor expired.

"(3) The term of office of the members of the Commission holding office on the date of the enactment of the Commission on Civil Rights Amendments Act of 1961 shall expire at the time of appointment of the last of the members first appointed after such date."

SEC. 3. Section 103(a) of the Civil Rights Act of 1957 (42 U.S.C. 1975b (a)) is amended by striking out "$50 per day" and inserting in lieu thereof "$75 per day."

SEC. 4. Section 104 of the Civil Rights Act of 1957 (42 U.S.C. 1975c) is amended to read as follows:

"DUTIES OF THE COMMISSION

"SEC. 104. (a) The Commission shall—

"(1) investigate allegations in writing under oath or affirmation that certain citizens of the United States are being deprived of their right to vote and have that vote counted by reason of their color, race, religion, or national origin; which writing, under oath or affirmation, shall set forth the facts upon which such belief or beliefs are based;

"(2) study and collect information concerning legal developments constituting a denial of due process of law or of equal protection of the laws under the Constitution:

"(3) appraise the laws and policies of the Federal Government with respect to due process of law and equal protection of the laws under the Constitution; and

"(4) to serve as a national clearing house for civil rights information, and to provide advice and technical assistance to communities, industries, or individuals, upon request from such parties in respect to due process of law and equal protection of the laws, including but not limited to the fields of voting, education, housing, employment, the use of public facilities, transportation and the administration of justice.

The Commission may, for such periods as it deems necessary, concentrate the performance of its duties to those specified in either paragraph (1), (2), (3), or (4) and may further concentrate the performance of its duties under any of such paragraphs to one or more aspects of the duties imposed therein.

"(b) The Commission shall, not later than January 31 of each year, submit a report to the President and the Congress setting forth its activities and findings during the preceding year and its recommendations with respect thereto. The Commission may submit such other reports to the President and to the Congress at such times as the Commission and the President deem advisable."

SEC. 5. (a) Section 105(a) of the Civil Rights Act of 1957 (42 U.S.C. 1975d (a)) is amended by striking out in the last sentence thereof "$50 per diem" and inserting in lieu thereof "$75 per diem."

(b) Section 105(d) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 1975d (d) is amended by striking out "and members of advisory committees constituted pursuant to subsection (c) of this section," and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "members of advisory committees constituted pursuant to subsection (c) of this section, and consultants appointed under authority of section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (60 Stat. 810; 5 U.S.C. 55a) specifically designated in writing by the Commission (but not exceeding twelve such consultants at any time)".

SEC. 6. Section 105(c) of the Civil Rights Act of 1957 (42 U.S.C. 1975d(c)) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: "The Commission is authorized to reimburse, out of moneys appropriated under the authority of section 106, any advisory committee constituted by it pursuant to this subsection for expenses of travel, stenographic services and subsistence incurred by the members thereof in the performance of functions approved by the Commission, and for costs of using the mails incurred by any such advisory committee in the performance of any such functions."

SEC. 7. Section 105(h) of the Civil Rights Act of 1957, as added by section 401 of the Civil Rights Act of 1960 (42 U.S.C. 1975d(h)), is amended by inserting after "each member of the Commission" the following: ", and

any officer or employee of the Commission designated by it,".

SEC. 8. The amendments to the Civil Rights Act of 1957 made by sections 3, 4, 5, 6, and 7 of this Act shall become effective on the day of the appointment by the President of the last of the members of the Commission on Civil Rights first appointed after the date of the enactment of this Act.

The summary accompanying Senate bill 1820 is as follows:

SUMMARY OF CLARK-CELLER CIVIL RIGHTS COMMISSION BILL

The sixth and final legislative pledge in the civil rights section of the 1960 Democratic platform read as follows:

"The new Democratic administration will broaden the scope and strengthen the powers of the (Civil Rights Commission) and make it permanent.

"Its functions will be to provide assistance to communities, industries, or individuals in the implementation of constitutional rights in education, housing, employment, transportation, and the administration of justice."

The Clark-Celler bill would make the Civil Rights Commission a permanent Federal agency with strengthened fact-finding powers and a new directive to act as a "national clearing house for civil rights information." The bill would effect seven changes in the provisions relating to the Commission in the Civil Rights Act of 1957, as amended:

1. The Commission would be made permanent by eliminating the September 9, 1961, termination date in existing law. Thereafter the Commission would be required to file reports of its activities annually or more frequently at its own discretion or the discretion of the President (sec. 4).

2. One member would be added to the Commission (making a total of seven members) and staggered 3-year terms would be provided (sec. 2).

3. The maximum compensation of Commissioners and appointed consultants, not to exceed 12 in number at any time, would be increased from $50 to $75 per diem (secs. 3 and 5).

4. The Commission would be authorized to study and collect information and appraise the laws and policies of the Federal Government with respect to denials of due process as well as denials of equal protection of the laws (sec. 4).

5. The Commission would be authorized in its discretion to reimburse State advisory committees for travel expenses, stenographic services, and subsistence incurred in the performance of Commission-approved functions (sec. 6).

6. Commission officers and employees specifically designated by the Civil Rights Commission would be authorized, in addition to the Commissioners themselves, to administer oaths and take statements of witnesses (sec. 7).

7. The Civil Rights Commission would be directed "to serve as a national clearing house for civil rights information, and to provide advice and technical assistance to communities, industries, or individuals, upon request from such parties in respect to due process of law and equal protection of the laws, including but not limited to the fields of voting, education, housing, employment, the use of public facilities, transportation and the administration of justice" (sec. 4).

Mr. CLARK subsequently said: Mr. President, earlier today I introduced, for appropriate reference, six measures dealing with various aspects of the civil rights problem. I ask unanimous consent that the bills lie on the table for 1 week, in order that other Senators may have an opportunity to join in sponsoring the bills if they so desire.

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

AMENDMENT OF TITLE 18, UNITED STATES CODE, RELATING TO INTERCEPTION OF CERTAIN COMMUNICATIONS

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code to authorize certain communications to be intercepted in compliance with State law and for other purposes.

The Constitutional Rights Subcommittee will soon resume its hearings on the subject of wiretapping, eavesdropping, and the Bill of Rights. A number of distinguished witnesses have been invited to testify, including the new Attorney General, representatives of local law enforcement departments and agencies, and members of the academic community. Prof. John E. North, of Omaha, a member of Creighton University School of Law faculty, will be among those who are participating in this series of hearings.

In light of the important decisions handed down by the Supreme Court in recent weeks there is added cause to find a legislative solution to the wiretap dilemma. Several bills have already been introduced and are now pending in the subcommittee. In order that the subcommittee might have an opportunity to consider a permissive wiretapping bill which places greater restrictions on local investigating officers and gives a proportionately broader protection to the individual citizen's right of privacy, it was deemed appropriate to introduce a measure authorizing wiretapping on a local basis only under court supervision which is limited to such telephones as are actually being used in the commission of a crime.

Briefly, the proposed bill recognizes that in some communities law enforcement may be immeasurably hampered by the flat prohibition against wiretapping now apparently specified in the Federal Communications Act. Such a bill would eliminate the embarrassment caused local law enforcement officers in situations similar to the one presented in *Pugach* v. *Dollinger* (365 U.S. 458). In that case the State law permitted wiretapping pursuant to a court order although the procedure may have violated or would lead to a violation of a Federal law.

Nevertheless, some feasible means of circumscribing the wiretapping authority granted by local court actions must be provided if the individual is to be accorded genuine protection of his basic right to privacy. This is done in the proposed bill by restricting wiretapping to telephones which have been or are being used in the commission of a crime. Neither such instruments nor the words flowing through them enjoy an absolute and unqualified immunity from search. This bill provides a workable rule respecting the interests of all.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that the text of the bill be printed in full at this point in my remarks.

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

The bill (S. 1822) to amend title 18 of the United States Code to authorize certain communications to be intercepted in compliance with State law, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. HRUSKA, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That chapter 223 of title 18 of the United States Code is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"§ 3501. Evidence of intercepted communications

"No law of the United States shall be construed to prohibit the interception, by any law enforcement officer or agency of any State or any political subdivision thereof in compliance with the provisions of any statute of such State, of a wire or radio communication, and the divulgence, in any proceeding in any court of such State, of the existence, contents, substance, purport, effect, or meaning of the communication so intercepted if such interception was made after determination by a court of such State that probable cause existed for belief that a crime has been, or is about to be, committed and that a particular telephone or telegraph instrument is being, or will be, used in furtherance of the commission of that crime pursuant to which leave was granted to intercept such wire or radio communications transmitted by that telephone or telegraph instrument for a reasonable period of time not to exceed thirty days."

AMENDMENT OF ACT RELATING TO TRANSPORTATION OF REMAINS, FAMILIES, AND EFFECTS OF FEDERAL EMPLOYEES DYING ABROAD—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Mr. LONG of Hawaii. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my name be added as a cosponsor of the bill (S. 1458) to amend the act relating to transportation of remains, families, and effects of Federal employees dying abroad, introduced by the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], the next time it is printed.

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

AMENDMENT OF IMMIGRATION AND NATIONALITY ACT—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILL

Under authority of the order of the Senate of May 4, 1961, the names of Senators FONG, LONG of Hawaii, and BUSH were added as additional cosponsors of the bill (S. 1809) to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act, introduced by Mr. DIRKSEN on May 4, 1961.

OPPOSITION TO RECOGNITION OF COMMUNIST CHINESE REGIME AND SUPPORT OF CHINESE NATIONALISTS—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF CONCURRENT RESOLUTION

Under authority of the order of the Senate of May 3, 1961, the names of Senators KEATING, COTTON, BUSH, SCOTT, CASE of New Jersey, FONG, ALLOTT, CASE of South Dakota, BOGGS, HUMPHREY, BENNETT, BRIDGES, CARROLL, STENNIS, and HRUSKA were added as additional cosponsors of the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 22) relative to relationship of the United States with the Republic of China and communistic China, submitted by Mr. DIRKSEN (for himself and Mr. MANSFIELD) on May 3, 1961.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON ECONOMIC IMPACT OF NATIONAL DEFENSE—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF RESOLUTION

Under authority of the order of the Senate of May 3, 1961, the names of Senators PROXMIRE, HUMPHREY, GRUENING, BYRD of West Virginia, RANDOLPH, and SMITH of Massachusetts were added as additional cosponsors of the resolution (S. Res. 135) establishing the Senate Select Committee on the Economic Impact of National Defense, submitted by Mr. HART on May 3, 1961.

ORDERLY MARKETING ACT OF 1961—ADDITIONAL TIME FOR BILL TO LIE ON THE DESK

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, the bill (S. 1735) to provide for adjusting conditions of competition between certain domestic industries and foreign industries with respect to the level of wages and the working conditions in the production of articles imported into the United States, is on the table for the convenience of Senators who may wish to consider cosponsoring the bill. I ask unanimous consent that the bill be allowed to lie on the table until next Monday, May 15, for the same purpose.

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

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

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

By Mr. BEALL:

Address delivered by Senator SALTONSTALL before Combined Republican Organizations dinner, at Baltimore, Md., on May 3, 1961, dealing with the mobilization of Republican resources for the future.

By Mr. WILEY:

Excerpts from radio address delivered by him over radio station WGN, Chicago, on May 7, 1961, on the subject of "The Challenge of Peace."

RETIREMENT OF THE HONORABLE PAUL BROWN

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a resolution of the Joint Committee on Defense Production, expressing its appreciation of the services of the Honorable Paul Brown, of Georgia, recently a Member of the House of Representatives.

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

RESOLUTION OF THE JOINT COMMITTEE ON DEFENSE PRODUCTION

Whereas the retirement of the Honorable Paul Brown, of Georgia, from the Congress of the United States has deprived the Joint Committee on Defense Production of the services of a most valuable member and officer; and

Whereas this faithful and most able public servant served the committee continuously from its inception in 1950 until 1961; and

Whereas he was unanimously elected to be chairman of the committee for the 84th and 86th Congresses and vice chairman of the committee for the 82d and 85th Congresses; and

Whereas his services contributed immeasurably to the success of the committee's functions performed under the Defense Production Act of 1950 in the critical areas of national mobilization readiness and expansion of national productive capacity; and

Whereas such services were becoming to his distinguished career of more than 27 years as Representative of the 10th Congressional District of the State of Georgia and reflected honor on himself, his State, and the Nation; and

Whereas Paul Brown is completely and selflessly devoted to the highest traditions of the Congress, to our principles of government, and to the rules of fairplay in all personal and official relationships; and

Whereas he is regarded by all who know him as a truly great statesman and patriot; and

Whereas he is dedicated to the law, both to the highest traditions of its practice and to its enactment by due and proper legislative process; and

Whereas it is fitting that we should recognize such sterling qualities and such generous service to the Congress and to the committee: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Joint Committee on Defense Production of the Congress of the United States, That we do hereby commend the meritorious service of our esteemed former colleague, Paul Brown, and extend to him our deepest appreciation and warmest wishes that the years ahead be abundantly happy and healthful; and be it further

Resolved, That we are of the sincere opinion that Paul Brown will be sorely missed in the ranks of the Congress and of the committee as a man who loves his fellow man, his country, his professions of law and politics, and the national pastime of baseball; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be spread upon the records of the Congress and upon the records of this committee.

THE PRESIDENT'S PROGRAM FOR THE TEXTILE INDUSTRY

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, candor compels me to confess that I am disappointed with the seven-point program announced by the President for the textile industry. While some parts of the program would alleviate to some degree some of the problems of the textile industry, the program will not prevent the continuing liquidation of the textile industry which has been in progress for some years. This is true because the program does not come to grips with the crucial fact that the economic ills of the textile industry are, in large measure, the inevitable result of certain unwise trade practices and policies adopted and pursued by unidentified officers of the State Department who distort and pervert the reciprocal trade concept originated by Franklin D. Roosevelt's great Secretary of State, Cordell Hull.

Cordell Hull laid down certain precepts in respect to American industries and foreign trade which are crystal clear and indisputable. He declared that the only mutually satisfactory trade between nations is reciprocal trade, and that any true reciprocal trade, in substance, involves an exchange of surpluses by the trading nations. As a consequence, he repeatedly said that the United States ought to enter into trade agreements with other nations under which the United States would export to such other nations goods produced in the United States in surplus quantities, and would import from such other nations goods which the United States either could not produce or could not produce effectively. He pointed out on a number of occasions this truth: When we import from abroad goods which we are producing at home in surplus quantities, the inevitable result is that American industries suffer a loss of domestic markets, Americans who work in such industries suffer a loss of their jobs, and Americans who have invested in such industries are deprived of a fair return on their investments.

This is precisely the plight in which the textile industry now finds itself. Notwithstanding the fact that the American textile industry has always produced a surplus of textile products, the unidentified men in the State Department who now manage our trade policies and practices have actually been encouraging the importation into the United States of textile products manufactured abroad by foreign workingmen, whose pay in some instances is only approximately 10 percent of the pay of American textile workers.

A subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, headed by the able Senior Senator from Rhode Island, JOHN PASTORE, has made a detailed study of this entire situation, and has made it crystal clear that the only way to prevent the continuing liquidation of the textile industry in the United States is for the United States to establish import quotas on textile products by country and by category.

It is impossible to overmagnify the importance of the textile industry to North Carolina. Approximately one-half of all the North Carolinians employed in manufacturing earn livelihoods for themselves and their families in this industry.

The absurdity of the present practice of encouraging the importation into the United States of textile goods made by cheap labor abroad, when American textile workers are producing such goods in surplus quantities, is made manifest by the Fair Labor Standards Act, which was enacted by the Congress to improve the compensation and working conditions of American workers. Under the section of the Fair Labor Standards Act codified as section 215 of title 29 of the United States Code, it is made a crime to ship in—interstate—commerce goods manufactured by Americans who are paid less than the minimum wage established by the act or who are compelled to work more than the maximum hours prescribed by the act.

While the Congress undertakes in this manner to afford protection to American textile workers, the unidentified men in the State Department having charge of our trade policies and practices actually rob American textile workers of their jobs by encouraging the importation into the United States of textile products which it would be unlawful to ship in interstate commerce if they had been produced under similar conditions in America.

The remedy which ought to be applied is simple. Instead of continuing the liquidation of the American textile industry, the Federal Government should allot to friendly foreign nations quotas by country and by category, giving such nations such reasonable part of our domestic textile markets as may be necessary to enable them to maintain viable economies, and reserve the remainder of such textile markets to our own industry. By so doing, we can best promote the interest of the free world and the soundness of our own domestic economy.

THE DANGER OF TAX TINKERING

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, recently, the administration presented to the Congress a series of proposals for revision of the tax laws. These, of course, must now be examined carefully.

Taxwise, we now, regrettably, exist in a kind of hand-to-mouth practice of levying new laws and continuing ones that threaten to expire. Rarely do we repeal such laws, even though some of these have continued long beyond their originally intended time.

Generally, we have followed a pattern of economic expediency, rather than to attempt to adopt a system of principles designed to meet the long-range needs of the country.

In my judgment, however, this is exactly what we need—that is, the creation of a tax philosophy and program to serve and preserve our free-enterprise system, as well as establish a more equitable method of treating our taxpayers.

Recently, I introduced in the Senate S. 10, which proposed the establishment of a commission to carry out a full-scale tax reform.

The purpose of the commission is to make a top-to-bottom review of the tax system, to develop recommendations for more equitable laws, to try to find ways and means by which the country can first, more effectively meet its fiscal needs; second, assure fair treatment of our citizens under the law; and third, spur, not stunt, economic growth and progress.

We recognize, of course, that tax laws first, if equitable, can serve the fundamental needs of the country; but second, if inequitable, can wreak inestimable damage upon a free economy.

Recently, Business Week, an outstanding publication in the business field, published an editorial entitled "The Danger of Tax Tinkering." The editorial contains some realistic observations on the dangers of further "tinkering" with our tax laws without comprehensive reform.

I request unanimous consent to have the editorial printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

THE DANGER OF TAX TINKERING

The tax proposals that President Kennedy has asked Congress to adopt this year are a very mixed batch of pickles. As the President himself says, this is not a comprehensive and consistent program of tax reform; it is a hastily assembled collection of separate proposals. Each of the various components of the program will require extensive analysis as Congress takes it up for action.

At this point, however, at least one of the Kennedy suggestions is clear enough to be judged on its merits or lack of them. This is his plan to give an incentive to capital spending by allowing a tax credit for investment beyond a specified percentage of depreciation allowances.

The aim of this proposal is admirable, and when some companies see the very substantial tax savings it would give them (up to 30 percent of their total tax liabilities in some cases), they will, perhaps understandably, be inclined not to look a gift horse in the mouth. Nevertheless, this gift horse is one that does require a careful dental examination.

The President's proposal, unfortunately, would do exactly the kind of thing that has so added to the complexities and inequities of the existing tax structure: It would use tax breaks to certain income recipients to encourage actions that the Government wishes to favor, or in effect, to grant subsidies to certain kinds of economic activities.

The sliding scale of tax credits would seek to induce businesses to spend money on plant and equipment rather than for other purposes—which might well contribute even more, in the case of individual companies, to their growth and the growth of the Nation. In addition, the proposal discriminates in favor of rapidly growing industries as against those laboring to generate sufficient funds for modernization or expansion.

Even worse, this legislation—in the judgment of experts in the field—is unspeakably complex and might lead to years of litigation. The very fact that the Government has put in so many qualifying clauses is testimony to the clumsy and discriminatory nature of the proposal.

This is no time to add further complexities to our already labyrinthine tax system. The reform of that system—which Kennedy himself says is a must for the next session of Congress—should aim at simplicity and equity—with tax considerations playing a minimum role in the process of making business decisions. This tax credit proposal is completely in the wrong direction.

DOUBTFUL GAINS

To raise $1.7 billion a year to offset the cost of the incentives for capital investment, the President proposes a variety of measures—including withholding at the source of the tax on dividends and interest, repeal of the dividend credit, tighter rules on deductible business expenses, and tougher treatment of income earned overseas.

It seems highly doubtful that some of these will produce as much revenue as the President hopes. Withholding the tax on dividends and interest, for instance, may catch some income that now escapes taxation, but much of the money that is collected will have to be refunded eventually because it goes to pensioners or small holders who owe no tax.

The proposal for new taxes on foreign operations of American corporations is a somewhat different matter. It is made against the background of the deficit in the U.S. balance of payments. In seeking to repeal the current deferral of taxes on earnings of American subsidiaries operating in industrialized foreign countries, the administration is hoping to encourage a prompter—and larger—return of taxable earnings to the United States.

The same objective is behind the President's recommendation to abolish tax deferrals for companies operating in foreign "tax havens"—a practice that has also complicated our balance-of-payments problem. The administration charges that tax havens are being abused by tax evaders, that they not only defer taxation but sometimes manage to avoid taxes entirely in repatriating earnings.

SWITCHING SIGNALS

No one can deny the fact that the emergence of the balance-of-payments problem calls for a variety of countermeasures, including changes in taxation. Nor can there be any argument against the administration's efforts to cut down on abuses that are possible under present law.

But the fact is that ever since World War II, Washington has encouraged American companies to increase their investments overseas. In effect, the Kennedy administration is saying that this program worked too well and that it must now abolish any inducements to invest abroad, at least in the industrialized countries.

Most American corporations that have invested abroad on a long-term basis feel that this switch in philosophy amounts to putting a penalty on them for risking their capital to do what the Government once wanted them to do. They complain that they would not have made such commitments on a temporary basis, and they contend that repeal of tax deferral now will give foreign companies, which already are providing intense competition, a definite advantage in the fight for world markets.

In the long run, these companies argue, the President's proposals could increase the strain on our balance of payments rather than relieve it.

In the circumstances, it is particularly important for Congress to make sure that it has heard all sides and considered all available evidence before it acts. The final version of any legislation in this area must be carefully drawn so that it will not hurt but help the balance-of-payments situation, with an absolute minimum of injury and injustice to investors who have sent their money abroad in all good faith.

NEEDED: SPEEDUP OF U.S. SPACE PROGRAM

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, today the Nation is paying special tribute to Comdr. Alan B. Shepard, our first man in space.

This is a just and fitting observance in honor of a brave man; in recognition of a major breakthrough in our space exploration program; and in celebration

of a historically significant step forward in freeman's effort to explore the universe.

The American people, I believe, can be justly proud.

Now, however, we look forward to success—with, we pray, a minimum of setbacks—in our next step of launching a manned spacecraft into orbit around the earth.

In the world stadium, nations are carefully watching the contest between the major protagonists of freedom and communism in space exporation—the United States and the Soviet Union. Although we didn't plan it that way, this is, indeed, a real space race.

According to experts, the cumulative scientific-technological value of our accomplishments far exceeds that of the Soviet Union.

Nevertheless, we cannot ignore nor underestimate the psychological impact which Russian firsts in space have had upon the minds of the world.

Regrettably, the U.S. timetable has run only a short distance behind Communist launchings. After the first sputnik, for example, we shortly orbited not one, but many satellites—now outnumbering the Soviets by about 40 to 15.

Recently, the Soviets reportedly orbited the first man in space. Now, we have successfully conducted a suborbital flight.

With such a relatively short lag in timing, it would appear that by only a slight speedup of our program we could demonstrate to the world that we can accomplish space feats not only equal to and greater—but also faster—than the Soviet Union.

The question is not: Will we do these things? Rather, the issue is: When will we do them?

Will we do them before or after the Soviets? In my judgment, we should do it before.

We recognize, of course, that space feats are basically scientific-technological military accomplishments rather than weapons of propaganda warfare.

Nevertheless, we cannot ignore the tremendous psychological impact which Soviet triumphs have had upon the world.

The task now is to first, predetermine the next major accomplishments in space; and second, as possible, set up the timetable so that the United States can get the maximum benefit not only from the accomplishments themselves, but also from the great psychological impact of firsts in the space race.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business, for the purpose of consideration of some of the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

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

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

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

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any reports of committees?

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, I ask that the nomination of Julius C. Holmes and the nomination of Harold C. Doyle be passed over, and that the remaining nominations on the calendar be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations will be stated as requested.

U.S. ATTORNEY

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of James B. Brennan, of Wisconsin, to be U.S. attorney for the eastern district of Wisconsin for a term of 4 years.

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

U.S. MARSHALS

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of U.S. marshals.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that these nominations be considered en bloc.

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

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

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

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. METCALF. 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.

COMDR. ALAN B. SHEPARD, JR., AND HIS FELLOW ASTRONAUTS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, on behalf of the distinguished minority leader, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN]; the distinguished minority whip, the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL]; the distinguished majority whip, the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY]; and myself, and, I am quite certain, all the other Members of the Senate, I submit and send to the desk a resolution for which I request immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be read.

The resolution (S. Res. 140) was read, as follows:

Whereas Commander Alan B. Shepard, together with the six other astronauts originally trained in the United States demonstrated with their great courage, dedication, skill and perseverance in the arduous preparation for flight into space; and

Whereas the first flight of an American into space was made successfully by Commander Alan B. Shepard, Junior, United States Navy, in his flight from Cape Canaveral, Florida, on May 5, 1961, in the spacecraft "Freedom 7" propelled by a Redstone rocket; and

Whereas by the courage, skill, perseverance and devotion to duty exhibited by Commander Shepard in that flight, therefore, he has earned the admiration of all Americans; and

Whereas by his successful flight, Commander Shepard has personified the determination and capacity of the United States with respect to the exploration of space for peaceful purposes: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate hereby extends to Commander Alan B. Shepard, Junior, United States Navy, its greetings and felicitations, and its highest commendation for the invaluable contribution made by him to the Nation and to the science of space exploration by man through his historic flight into space.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Senate is directed to transmit to Commander Shepard a copy of this resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the resolution?

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

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the successful completion of the first manned flight into outer space by an American astronaut, Commander Shepard, is an event of great moment. In the scientific and technical sense, it represents an important stride in the exploration of outer space. In the realm of the human spirit, it symbolizes the unending challenge of the unknown. Some have wondered what makes a man want to stake his life on a rocket ride. The answer is simple. Outer space is like the mountain. Men take the risk because it is there.

It is fitting that the rocket should have been named "Freedom VII," for this was the first flight into space by a freeman. It was the first and the only manned space flight which was freely observed and freely reported. It was an important step toward maintaining both freedom in outer space and earthly freedom affected by the use of outer space. This is the ultimate meaning of the flight of Commander Shepard, and of our efforts as a nation in the field of space exploration.

We could also do with less talk about prestige, Mr. President, and a better understanding of the significance of space exploration for our way of life. With respect to freedom of international communication, for example, within a matter of several years we are likely to be confronted with one of the most amazing opportunities as well as one of the most serious problems in history.

By means of satellite relay, it will be possible to transmit to every corner of the globe a single television program which will be made understandable everywhere through simultaneous translation. Think of it. Yet think also of the consequences if the global television system is controlled by forces hostile to our way of life.

Equally significant for the future of freedom is the implication of space exploration with respect to the natural phenomenon of weather. Freemen have

a vital stake in the meteorological use of outer space in the years ahead.

These are only two illustrations of the importance of space exploration for the future of freedom. There are many others, and many more to come. After all, who would have dared, even a few years ago, to imagine that in 1961 the first man in the history of man should have been delivered beyond the gravitational field of this planet and safely returned to earth.

We can be grateful for the labor of all who made it possible for Commander Shepard to make the first successful freedom flight. To all of the scientists, administrative personnel, craftsmen, and tradesmen, and to the thousands who participated in the air and naval operation on the day of the flight, we express our appreciation. To the hundreds of newspaper, radio, and television reporters and technicians, as well as to the papers and stations, we express appreciation for their excellent service in communicating this momentous happening. Those in Congress and in the executive branch who have contributed to the development of the space program can also take satisfaction for their part in making the program a success.

Finally, Mr. President, every American has contributed to the space program and to the flight of Freedom VII, and I join them in saying to America's No. 1 astronaut: Well done, Comdr. Alan Shepard.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that copies of the resolution in behalf of Commander Shepard be forwarded by the Secretary of the Senate to the six other astronauts. They are, likewise, entitled to warmest recognition and congratulations. It was the luck of the draw which designated one of them, and we know they were all ready to do their duty had they been selected. The names of the others are Walter Marty Schirra, Jr., Donald Kent Slayton, Virgil I. Grissom, John H. Glenn, Jr., Leroy Gordon Cooper, Jr., and Malcolm S. Carpenter.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, about 200 years ago Peter the Great and his entourage were moving through Poland. Someone indicated there had been devised a new torture machine on which the human body could be broken. When Peter the Great asked that it be demonstrated, he was told that they had no one in prison on which to demonstrate it. Peter the Great then said:

> Take one of my entourage and break his body on it.

There we have an indication of what happens under a despotic and tyrannical government, where life has no dignity, often no value, in sharp contrast to what happens in a free country.

Sometime early last year seven young men appeared at my office. They were going to use my office briefly in anticipation of a modest reception in the old U.S. Supreme Court Chamber. They were the seven astronauts, including Comdr. Alan Shepard. I suggested we ought to have pictures taken. He said: "I am afraid it is against the rules." I said:

> We are in my office. It is private. If you do not mind, we will have the pictures taken.

How delighted I was, after the announcement came from Cape Canaveral, that the picture of the seven astronauts is still intact. May it always be intact. May all their flights be successful. But I point out that there is no law to compel a person to become an astronaut. There is nothing in the whole lexicon of our Government that requires a man to submit himself, whether he is in or out of the armed services. This is a voluntary matter with seven fine young Americans, who are willing to take the hazards and risks which are involved for the purpose of advancing the cause of science and keeping the country in the forefront of scientific achievement.

So today, as we salute a very notable exploit, we salute also the atmosphere of freedom in which it was encompassed, the greatest moral climate, which summons up all the courage, all the sense of risk, all the talents of which human beings are capable in the cause of their country.

Today we salute the astronauts and also the great gospel of freedom.

Mr. COTTON. On this day, when the Congress and the country honor the American astronaut from New Hampshire, I ask for myself and my colleague [Mr. BRIDGES] that an editorial published in the Manchester, N.H., Union-Leader be printed in the RECORD.

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

ALAN B. SHEPARD, JR., NEW HAMPSHIRE, FIRST IN SPACE (MAY 5, 1961)

Today even the Great Stone Face wears a smile because by the grace of God, the courage of a New Hampshire boy and the skill of American scientists, the United States became the first Nation to put a man in outer space.

This newspaper will never recognize the Soviet claim to have put a man in space as any more than the everlasting Communist lie. The Communists knew this Nation was about to put a man into space, so they staged their fake performance in order to try to maintain their reputation for always being first.

Today from Coos to the sea every New Hampshire man, woman, and child walks taller in the pride that it was a New Hampshire boy who rode in the space capsule, out from the murk and confusion of this world into the clear realm of outer space.

Above and belond the scientific achievement of this first man's space flight is to be remembered the sheer courage of Derry's Alan B. Shepard, Jr.

This was no buggyride to the local drug store for a sundae. One misplaced wire, one short circuit, one tiny thing gone wrong, and this would have been a one-way ride into eternity.

No one forced Alan Shepard to take this risk. He made his choice freely and consciously because of his love of country and his desire to put this Nation once again on the winning side.

This is the greatest of all human bravery. Men have, on occasion, impetuously dashed into a burning fire and performed a daring rescue, or in the heat of battle, stormed an enemy fortification in the face of almost impossible odds.

However, Alan Shepard's decision was a calm, cool, conscious choice in the tradition of his native State's motto, "Live Free or Die."

WILLIAM LOEB,
Publisher.

Mr. COTTON. To quote the editorial:

> Today, from Coos to the sea every New Hampshire man, woman, and child walks taller in the pride that it was a New Hampshire boy who rode in the space capsule.

I am indeed proud today to have printed in the RECORD this editorial extolling the heroism and bravery of this son of New Hampshire, Comdr. Alan B. Shepard, Jr.

The editorial emphasizes a point well made today in the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Illinois, the minority leader [Mr. DIRKSEN].

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I wish to add my word to what my distinguished colleague from New Hampshire has said about Commander Shepard. It is a very happy day for America. It was a wonderful day on Friday, when the prestige of America rode with Commander Shepard in his Mercury capsule. His accomplishment has added greatly to the standing and prestige of this country in the whole free world. We are proud that America has done it. My colleagues and I are doubly proud that Commander Shepard is from New Hampshire; that he is not only a typical American, but a typical New Hampshire boy. I have known his mother and father and his whole family for a long period of years. They are very fine citizens of our State. We share the great pride of New Hampshire with the whole Nation today.

Mr. LONG of Hawaii. Mr. President, last Friday, when it was announced to the world that the United States had put a man into outer space, I was attending a meeting of the board of directors of Lions International in Louisville, Ky. This announcement made a deep impression on the members of the board, who within minutes adopted a congratulatory statement.

I ask unanimous consent that that statement be inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, as I believe it expresses the joy, hope, and aspirations of the American people in eloquent language.

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

> The 625,000 members of Lions International from 111 nations and geographical locations of the free world, through appropriate action of its international board of directors, convened in Louisville, Ky., express their joyful congratulations to the first American astronaut, Alan B. Shepard, Jr., upon the successful completion of the first space entry and return flight on Friday, May 5, 1961.
>
> It is our sincere hope and prayer, that this feat may redound to the true cause of universal peace, rather than as an adjunct to human destruction—To this end we in-

voke the enternal and merciful benediction of Almighty God.

Given under the seal of Lions International and the signature of its international president, this 5th day of May, in the year of our Lord, 1961.

FINIS E. DAVIS,
International President.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, as a member of the Committee on Armed Services since its inception and as a member of the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences, I wish to join in congratulating Commander Shepard and all those who are associated with him in the tremendous accomplishment about which we have read in the last week. We have heard much discussion on this subject with relation to the peace value of space, with relation to the military value of space; the prospective uses both for peacetime progress and in wartime activity. We have just witnessed a wonderful accomplishment.

We ought now to go forward with that endeavor and follow up with other accomplishments on the path on which Commander Shepard has so ably led the way.

I believe the six other members of the astronaut group who did not ascend at this time, but who will certainly achieve some future accomplishments in space, should be joined in our congratulatory speeches today. I join with all others who are proud of the accomplishment of Commander Shepard and what it means to the future of our country and to peace in the world.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, today we are all joining in our salutes to Commander Shepard for his stupendous achievement. I was privileged to meet the commander a few minutes ago at the reception. I said to him:

You said, "Man, what a ride." We say, "Commander, What a man."

But with all of our salutes to Commander Shepard for his accomplishment and what it has meant to the free world, we should recognize also that it is the culmination of efforts of many other people, and that he himself has been backstopped by other astronauts who have gone through a demanding period of training. It was my privilege a short while ago to visit with one of the other astronauts, Colonel Glenn, who was a stand-in for Commander Shepard. I was impressed by Colonel Glenn as, I am sure, I would have been by Commander Shepard's other associates.

Every first team is supported by the second string. For every star in a victory there are those who work with the star to make his accomplishments possible. I ask unanimous consent, therefore, that immediately following my remarks there be listed the names, ranks, and immediate past assignments of the other astronauts.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. YOUNG of Ohio in the Chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

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

Alan B. Shepard, Jr., commander, U.S. Navy; project test pilot for Navy F-5D Skylancer and instructor of test pilots.

John H. Glenn, Jr., lieutenant colonel, U.S. Marine Corps, Fighter Design Branch, Naval Bureau of Aeronautics, Washington.

Virgil I. Grissom, captain, U.S. Air Force; test pilot, Wright pilot fighter.

Malcolm S. Carpenter, lieutenant commander, U.S. Navy; air intelligence officer, U.S.S. *Hornet*, antisubmarine warfare aircraft carrier.

Leroy G. Cooper, Jr., captain, U.S. Air Force; aeronautical engineer and test pilot, Edwards Air Force Base.

Walter M. Schirra, Jr., lieutenant commander, U.S. Navy; suitability development work on the F-4H aircraft, Patuxent Naval Air Station.

Donald K. Slayton, major, U.S. Air Force; Chief, Fighter Test Section, Edwards Air Force Base.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, I wish to associate myself with the statement made by the majority leader, MIKE MANSFIELD, in commendation of America's first astronaut, Cmdr. Alan Shepard.

This single feat of heroism, courage, and technology has put America back into the race for the conquest of space, and I certainly hope that it presages many "firsts" for this country's space effort.

I was privileged to be at Cape Canaveral as a member of the Aeronautics and Space Sciences Committee and had occasion to watch this historic mission which was so successfully accomplished by Alan Shepard. I am equally impressed with the teamwork that I saw at Cape Canaveral, where the best of American engineering, science, and technical leadership was fused into one challenging and all-important mission.

This important success could mean much to America's future in space and to the millions of people who have historically looked to this country for scientific and technical leadership.

I salute Commander Shepard, each of the other astronauts, and every member of our space program who made this historic achievement possible.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, we of the U.S. Senate, today, have been privileged to be close to greatness.

It is the greatness of Comdr. Alan B. Shepard, boy of New England and hero of America, our first man in space.

It is the greatness of his fellow astronauts, all eager to be on with the still long and challenging problems and perils of space.

It is the greatness of the team of unsung aids—the scientists and all the myriad of major and minor workers who make this historic achievement possible.

No, I will not say unsung, for modest Alan Shepard was the first to salute them and thank them for their invaluable part in this prestige performance.

In a sense, too, we have been privileged to be close to the American home of sacrifice as wife and parents of Alan Shepard symbolize the spirit of our common service—patriotism with an implicit trust in God.

Thus is written a golden page in the human history of our country. It is the power and persistence of the mind that makes such a feat practicable. It is the courage of the free heart that makes its accomplishment possible. It is the sincerity of the American spirit that dedicates its discoveries to the peaceful purposes of all mankind.

All America salutes its son: Comdr. Alan B. Shepard.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I associate myself with the remarks of the distinguished Senators who have commended Comdr. Alan Shepard. I believe the other six astronauts, who were fully trained and were standing by, should also be honored on this day when we honor this American who has written a new chapter in the human race.

Commander Shepard's achievement far exceeds the achievement of Columbus and far exceeds any other exploration in history, because others moved in the environment of man, and Commander Shepard, with the help of scientists and the resources of the American Government, has moved out of man's natural environment.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, all of us were proud today to participate in welcoming to Washington Lt. Cmdr. Alan B. Shepard and his courageous fellow astronauts. We salute each of these men for his part in the great drama which culminated in last Friday's thrilling space shot.

It is also a magnificent and eloquent testimonial to our scientists who got such a late start in this field and have made such giant strides in a relatively short time. But of more immediate importance, we commend Commander Shepard for his courage and voluntary willingness to risk his life in this great cause.

It is wonderful that he and the other astronauts have been greeted with such warmth and enthusiasm in Washington today. He has been received and congratulated by the President, by Members of Congress, by military leaders, and by world statesmen. This is all fitting and fully deserved.

But the ultimate in American welcome, the summit of American applause, apparently may be denied this great national hero. At the present time, a ruling has been made that Commander Shepard and the other astronauts will not be permitted a traditional heroes ticker-tape parade in New York City.

That city has officially extended an invitation for such a parade and the people of the city are waiting with open arms to extend their felicitations.

There is no question that the reception for Commander Shepard would outdo even that accorded Charles Lindbergh in 1927.

I recognize, of course, that it may be found necessary for these men to return at once to their important man-in-space mission. We must not in any way interfere with progress in that field.

But I would hope it will be possible, within the limits of national security requirements, for this great event to be

authorized at some time in the near future. It must be remembered that although Commander Shepard is from the Northeast, as has been brought out by the distinguished Senators from New Hampshire, he is a national hero, fully qualified for this traditional national welcome.

I have, therefore, sent a telegram to President Kennedy, asking him to reconsider the veto on the New York ticker-tape parade, so long as such an event would not unduly threaten the national interest in our man-in-space effort.

MILWAUKEE SENTINEL'S EXCELLENT EDITORIAL ON FIRST FREEDOM SPACE FLIGHT

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an excellent editorial from the Milwaukee Sentinel of May 6 appraising the great significance of Commander Shepard's space flight be printed in the RECORD.

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

FREEDOM TRIUMPH

Much more than a test pilot's cool courage accompanied our first spaceman on his thrilling and historic journey.

Riding with Comdr. Alan B. Shepard, Jr., in the freedom capsule were the prestige of the United States, the prayers of his fellow Americans and the good will of the free world.

This is why the success of our first man-in-space venture produced throughout all our country a great wave of elation.

"What a beautiful view," Commander Shepard exclaimed, as the capsule was climbing across the threshold of space.

"What a beautiful feeling," we here on earth could echo as the parachutes lowered him to the ocean 302 miles from Canaveral.

It is a justified elation in more ways than one.

It puts us back in the space race with the Russians.

It is true that we have yet to orbit a man around the globe. But Commander Shepard's achievement is a certain portent that we will.

This was the essential breakthrough. This was the triumph that took us out of zero in the astronaut space score.

In contrast to the secrecy with which the Russians surround their space efforts—proclaiming only those that succeed—our first spaceman attempt was announced far in advance.

It was performed in the open before the press of the world, including the Soviet Union.

If it had failed, it would have failed in the open.

Commander Shepard literally rode a freedom capsule.

Our congratulations to him and to all the hundreds of men whose intelligence, sacrifice, perseverance and dedication made his exploit possible.

We don't want to labor a lesson. But those are the qualities all of us need in the relentless cold war contest with the Russians—and if we show them, we shall win.

Mr. MUNDT obtained the floor.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield briefly?

Mr. MUNDT. If I may have assurance, Mr. President, that I shall have the floor after yielding, I shall be glad to do so.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from South Dakota may yield to me without losing his right to the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, has the resolution been agreed to?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution has not been agreed to.

Does the Senator desire to address a motion to the Chair?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the resolution be agreed to.

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

The resolution (S. Res. 140) was agreed to unanimously.

The preamble was agreed to.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the time yielded by the Senator from South Dakota not be taken from the time allotted to him.

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

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I was indeed glad to yield for the purpose the Senator had in mind. I had hoped the resolution would be agreed to. I wish to speak about the event which gave rise to the resolution.

AUTHORIZATION OF SPECIAL MEDAL IN HONOR OF THE GALLANT AND COURAGEOUS SERVICE OF COMDR. ALAN B. SHEPARD, JR.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, Friday, May 5, 1961, will go down in history as a bright page for American freedom. Before the entire world, our Nation "put the chips on the table," so to speak, in scheduling and succeeding with the shot which carried Comdr. Alan B. Shepard, Jr., to the space frontier. I am certainly happy to be among those present and voting for the congratulatory resolution which the Senate has just adopted.

The scientific achievement of the Project Mercury success of this past weekend cannot be minimized. This was a tremendous and historic accomplishment.

However, it seems to me that even more important than the scientific and technological breakthrough achieved is that in this vital experiment we have once again demonstrated the strength and character of our people and one of the foremost reasons why a free society such as ours can fulfill the best hopes of mankind.

Comdr. Alan B. Shepard, Jr., measures up to all that we would hope to achieve in a citizenry dedicated to the preservation of freedom. His courage and fortitude in undertaking this hazardous assignment—for which he volunteered—is in the best traditions of our history in which American heroes have met and overcome tests and assignments under the most difficult of circumstances.

It is indeed fitting that today Congress should adopt a resolution congratulating Commander Shepard for his heroism. As I have stated, it is proper indeed that a measure paying tribute to Commander Shepard should pass both Houses of Congress today but it seems to me, Mr. President, we should do more than this in order to appropriately signalize this achievement and in order to establish proper recognition of the heroism displayed by Commander Shepard and by the other astronauts.

In view of that I believe it is fitting and proper we should do more than congratulate Alan Shepard, I feel that we should award to Commander Shepard a special medal for his achievement, which is deserving of the highest recognition. It clearly ranks as high in history as the memorable solo flight of Charles Lindbergh in the *Spirit of St. Louis*. Today, on behalf of myself and the two Senators from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES and Mr. COTTON], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a joint resolution authorizing a special medal in honor of the gallant and courageous service of New Hampshire's distinguished son, Commander Shepard, and I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be printed in the RECORD.

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

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 80) to authorize the President of the United States to present a medal to Comdr. Alan B. Shepard, Jr., introduced by Mr. MUNDT (for himself, Mr. BRIDGES, and Mr. COTTON), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two-thirds of each House concurring therein), That, in recognition of the gallant and courageous service rendered by Commander Alan B. Shepard, Junior, U.S. Navy, in piloting the first United States manned flight into space, and in recognition of the fortitude, dedication and perseverance exhibited by him during his preparation for and execution of this epic achievement in the history of American scientific endeavor, the President of the United States is authorized to present to Commander Alan B. Shepard, Junior, in the name of Congress, an appropriate gold medal. For such purpose, the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to cause to be struck a gold medal with suitable emblems, devices, and inscriptions to be determined by the Secretary. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of $5,000 for this purpose.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to a concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 296) commending Comdr. Alan B. Shepard, Jr., for his outstanding achievement in flight into space, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

FLIGHT OF FREEDOM VII—TRIBUTE TO COMDR. ALAN B. SHEPARD, JR.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, I request unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of House Concurrent Resolution 296, just received from the House.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be read, for the information of the Senate.

The resolution (H. Con. Res. 296) was read, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Congress hereby commends Commander Alan B. Shepard, Junior, U.S. Navy, of Derry, New Hampshire, for his outstanding achievement and the courage and skill displayed by him in his flight into space on May 5, 1961, in the Mercury capsule known as Freedom 7.

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

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the concurrent resolution.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, today, both the House and the Senate have adopted resolutions paying tribute to Comdr. Alan B. Shepard, Jr.

It is my hope, and I am certain it will be fulfilled, that the House concurrent resolution will be adopted unanimously by the Senate.

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

The concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 296) was unanimously agreed to.

JOHN BIRCH SOCIETY

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, last Friday the U.S. Chamber of Commerce concluded its week-long national meeting in Washington. What I have to say this morning I had hoped to say on the floor of the Senate on Friday, but because the Senate was not in session then, it has been delayed until this morning.

What I wish to call to the attention of Members of the Senate is the selection of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce as the recipient of the wrath and the condemnation of the organization known as the John Birch Society.

President Eisenhower, Chief Justice Warren, Allen Dulles, the late John Foster Dulles, as well as distinguished Members of this body, have been attacked by this organization. The U.S. Chamber of Commerce now joins those ranks.

Quite recently I obtained a copy of the Birch Society's so-called White Book. It is an accumulation of their once-a-month publications that the society circulates to all of its members. It buttresses two other manuscripts, the secret, or semisecret, "Politician," written by Robert Welch himself, and the Blue Book, the official organizational manual for the society. The White Book, now available to all who are willing to pay the price, discloses in its May 1960 bulletin, at pages 10, 11, and 12, its position, or the position of its leader, Robert Welch, on the U.S. Chamber of Commerce.

I shall only skip read, in order to save time, and I ask unanimous consent that the full paging on the U.S. Chamber of Commerce be included in the RECORD following these remarks.

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

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. McGEE. What it says is that the U.S. Chamber of Commerce—I am now quoting from the John Birch Society White Book:

Is now offering a course in practical politics for business people all over the United States. * * * We can't help wondering whether or not the Lenin Institute in Moscow is now giving courses for the U.S. Chamber of Commerce.

It goes on to suggest that what the society must do, and what they must urge the Chamber of Commerce of the United States to do, is "To publicize and eliminate any Socialist teachings or pro-Communist slant" political courses.

Finally, the suggestion is made, in the tract, that "if the leftists have permeated the staff of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce to the extent indicated—or purposely been placed on that staff during the recent liberal administration—the informed and patriotic members of the American business community still do not have to take it lying down."

It seems to me the attack on the U.S. Chamber of Commerce by the Birch Society speaks for itself.

EXHIBIT 1

[From May 1, 1960, Bulletin of John Birch Society]

The U.S. Chamber of Commerce is now offering a course in "Practical Politics" for business people all over the United States. It is also offering a course in "Free Enterprise and the American Way of Life," to plant foremen. And we can't help wondering whether or not the Lenin Institute in Moscow is now giving courses, for teachers who are later expected to give courses to Americans, on the American way of life.

For the reports that have come to us indicate that, under the guise of practical politics, the lesson being insistently hammered into the heads of the businessmen is that: (1) The important thing is for them to win elections; (2) a liberal and internationalist has a far better chance of winning any election in America today than a conservative and isolationist; and (3) that therefore the American businessmen should pick liberals as their candidates and become active in promoting the winning campaigns of such liberals for election. Maybe this line did not come directly out of Moscow—or maybe it did. But at any rate, Moscow certainly could not find a better one for promoting its indoctrination of American business and community leaders with ideas that serve its purpose.

As to the course for foremen, at least one teacher of these courses—and apparently a typical one—has stated that: First, we must forget about communism, because this is not our problem; second, the current trend to socialism is not due to Communist influences, but to other faults, especially in our educational system; third, our country exploited Japan by not paying the Japanese enough for their silk, and exploited Mexico by using up its oil resources; fourth, our marines have been sent into countries to put down uprisings against ruling regimes solely because those regimes were friendly to this country; fifth, the money we have collected on tariffs should all be sent back to the countries on which the tariffs were paid, to subsidize the workers in those countries and bring their standards of living up to ours; sixth, our country was a young nation, which lacked understanding, but is now showing signs of growing up and assuming its proper responsibilities. These are the beliefs—or the pretended beliefs—please note, of a man who is teaching free enterprise to plant foremen, on behalf of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States.

We urge every businessman and every foreman, who is a member of the John Birch Society, to go to one or both of these courses if possible, and to do everything he can to find out for himself—and document with notes made during or immediately after the meetings—just what is being taught and what general doctrines are being subtly and insidiously advanced. Then go to work through your local chamber of commerce, through the national chamber if you are a member, through your fellow businessmen and foremen, and through every practicable means and channel, to publicize and eliminate any Socialist teachings or pro-Communist slant that you find in the U.S. Chamber courses; and to identify, and have the chamber get rid of, those who have been responsible for such un-American propaganda.

After seeing what has happened to the National Council of Churches, after seeing the kind of leadership the American Bar Association has recently been willing to accept, and after seeing the infiltration or seizure by leftwing forces of so many solid, old American organizations which should have remained among our strongest bulwarks against the collective advance, we are no longer surprised at anything. But lack of surprise should not mean complacency. If the leftists have permeated the staff of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce to the extent indicated—or purposely been placed on that staff during the recent liberal administration—the informed and patriotic members of the American business community still do not have to take it lying down. And those who will stand up and fight now, in any particular community, will find that they are not alone but have allies doing the same in a great many other places as well. Such coordination is one of the primary functions of the John Birch Society in general, and of this part of this bulletin in particular.

BUDGET DIRECTOR BELL DEFENDS ADMINISTRATION'S FISCAL POLICIES

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I have just received a letter from the Budget Director, Mr. David Bell, setting forth with somewhat more precision than previously the economic policy position of the administration.

Because of the significance of Mr. Bell's reply, I ask unanimous consent that his response and my questions provoking his response be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

Senator PROXMIRE. On page 11 of your statement, at the end of the third paragraph, you say, "The relevant criterion in

determining the desirability of a proposed use of resources for a public purpose is its value to the country in comparison to the value of using the same resources for other purposes, public or private."

It seems to me that this statement raises an enormously important philosophical question. The statement seems to imply that there should not be a presumption, and a strong presumption, on the side of using resources for private rather than public purposes. I feel that in a system of freedom, the presumption should always be clearly and emphatically on the side of freedom as compared with public action. At the same time, I have been perfectly ready and willing to vote and work and speak for public action where I think the case can be clearly made. Nevertheless, the presumption, in my judgment, in our free, private enterprise system, should be on the side of private use of resources.

Does your statement on page 11, as quoted, contradict this viewpoint and mean that there is in your administration's view no presumption on the side of private, as compared with public, use of resources?

Budget Director BELL. I agree entirely that in our free, private enterprise system, the presumption should be on the side of private use of resources. Only where, as you say, "the case can be clearly made," should public action be undertaken—or, as my statement said, where the desirability of a proposed use of resources for a public purpose clearly exceeds the value of using the same resources for private purposes.

Senator PROXMIRE. On page 10 of the "Details in Support of the Statement of the Director of the Bureau of the Budget," in discussing budget changes under "Agriculture and agricultural resources," you say in part, "The largest increases are $225 million in Commodity Credit Corporation expenditures under the new feed grain legislation * * *."

This surprises me, since the Secretary of Agriculture came before the Senate Agriculture and Forestry Committee, of which I am a member, and contended that the new feed grain bill would save hundreds of millions of dollars. The Senate Agriculture Committee was convinced that this legislation would conserve roughly $500 million in obligations that would otherwise be incurred by the CCC. Members of the Senate Agriculture Committee so stated in our report to the Senate on the feed grain bill. This is one of the reasons, and one of the most important reasons, why the feed grain bill was passed.

It is easy to understand why this saving would not be realized for a period of years. In fact, the Secretary was at pains to explain that this saving would be realized over a period of perhaps as much as 10 years. At the same time, it is very difficult to understand why this particular legislation should have resulted in an immediate increase of $225 million in CCC spending. Can you give me an explanation of this?

Budget Director BELL. The increase of $225 million in Commodity Credit Corporation expenditures in 1961 results from the provision in the feed grain legislation which authorizes up to a 50 percent partial payment to producers in advance of determination of performance. Under this authorization, the Department of Agriculture will make such advance payment to the producer as soon as he signifies that he will cooperate in the program. However, it is expected that these payments will be offset in later years, as you suggest.

Senator PROXMIRE. On pages 13 and 14 of your principal statement, you argue for compensatory spending and retrenchment designed to stabilize the economy by expanding public spending in a slack time, and contracting it in flush periods.

You give several specific examples of expenditures which should not be so adjusted. Defense is one, enforcement activity is a second. No examples were given of governmental activities which are subject to speeding up and slowing down. I would appreciate it very much if you could supply me with specific governmental work which can be regulated this way, and if you could give me the approximate time between (a) a Presidential decision and time job-providing activities could actually begin; (b) a congressional decision and the time actual work would begin on the job.

I note that your statement does not contend that this governmental activity should depend upon economic forecasting. It does indicate that this governmental activity should be based on the actual economic conditions existing at a particular time. Although I consider the course you take in your statement the wisest, as I have little faith in economic forecasting, still it seems to me that there must necessarily be at least an element of economic forecasting involved unless you can show that substantial projects can be put into effect almost instantaneously.

Would it not be better to strengthen our automatic spending and revenue stabilizers such as unemployment compensation and income taxes, rather than to time governmental purchasing and hiring on the feeble and uncertain reed of economic prediction?

Also, you state on page 14 of your principal statement, "But steps to speed up public expenditure programs must always be taken with due care, lest waste and inefficiency result." Can you give me examples of specific public expenditure programs which can in fact be speeded up or slowed down without significant waste or inefficiency from the standpoint either of requiring additional spending or postponing a needed service?

Budget Director BELL. Several interrelated questions are asked here. It might be well to begin an answer by noting, as pointed out in my statement, that the increase or decrease of Federal expenditure programs for the purpose of offsetting business cycle movements can be accomplished only within limits. And such actions should be carefully evaluated to assure that they will not result in waste or inefficiency. The magnitude of the desired adjustments depends in part on the economic conditions at the time in question. Moreover, whether the timing of an activity could be properly adjusted would depend on a variety of circumstances, including the state of agency planning and programing, the extent to which agency programs have been retarded by lack of funds, and the availability of financing at the particular time when the adjustment is required. Examples of activities cannot be given merely by citing certain general classes or types of Government operations. However, some of the experience this year can be specifically cited.

First, some actions which were taken administratively, within available funds, are (1) the speedup in payments of veterans' life insurance dividends and of tax refunds, (2) the expansion and improvement of surplus food distribution to the needy, and (3) the acceleration of farm housing and direct veterans' housing loans (including speedier processing of applications on hand partly by shifting assignments of agency personnel) from funds already authorized. Moreover, in February, the President requested each Federal department and agency to review its procurement and construction plans for the remainder of fiscal year 1961 with a view toward speeding up contracts and purchases within available funds. The purpose of the speedup was to stimulate employment and production as quickly as possible without adding to the total of Federal expenditures. Agency plans reported under this directive indicated an increase of $660 million in obligations and $247 million in expenditures by June 30, over previous anticipations. Roughly one-quarter of this amount involves such defense activities as procurement of common supply items, and repair, rehabilitation, and modernization of existing physical plant. Other examples of speedups within available funds include cleaning, repair, improvement, and construction of public buildings, work on natural resources by the Corps of Engineers and the Department of the Interior, and construction under the Federal Aviation Agency and the Public Health Service.

Thus, it was found possible to plan to shift some procurement and construction forward, with a sizable expected acceleration within weeks of the President's directive. It might be argued that these actions would serve only to defer or delay the economic problem. However, there can be no question that the Government action was aimed at providing a stimulus during a period when private demands were weak, and that the private sectors of the economy might—partly as a result of the Government action—show greater strength later.

Some expenditure changes, of course, require legislative action, either in the form of new legislation or increased appropriations. With respect to new legislation (and the necessary appropriations therefor), programs such as temporary extended unemployment compensation can and will have a substantial impact within a very short time of congressional decision.

Also, the expansion of certain types of continuing work for which increased appropriations might be required, such as small public works projects, various types of resource conservation, and repairs and renovations of public buildings, can result in job-providing opportunities within a few weeks to 3 months.

In somewhat more detail, specific examples of small projects which it might be possible to start quickly and complete within a relatively short time are:

Small water resource projects such as the Corps of Engineers levees, channel improvements, other local flood protection works, and navigation and flood control works; and watershed protection projects in the Department of Agriculture's program.

Roads, trails, and small structures (such as visitor centers, recreational facilities, public convenience facilities, miscellaneous utilities, fire towers) needed in national parks and forests, and on public and Indian lands.

Small buildings such as border and customs stations, warehouses, Coast Guard stations, fish hatcheries, wildlife refuges, and other facilities.

Resource conservation work, such as reforestation, timber stand improvement, reseeding, and range improvements.

To be put underway quickly, projects should be already authorized, thus requiring only appropriations to start them. As previously noted, for most rapid impact, they should be small projects, which would require little advance planning, on which contracts can be let quickly, and which can be completed within a year or 18 months. If it were the case that early construction of such projects brought them to completion before they were needed, some waste—idleness or underuse of facilities—would result. However, in the great majority of instances, needs are urgent and even the requests for authorization of construction are typically not made until the need is in existence. For example, requests for authorization of public

buildings usually are made only after various makeshift arrangements, including space rentals, have been resorted to. In such instances, it is possible to effect the expansion of Government activities without any waste or inefficiency.

Larger public works projects, requiring a considerable amount of advance planning and several years to complete, do not have a similar degree of short-run flexibility. Once started, they can be speeded up or slowed down only within narrow limits, and they should progress at economic rates if waste is to be prevented. On the other hand, such projects are usually not scheduled for a start until the need for the project is obvious and pressing, and after a long period of planning and negotiation. If it is possible to hasten the beginning of actual construction on these projects by speeding up the planning and negotiation stage, no waste or inefficiency should result.

In the case of procurement, it is true that, to the extent that supplies are bought and warehoused in advance of actual need, a form of waste is involved. Even here, however, there is usually some flexibility in warehouse use so that the only waste is an imputed one—the interest cost of funds spent earlier than they would normally have been spent.

It is true, as you suggest, that some economic forecasting is inevitably involved in arriving at judgments regarding a change in the timing or magnitude of governmental activities for contracyclical reasons. I agree that such forecasting necessarily involves uncertainties. However, as the Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers noted in his testimony before the Joint Economic Committee in March, the timelag problem in attempting to vary or adjust certain programs for economic reasons is less serious at present than in any of the other postwar recessions, since we are now faced not only with a cyclical situation but also with the problem of persistent economic slack. Our current problem is not only to promote economic recovery from the recession, but to foster a higher rate of economic growth. Thus there is now less risk that Government actions will be effective too late or will add to inflationary pressures.

Our automatic spending and revenue stabilizers are certainly important contributors to economic stability and steps can and should be taken to strengthen them. As you know, the President has indicated that he will suggest improvements in the permanent unemployment compensation system to increase its effectiveness. However, I doubt that we can or should place complete reliance on automatic stabilizers to the exclusion of discretionary (legislative and administrative) actions in times of recession or inflationary boom. Even relying on automatic stabilizers involves an implied forecast and policy decision—a decision that the degree of effect of the automatic stabilizers will be just right for the situation.

Senator PROXMIRE. On page 15 of your principal statement you argue for an increase in taxes in wartime for economic stabilization purposes. I think almost everyone would concur with that position. Also, it seems to me that there would be no problem in persuading many that it would be wise to reduce taxes when the war is over. With the exception of war periods however, it would seem to me extremely dangerous to go much beyond the automatic stabilization impact of our progressive income taxes by raising and lowering income taxes in anticipation of an economic recession or an economic boom. In a period like the present for example, couldn't we possibly dig ourselves into a bottomless deficit pit?

Can you indicate to me how such a program would have affected the Treasury if it had been pursued between 1931 and 1940?

Budget Director BELL. I agree that there are dangers in raising or lowering income tax rates in anticipation of an economic recession or an economic boom. Certainly great care and consideration must be given in determining any course of discretionary stabilization policy, whether it be on the tax or expenditure side.

My point was threefold. First, the automatic stabilizers, while extremely useful, can and should at times be supplemented by certain governmental expenditure and/or tax actions as required by the then current and prospective economic situation. Because of the hazards in economic prediction and anticipation, the burden of proof and responsibility would have to be placed on those proposing the utilization of discretionary compensatory actions. I agree that wartime and postwar actions represent extreme cases, but they do indicate examples of the kind of situations I have in mind.

Second, as I stated, a major surge in private spending calls for an increase in tax rates, while a serious or prolonged decline in economic activity relative to the Nation's potential would call for a reduction in tax rates; such change would, as a practical matter, ordinarily be based on actuality rather than anticipations.

Third, over the longer run, tax and expenditure policies must be adjusted to assure that the economy is not being stabilized at levels far below full capacity.

Any attempt to analyze the impact of various kinds of possible changes in tax rates during the 1930's would at the very best be extremely hypothetical. Moreover, given the vast changes in the economy and in the Government tax and expenditure structure since that time, I do not think the conclusions which might be drawn would be particularly relevant to current and future periods.

In the present situation, given the limits on the use of monetary policy because of the current balance of payments situation, fiscal policy must play a greater role in promoting economic stability and growth. The economy has been operating at a level considerably below its capacity and we have had persistent and high unemployment. In such a situation, a well planned stimulus to economic recovery as well as Federal actions to foster longer run economic growth through tax and expenditure policy certainly need not place us in a bottomless deficit pit. Carefully designed and limited actions which succeed in generating recovery and growth toward full employment levels can easily result in increased total revenues and actually help us eliminate budget deficits which might otherwise be substantial and persistent.

Senator PROXMIRE. Your statement on page 16 of your principal remarks, "Now that the need for estimates of foreign exchange expenditures is more apparent, and Treasury and the Budget Bureau are taking steps to identify direct outlays for foreign goods and services, and as the President directed in his balance-of-payments message, these will be considered in making budgetary decisions," is very welcome.

Now, would it be possible for the Budget Bureau, perhaps in connection with the Treasury, to offer an alternative analysis of our balance-of-payments situation to correct some of the factors in the balance-of-payments equation to allow for the impact, direct and indirect, of governmental programs?

For example, currently the exports of the country greatly exceed imports. At the same time, it is well known that one reason for this is because of our very large foreign aid program. Much of what we ship overseas adds to our exports. It seems to me that this is a direct influence that could be easily segregated and indicated.

On the other hand, the purchases of American troops abroad unquestionably results in the export of American goods to satisfy the desire of American troops to buy American goods abroad. Is there any way this kind of indirect influence can be shown separately?

Budget Director BELL. In regard to your questions concerning the direct and indirect impact of governmental programs on the balance of payments, we are developing procedures to identify that portion of exports financed with Federal funds, and the amounts of Federal expenditures for foreign goods and services. The problems of identifying and quantifying the indirect effects of Government programs on the balance of payments are far greater and it probably will be impossible fully to analyze these effects.

For example, as to American troops abroad, we have rough estimates that approximately $250 million of U.S. goods were sold in PX's in fiscal year 1960. A large part of these goods are shipped abroad through military channels to U.S. warehouses, and are not reported as exports. As to troop expenditures in foreign economies for U.S. goods, we have no way of arriving at estimates of this indirect impact. It is unlikely, however, that the impact would be at all significant since most purchases of U.S. goods abroad would be through the PX system.

BIRTHDAY TRIBUTE TO HARRY S. TRUMAN

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, it is an honor to join with Americans everywhere in wishing happy birthday to one of the great men of our time—President Harry S. Truman.

We wish him well and hope for many more years of happiness and a full life for him and Mrs. Truman. We look forward to having the benefit, in Washington and throughout the country, of his wise counsel and experience.

Mr. President, last month the mural by Thomas Hart Benton, commemorating "Independence and the Opening of the West," was dedicated at the Truman Library in Independence, Mo. The main address was delivered by the Chief Justice of the United States, the Honorable Earl Warren.

This was an historic and moving occasion. I hope that all Americans will have the chance to view this impressive painting and to see the Truman Library in Independence, which honors the Presidency and one of our great Presidents.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the address delivered by Chief Justice Earl Warren at the dedication ceremonies of the mural by Thomas Hart Benton at the Truman Library at Independence, Mo., April 15, 1961, a description of the mural written by the artist, and an article from the Kansas City Star dated April 16, 1961, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

ADDRESS DELIVERED BY CHIEF JUSTICE WARREN AT PRESENTATION CEREMONIES OF MURAL DONE BY THOMAS HART BENTON FOR THE TRUMAN LIBRARY INSTITUTE, INDEPENDENCE, MO., APRIL 15, 1961

It was less than 4 years ago that we met to dedicate this Harry S. Truman Library to

its high mission of service to our people and to their democratic institutions.

In that short period of time it has passed successfully through the trials of initial organization and is now firmly established as an outstanding center of research in the history of our Government in the mid-20th century.

The Truman Library has already contributed significantly to an understanding by our people of the Office of the Presidency. It has helped to create a new appreciation of the nature of that great Office, its responsibilities, its powers and its limitations. The library has attracted scholars to an early and detailed examination of a critical period of American history while the facts are still fresh in the minds of living men. It has done much to enliven the interest of thousands of our young people in the history of our Nation—and in doing so it has demonstrated again that there is no more effective material for stimulating—and satisfying—that interest than the papers of our Presidents.

It is good that President Truman's papers should be rooted here in the ground from which they sprang—as are those of President Roosevelt and President Hoover, and as those of President Eisenhower soon will be, in their States. The Presidency binds together our whole people—from the East, the Far West, the Middle West, and the South—and what better reminder could we have of our basic national unity than the establishment of centers for the study of the Office of our Presidency in points as widely separated as Hyde Park, Palo Alto, Independence, and Abilene. It is good, too, because it reminds us that our strength comes not from our unity alone, but from the combination within our Union of a rich variety of vigorously divergent strains.

Independence, Mo.—and the man from Independence to whom this institution is dedicated—symbolize for all of us the energy, the vision, the sturdy self-reliance, and the love of liberty which opened up our western frontiers. It is to this same spirit that we must look today to keep our Nation in the forefront of man's race to conquer the new frontiers of our own dangerous and exciting age.

When America moved through the gateway of Independence, Mo., to meet the challenge of the Far West, President Truman's people were in the forefront of that historic caravan. And rare judgment they had, too, for his maternal grandfather, Simon Young, and his partners soon became the owners of what is now Sacramento, the capital city of California.

Thomas Hart Benton's "Independence and the Opening of the West" captures the full drama of the epic western movement of our Nation. It cannot fail to reach the minds and hearts of all who see it. It will help to stir the imagination and the vision of our young people with whom the future of our Nation rests, and turn their thoughts to our heroic history and to the values which made this country great.

In the late 1820's and the early 1830's when Independence was being settled, our country was an agricultural community of less than 13 million people. Today, we are a highly organized, complex society of 180 million. It is all too easy, in these circumstances, to forget those earlier days and the lessons which they teach us.

That was an heroic age, with many brilliant and hard-won victories. Its heroes were not necessarily statesmen or generals, but determined individual men and women who pressed westward in search of independence and opportunity for themselves and their children. Their victories were not won in great climactic battles, but in the daily surmounting of incredible hardships, privation, and personal danger. They had a great vision for the western country—and because they had a great vision great things were done. We must not lose that vision and that enthusiasm, for they are the stuff of which true patriotism is made and upon which a nation's future is built.

As our people come to visit the Truman Library, their eyes will fall first upon this great mural—and if they see it with eyes brightened by a knowledge of our own history every figure in it will have meaning for them and will help to build within their hearts a deep and abiding patriotism. The knowledge of our heroic past will open vistas for them into our future. It is upon the nurturing of this kind of patriotism in the hearts of our young people—a patriotism born of pride in the accomplishments of our past and faith in the future of our institutions—that the real security of our Nation depends.

Our Nation's progress has been based upon the faith of Americans in themselves; upon their belief in their own institutions founded upon a knowledge of how and why those institutions came into being; and upon their vision for the future. Upon our own faith, knowledge, and vision, and not upon the things we do or say because we hate or fear something or somebody, rest both the glory of our past and the hope of our future.

When our Nation came into being we were a few scattered colonies stretched along our eastern coast. We pushed out to the Alleghenies, to the Ohio, to the Mississippi and the Missouri. From Independence our driving, searching people struck out in three resistless streams to divergent parts of the then unknown West, possessed of a determined belief in their ability to create a good life for themselves, and seeking only the opportunity to try. Each of these successive waves of migration was inspired by courage, faith, and hope—never by fear. It has often been said of these pioneers that the timid never started and the weak died on the way.

This is the same country it was then, populated by the same stock. We have the same potential—we are still young. There is still room for unlimited development—and, for those who have the faith, for the satisfaction that comes from great accomplishment.

The mural which we dedicate today, depicting the expanse of the West and the courage of the men and women who conquered it, will inspire us all to face with courage and hope the great unexplored realms of matter, mind, and soul which spread before us. It will be a symbol to all of us of the spirit of our pioneer fathers who so successfully met the challenge of their time; and it will be a symbol, too, of the great President who came from that stock and who brought to the high councils of our Nation and of the world, the courage and vision of the West.

Independence and the Opening of the West

(By Thomas Hart Benton)

THE BACKGROUND

President Truman's hometown was settled by farmers in the late twenties and early thirties of the last century. No doubt, in the pioneer American way of the time, they were looking for a quiet haven beyond the elbow jostling of crowds. This is not what they got.

Independence became rapidly after its foundation a "jumping off" place for the West, a noisy, busy and somewhat turbulent frontier outfitting station. It mushroomed with blacksmith shops, wagon builders' and wheelwrights' sheds, stock traders' corrals, general stores, gun shops, grog shops, and makeshift hotels. Milling in the new town's streets were hunters, fur trappers of the high Rockies, fur merchants from St. Louis and eastward, Indians of adjacent areas, titled adventurers from cultured lands across the sea, soldiers, literary celebrities, Frenchmen, Germans, Mexicans, and above all profit seekers of every shade and degree of honesty looking to the Indian trade or further to the Spanish trade of Santa Fe and Chihuahua. When the Oregon country beckoned in the early 1840's the settlers poured through in one of the greatest migrations of history.

For something over three decades Independence funneled through its streets and shops most of the expansionist energy of America, which, accelerated by the Jefferson administration's purchase in 1803 of the vast tracts of Louisiana, began moving gropingly but irresistibly toward the shores of the Pacific Ocean. That Independence should exercise a prime function in this movement wast inevitable for, whether her founders knew it or not, they had established their town on ancient trails over which for centuries buffalo and deer had made their seasonal passings and over which, also for untold years, the Indians had marched their bartering and warmaking expeditions eastward and westward. Independence was located at a national takeoff point for the overland routes to the Southwest and the West.

Before English speaking peoples had reached the Mississippi, French and Spanish adventurers and hunters had discovered and used the relatively easy southwestward passages offered by the trails. After the accession of Louisiana, American explorers began probing them. Organized mercantile expeditions to New Mexico, Santa Fe, and Taos began passing, now and then, through or near the site of Independence. Coinciding with these movements, and a chief factor in forwarding the rapid growth of the town and in sustaining its historic functions, came the development of effective steamboating on the Missouri River. Westward travelers because of this could move easily to the very head of the Plains trails, so much more negotiable than those eastward. They could thus start the long part of the trek with fresh animals and sound wagons. So, set up at a strategic conjunction of river and trail and at a time when American urges westward were reaching to climactic proportions, it was given to Independence to play a first and major part in the continental destiny of the United States.

THE PAINTING

The mural painting, "Independence and the Opening of the West," has obviously a large theme. It is too large, in fact, for anything but generalized treatment in the space available. No specific events of written history are therefore represented nor any of the specific individuals of record. There were too many of both. In their place are symbolic figures, symbolic happenings, representing a multiplicity of real individuals and real events. For instance, your great-grandfather who went to the high western mountains and ought to be in the picture is not. Neither are his friends Kit Carson and Jim Bridger. In their place is a generalized hunter, trapper, and mountain man who stands for all three. The same goes for the other people and things shown.

In the area about and above the door are the chief opposing elements of the drama. Here are the Plains Indians, against the hunter and trapper, and the French "voyageur" and the permanent settler who finally dispossessed the Indians. The prospective settler represented is placed in the important position directly above the door because it was he, and she, who set the seal of accomplished fact on our continental destiny. Traders, explorers, hunters, and adventures marked the paths over which

destiny took its course but it was the settler who, in the end, was most consequential in establishing the United States we now know. All settlers, hunters, trappers, and traders of the West sooner or later came in direct contact with the Indians whose hunting lands they invaded.

The Indians adjacent to the the door are Pawnees. The Pawnees ranged from what is now Nebraska to the borders of present-day Oklahoma country. Their chief wealth was in horses and they were celebrated for their ability to steal them, from other Indians as well as from the whites.

Travelers of the Plains trails might well meet them first. They would be likely to appear friendly in the hope of picking up a little coffee or tobacco, and this is indicated by the offer of the pipe to the leader of the settlers' train which is coming to a halt for supper. The whites are suspicious as they usually were with Indians whose unpredictable behaviors, volatile temperaments, and ways of thinking they did not understand. Some justification of that suspicion is indicated by the Pawnee warrior, in the foreground to the left of the door, who though probably aware of the peaceful pipe offering has ideas of his own. The Indians were individualistic and acted more frequently on purely personal initiative than the whites who traversed the prairies. The whites knew the value of disciplined cooperative action. That is one reason why they dispossessed the Indians even though obstreperous whites frequently enough forgot their group responsibilities. It was these latter who caused most of the Indian troubles, according to Josiah Gregg, the first historian of the Plains, and aside from President Truman the most distinguished citizen of Independence.

The Pawnee in the foreplane of the picture is equipped, and painted, for marauding action with ready bow and arrow and the famous Pawnee lasso entwined about his waist. Opposite to him on the right side of the door is the Jim Bridger, Kit Carson, Jim Beckwourth type of hunter, trapper, and mountain man, who first scouted the pathways of the West. He would not make trouble with the Indians. Normally he gets along with them, but he would be ready, as the dropping of his traps and the charging of his gun suggests, for any troubles which might arise. He is a dead shot and, like the Indians, inured to physical hardships. He is not merely an adventurer but is as we say, "in business." He works at his beaver hunting and trapping for a profit, but he usually expends this in a few wild days of "hoopla" with the whisky kegs, gambling rings, and acquiescent young Indian squaws assembled by more calculating fur seekers from Independence, St. Louis, and eastward, who buy his hard earned pelts at a fraction of their world market value. He it is who made possible the beaver fortunes of the Astors and other great and respectable notables of the 19th century. He himself is not notably respectable but is nevertheless one of the stalwarts of our westward destiny.

Above him is that other omnipresent actor on our western trails, the French voyageur—boatman, axman, mule skinner, and ox driver. Everywhere on the frontier from Louisiana to Canada he was the man of hard work, gay song, and perpetual good humor. His name is rarely known to record but we owe more to him, perhaps, than to his celebrated countryman Lafayette.

In the foreground to the right of the door are shown the indispensable workers of an outfitting town such as was Independence. The boy pulling the bellows rope in the blacksmith shop is not paid for his trouble. He is doing what all country town kids have always liked to do, including the artist. Beyond these, again to the right, indicating the direction of the trade which first built up the town is a Mexican gentleman with his, at the moment, refractory riding mule.

The oxen led in back of the wheelwright may be for sale or be simply on their way to the owner's wagon. In the rear, wagons form a train, the loaded ones moving out toward the prairie. 'Way back in the distance, showing that the wagons are headed for Oregon, are the famous landmarks of the Oregon Trail, Chimney and Courthouse Rocks in western Nebraska.

To the left of the door, back of the Pawnee warrior a trader displays his wares to a Cheyenne chief who has red fox furs to barter. Near the chief's hand is his rifle, a French flintlock which has likely come west from New Orleans, its journey furthered perhaps by the introduction of an arrow to the body of its original owner. Back of the trader is the persuasive whisky keg, likely full of watered alcohol, pepper, and tobacco juice, and back of that a young Cheyenne squaw bringing in more fur to trade. Near her, pack mules are being reloaded for a further westward journey. They are tardy members of the mule train going over the hill.

Above and to the left of the Cheyenne chief a number of his young warriors show off their horsemanship, no doubt stimulated by trader's beverages. Back of them is Fort Bent, a formidable adobe fortress set far out on the Santa Fe Trail along the banks of the Arkansas River, in southern Colorado. Back of the fort are the Spanish Peaks, landmarks of the way of Taos and Santa Fe.

The lower panels, right and left of the door, show Independence in the late 1840's and the Missouri River landing where arrived most of the goods and peoples which changed Independence from a quiet backwoods settlement to a gateway of destiny.

ABOUT THE ARTIST

The Benton mural was purchased for the Library by the Harry S. Truman Library, Inc., the private corporation that built the building, and the Edwin Austin Abbey Memorial Trust Fund for Mural Painting. The latter fund carried 40 percent of the $60,000 cost. The 3-year contract for the painting was signed June 6, 1958, by Mr. Benton, David D. Lloyd, executive director of the corporation, and representatives of the National Academy of Design which administers the Abbey Fund. The Harry S. Truman Library, a Federal Government institution under the National Archives and Records Service, General Services Administration, owns and operates the Library but bore none of the cost of the mural. After extensive preparatory work, actual painting took approximately 8 months. The work was completed in March 1961.

The artist used an acrylic polymer latex paint which was applied on a special Belgian linen surface. A sealer was applied over the original paint on the plaster wall, to prevent bleeding action, and the linen was applied with a polyester adhesive. The linen was then covered with a liquid latex gesso to provide the painting ground. The mural occupies a space 19 by 32 feet, and covers 495 square feet.

Mr. Benton wants to express his appreciation to Mr. Sidney Larson of Columbia, Mo., and Mr. Duard Marshall of Kansas City who squared off the wall in three-quarter inch squares and elevated his working design, or cartoon, in pencil—also to Mr. Charles Banks Wilson of Miami, Okla., who was an invaluable assistant in the research for Indian and frontier material.

The artist is the outstanding mural painter in America, and has done many other notable works including those at the Capitol Building in Jefferson City, Harzfeld's Store and the River Club in Kansas City, the new School for Social Research in New York City, and others for the Power Authority of the State of New York and the State of Indiana. He was born April 15, 1889, at Neosho, Mo. The mural was dedicated on his 72d birthday. For many years he has lived in Kansas City, having served as director of the department of painting at the Kansas City Art Institute from 1935 to 1941. He studied at the Chicago Art Institute and the Academie Julien in Paris, and has received a number of honorary degrees and memberships from organizations in this country and abroad. He is the author of a well-known book, "An Artist in America," and many articles.

[From the Kansas City Star, Apr. 16, 1961]

TRUMAN'S RESTRAINT AS A CRITIC EARNS PLAUDITS WITH BENTON'S ARTISTIC GENIUS

(By Joe Lastelic)

Thomas Hart Benton smoked a black cigar and listened with his head bowed yesterday as he heard his mural in the Truman Library in Independence described as an American epic.

Nearly 2,000 persons sat under sunny skies in a stiff wind in front of the library during the hour-long dedication ceremonies of the mural. Heading the list of notables was former President Harry S. Truman and Chief Justice Earl Warren.

After he listened to the plaudits, Benton was called on for some remarks. He recalled that Mr. Truman had dabbed a bit of paint on the 19 by 32-foot mural, "Independence and the Opening of the West," and now Benton joshed the former President about his help.

"If he had any ideas for the improvement of the mural he didn't tell me about them," Benton said. "This is remarkable reticence, not often found at any time between patron and saint.

"Even with such a supreme artist as Michelangelo, Pope Julius II was a frequent kibitzer," Benton said with a smile.

Benton said Mr. Truman has been his best patron.

"He possessed the equipment as a historian to be a really disturbing kibitzer if he had wanted to," the artist explained. "Instead, he permitted my work here to develop on its original plan and through its own logic to its own kind of completion. I, therefore, hope the mural turns out to be a success. If it does, the President's considerate restraint will have helped to make it so. If it doesn't, you know who's responsible."

Mr. Truman spoke of Benton in the same jocular vein.

"I succeeded in getting along with Thomas Hart Benton and that's a job that's hard for anybody to do," the former President said.

He explained Benton was chosen to do the work because he is the best muralist in the country, adding: "I think this is his best painting."

In introducing the Chief Justice, Mr. Truman called him one of the greatest in the history of this country, adding that he was honored and grateful to have Warren attend the ceremony.

The mural "captures the full drama of the epic western movement of our Nation," Warren, the dedication speaker, said.

"It cannot fail to reach the minds and hearts of all who see it. It will help to stir the imagination and the vision of our young people with whom the future of our Nation rests, and turn their thoughts to our heroic history and to the values which made this country great."

CITES WEST'S HISTORY

The builders of the West were not statesmen or generals, Warren pointed out, but determined men and women who were in

search of independence and opportunity for themselves and their children. Their victories were not won in climactic battles, but in the daily surmounting of incredible hardships, privation, and personal danger, he said.

"As our people come to visit the Truman Library, their eyes will fall first upon this great mural, and if they see it with eyes brightened by a knowledge of our own history every figure in it will have meaning for them and will help to build within their hearts a deep and abiding patriotism," Warren said. "The knowledge of our heroic past will open vistas for them into our future."

This is the same country as when the pioneers struck west on the trails leading out of Independence, Warren said. It has the same potential, and there is still room for unlimited development.

"The mural * * * will inspire us all to face with courage and hope the great unexplored realms of matter, mind and soul which spread before us.

"It will be a symbol to all of us of the spirit of our pioneer fathers, who so successfully met the challenge of their time; and it will be a symbol, too, of the great President who came from that stock and brought to the high councils of our Nation and of the world the courage and vision of the West."

In the presentation, Eugene Savage, New York, representing the Abbey Mural Fund and the National Academy of Design, called the mural an American epic that makes an outstanding contribution to our national consciousness and purpose.

David D. Lloyd, New York, a member of the library's board of directors, said Benton's art "expresses and portrays America for the eyes of the world."

Dr. Wayne C. Grover, Washington, Archivist of the United States, accepted the mural on behalf of the Government and said it's another step in making the Truman Library a great national cultural institution.

"Mr. Benton is the best muralist America has produced," Dr. Grover added, "and this is the best mural he has produced."

At the completion of the ceremony the dignitaries filed into the library, for a reception. The Chief Justice did not attend, but flew back to Washington.

In the garden room of the library Mr. and Mrs. Truman, Mr. and Mrs. Benton, their daughter, Miss Jessie Benton, and Dr. Philip Brooks, director of the library, and Mrs. Brooks, greeted more than 1,000 guests. They drank punch and viewed Benton's preliminary sketches, models and other research work for the mural.

Benton, who had expressed concern about having to shake so many hands stayed to the end.

"Mr. President, the sun did come out for us after all," Benton remarked during the reception.

"I told you it would, Tom," Mr. Truman smiled.

BENTON BIRTHDAY FETE

About 80 persons attended a birthday dinner for Benton last night at the Hotel Muehlebach at which Sam Gorman and Barney Allis were hosts.

Among those at the head table were Mr. and Mrs. Truman and Sir Roland and Lady Margaret Symonette of Nassau. They represented Queen Elizabeth II.

When the cake, shaped like a book was brought in, Benton looked at the four candles, blew them out, then made the briefest of speeches:

"When Mr. President Truman sits down with me for a birthday party I'd say, well—uh—uh—that's a helluva occasion."

Later, at a gathering of some of the artist's close friends at the Benton home to view a painting he is now doing for the New York Port Authority, Sir Roland commented of Benton: "I'm terrifically fond of him."

Sir Roland, a native and lifelong resident of the Bahama Islands, holds the title of "leader of the Government."

"You don't have anything here that corresponds to it," he said, "but in England, it would be the prime minister."

The official first became acquainted with Benton when the artist visited the tropical islands 2 or 3 years ago.

"He came to one of our dinner parties," Sir Roland said. "He's a terrific character. I don't suppose there is one in 10 million like him. He's what I suppose we might term a rugged individualist."

"We came through here in 1959 and I saw him up on the scaffold," the official said. "I met President Truman, too."

After Benton finished the Truman library mural, he repaired again to the Bahamas for revitalization. But this time, the artist became ill and returned home.

"We're not trying to shun our share of the responsibility," Sir Roland said. "But he went out on a fishing trip and got a cold."

"He told me just now," the official said, "that he had made his mistake when he got on the airplane to return here. He said he should have stayed down there and recovered. We have an excellent clinic there."

THE CHALLENGE OF OUTER SPACE TO THE LEGAL PROFESSION—ADDRESS BY SENATOR KERR

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, the distinguished senior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR] delivered the principal address at the University of Oklahoma on the occasion of the 13th annual Law Day observance on April 27. His address was entitled "The Challenge of Outer Space to the Legal Profession." It highlighted the many facets of the legal problems in this space era.

Senator ROBERT S. KERR is a lawyer, a successful businessman, a recognized authority in the field of conservation, and, as we all know, is Chairman of the Senate Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences, on which I have been the ranking minority member since its inception. The judgment and insight possessed by the senior Senator from Oklahoma has been invaluable in expediting the work of the committee. Senator KERR is well qualified to appraise realistically the legal ramifications and challenges resulting from space exploration. I therefore ask unanimous consent that this learned and enlightened address delivered before his alma mater be made available to my colleagues and the public by having it printed in the RECORD.

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

THE CHALLENGE OF OUTER SPACE TO THE LEGAL PROFFESSION

(By Senator ROBERT S. KERR)

I want to thank Dean Sneed, and at the same time, congratulate him. My gratitude stems from the invitation to join with you in celebrating Oklahoma's 13th annual Law Day, paricularly when this day is highlighted by a program on the problems of space exploration. My congratulations are to Dean Sneed as the newly elected mayor of Norman.

I seek your indulgence for a moment of reminiscence. Forty-five years ago as a junior in this university, I sat in the old chapel assembly room on this campus and heard what was regarded as one of the great men of that day, Dr. Raymond Robbins, speak of frontiers, new and old. I heard him recount in thrilling language his experiences in making the wild gold rush into Alaska in the last days of the previous century. He concluded his speech that morning by describing his experiences in standing on the rugged cliffs of our continuent and looking out across the Bering Sea to the frozen Siberian wastelands, where, he said, the West ends and the East begins. He then said, "As I and others stood there that stormy wintry morning, we lifted our hands to Heaven and thanked our God for having been among those who had conquered the world's last frontier.

How little he knew of the vast and glorious frontiers ahead of which he had never known or heard.

And, little did I dream when I attended the university that I would ever return here to speak before the college of law on the legal problems of space exploration. In fact, as recently as the last graduation of one of my sons from this college of law, the area of space law had not been opened.

During my 12 years in the U.S. Senate, and before that, as Governor of Oklahoma, I have had many opportunities to talk to university and college groups over the State. My favorite subject, of course, has been "Land, Wood and Water." Conservation and development of our natural resources, in order to insure future prosperity and growth of Oklahoma, has been my objective. I am profoundly grateful to the many people who have shared this dream and have helped so much to bring it so close to reality. This program has had the enthusiastic support of our younger citizens and I am confident the Land, Wood and Water blueprint that we are using here in Oklahoma holds great promise for generations of Sooners to come. Mayor Sneed and the civic leaders of Norman have a great stake in this program, for the reservoir on Little River will provide this city, and the university, with many benefits. The Little River project is part of a truly remarkable idea, an idea that harmonizes with the hope and belief that this college of law will continue to expand its services to the people of Oklahoma. And not the least of these new services is the leadership it is providing to the Nation and world in the field of space law.

Oklahoma's Land, Wood and Water program has advanced more rapidly than similar programs in other States with comparable problems. I earnestly solicit your continued study and support of it, for it is becoming more and more apparent that the technology of natural resource conservation is closely related to the more glamorous technology associated with this Nation's space program. President Kennedy pointed up the significance of this association just a few days ago. In a comment upon the Russian feat of orbiting a man around the earth, the President declared that if this Government's water research program leads to a practical method for making sea water drinkable, such a scientific breakthrough would be of greater benefit to mankind than anything accomplished so far in the race for space.

Since I became chairman of the Senate Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences in January, I have amended my long standing slogan, making it: "Land, Wood, Water and Space." I believe the new version accurately describes a new horizon of great promise for the pioneering spirit of Oklahoma.

Oklahomans have never lost the spirit of youth, of optimism and of going ahead into the future undaunted by fear of what lies

over the horizon. The qualities needed to explore the universe are the selfsame qualities that inspired our fathers and grandfathers to rush into Oklahoma's space and settle on what was, to them a new and strange land. Their spirit and initiative, their courage and their quest for adventure—all of these qualities have stood them in good stead as they struggled to establish stewardship over what so recently was wilderness. As they are harnessing our land, wood and water for the common good, so will they and their sons and daughters attack the newer problems of our time. This law day proves this. The University of Oklahoma pioneered the Law Day, U.S.A., program now observed throughout the Nation on May 1. It effectively calls attention to the American concepts of truth, fairness and justice on a day long associated with the opposite standards of communism.

The advent of the space age found this college of law in the forefront in recognizing the importance of space problems. Under the guidance of law librarian Mortimer Schwartz, a comprehensive collection of writings on space law was started here in 1957. Scholars of many countries have contributed to this space law collection. The seminar on space technology, sponsored last fall by this university in conjunction with the University of California, is another example of leadership in this field.

Leadership has long been the hallmark of this college. The graduates who have achieved distinction in the armed services, who are being honored today personify this fact. Three of the five general officers in the Office of the Judge Advocate General of the Air Force are graduates of our college of law. There are others in the Armed Forces who are here today and who have brought equal distinction to our university. We commend them for the manner in which they have lived up to Oklahoma's great traditions. We are especially grateful for the manner in which our law graduates have handled hundreds of cases which have come before the Military Court of Justice.

Moreover, it seems to me that the basic principles of law are not remote from each other, whether the area of investigation is the Uniform Code of Military Justice or a code for the law of outer space. The philosophy of justice seems to me to be immutable and total. The principles that apply in one specialized portion of justice apply, in fact, everywhere.

I was asked to talk today about the problems of space. Since the Senate Space Committee has just published a symposium on "The Legal Problems of Space Exploration," I am very happy on this occasion to present this bound volume to the college of law for its permanent collection. No matter where you are sitting, I am sure you can see that this is a very thick book. It should be dear to any lawyer's heart because it is studded with legal problems.

I am sure this book tells more about outer space than we can cover in a single sitting, and I have decided to discuss those problems which are most challenging to the legal profession. At the outset I should point out that there is at least one problem the lawyers won't have to worry about. Space exploration is not unconstitutional. While the Founding Fathers did not specifically provide for space activities, they did not prohibit them. Whatever else happens, it is always comforting to know that we are proceeding along constitutional lines.

The problems for which we must seek solutions emerge from a complex of political, economic, scientific, and technological factors. To identify and understand these problems, it is necessary to ask ourselves what makes space exploration important? What objectives does the United States seek to attain? What policies have we adopted?

Space exploration is vital both to national and international security because it is a major new factor in man's quest for peace and his desire to avoid and prevent the massive destruction of nuclear war.

The Secretary of the Air Force, Mr. Eugene M. Zuckert, emphasized this point in a speech in Oklahoma City a few days ago. The Secretary said the Soviet space effort serves to dramatize the situation of the free world in a way that should fire our determination. We heartily endorse the warning he sounded when he said, "Experience tells us we cannot count on Communist exploitation of space for peaceful purposes. America and her allies have no choice but to extend our influence into space to the end that no nation shall be disfranchised in space, and no nation shall be disfranchised on earth through domination of space by another."

No one should dispute this statement. The nation that dominates space can dominate the earth. Our peril then, is this: Shall space and space law be the domain of a pagan power in which a dictator is the law unto himself?

Faced with this awesome possibility, the United States has adopted a policy that space activities should be devoted to peaceful purposes for the benefit of all mankind. We have given responsibility for our civilian program to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. Civilian applications of space power now receiving much much effort would enable us to have instantaneous worldwide communications, more accurate weather predictions, and more precise guidance in navigation. The Department of Defense is in charge of space activities which are unique to military preparedness. It is our intention that the United States shall be a leader in this field, devoted to the expansion of human knowledge and to cooperation with other nations in the peaceful applications of space technology.

To achieve our international space objectives, we are simultaneously using three methods of approach. We make international agreements for such programs as our worldwide network of tracking stations where data from space probes and orbiting satellites is received for evaluation. We take unilateral action when we announce policies which may gain the support of other nations. And we follow the policy of taking whatever positive steps are open to us through the United Nations and its specialized agencies.

We participated, with other member nations, in the work of the United Nations ad hoc Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space. The work of this Committee, which was established in December 1958, was based upon the premise that mankind has a common interest in space exploration and that present national rivalries should not be launched into the cosmic reaches of the universe. Although the Soviet Union, and several other nations, refused to cooperate in the task of the Committee, a report was completed in June 1959 by other members who forged ahead with a survey of the possibilities for international cooperation and organization of space activities.

The report concluded that the basic principles of justice embodied in the provisions of the United Nations Charter are not confined to the earth—they extend to all the purposes which we may undertake in outer space. The same holds true for the statute of the International Court of Justice. It was clear to the Committee that political considerations would affect legal space problems to a far greater extent than those concerned with science and technology. The result was, therefore, that the legal problems were identified in terms of their importance, and how they might be met, but no recommendations were made for their solution.

Since that time, the United Nations established, on December 12, 1959, its permanent Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space. The General Assembly asked for a study and report on the nature of legal problems which may arise from the exploration of outer space. Although the United States and the Soviet Union had reached agreement on the membership of this Committee, the Russians have not been willing to get started with the work.

It is in this international area that the talents and skills of the legal profession can be brought to bear upon problems whose solution may well mean the difference between using outer space for peace rather than war.

Not all lawyers agree, of course, on the same list of priority problems, but since little has been done to solve these problems, we will start with a discussion of those which have been officially identified by our Department of State and the United Nations.

A primary problem concerns the freedom of all nations to use outer space. When space exploration began during the International Geophysical Year, the assumption was that nations had permission to launch satellites around the globe regardless of the fact that they orbited over the national boundary lines of many states. The United Nations Committee concluded that as far as peaceful purposes are concerned, the fact that no nation objected to satellites may have resulted in general acceptance of a rule that outer space is free for exploration in accordance with existing or future international law or agreements.

As lawyers, of course, you will be alerted by that word "may" in this context. Although no nation has objected to spacecraft in outer space, even since the end of the IGY, we cannot be sure that none ever will. If outer space is to be free for peaceful purposes; if outer space is to be controlled so that ever more destructive weapons will not be directed toward the earth; it will be necessary to devise international agreements.

The U.S. policy of international cooperation calls for agreement on these points: (1) that no nation shall claim sovereignty over celestial bodies; (2) that none shall engage in warlike activities or station weapons of mass destruction in outer space; and (3) that the United Nations should verify the launching of spacecraft in advance. Agreement on these points would go a long way toward dispelling the fear of a surprise attack.

You may well ask—If we cannot get agreement with the Soviet Union on starting some committee work in the United Nations, how can we possibly move forward toward the goal we seek to achieve?

Freedom of outer space may be compared to the problem of freedom of the seas during the age of exploration in the 15th and 16th centuries. International custom has resulted in general recognition that the high seas are free for the ships of all nations, although territorial waters are claimed along the seaboards. The members of the United Nations ad hoc Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space came to unanimous agreement on the necessity for studying the principles and procedures which we have already developed in controlling air space and the sea. We need to determine in what ways these areas are similar to outer space, and in what ways outer space is so unique that the rules and regulations we have developed in the past will not apply. Just as the lawyers of several hundred years ago faced the problem of freedom of the high seas, so today you stand on the threshold of a new age of exploration with an unparalled opportunity to bring law and order into our space activities. The least that mankind should do is to be able and willing to apply the principles of

justice under human law in that vast firmament where throughout limitless eons God has declared his glory and his sovereignty maintaining physical order under natural law.

Already, some agreement has been reached in certain scientific and technical areas. If the scientists and engineers can get agreement because it is essential to the success of their projects, a favorable climate may be created for the settlement of some of the political problems which are now testing our ingenuity and patience.

The problem on which we have reached some agreement is that of allocating radio frequencies to satellites. It is a scientific fact that the radio spectrum is limited and unless nations agree on how to divide the use of channels, we could have utter chaos in communications. All radio transmissions could become hopelessly garbled. To meet this problem the Administrative Radio Conference of the International Telecommunication Union met in Geneva during the latter part of 1959. The result was an agreement whose provisions will affect about 100 nations. This treaty is now before the U.S. Senate, awaiting ratification.

Solution of the radio frequency problem is vital to satellite communications systems. Many experts predict that this enterprise will be commercially profitable. Certainly as we get more deeply into this new method of communications, which involves government and industry as well as international agreements, lawyers will face many situations which challenge their ability to provide guidelines for the future.

Another problem which requires forethought is that of liability for injury or damage caused by spacecraft. Will it be possible for us to use some of the same ideas we developed for aircraft operating in air space? Should we decide that the nation which launches a space vehicle is liable for unlimited damages, or should we attempt to establish an international fund to take care of such matters? If there are questions about payment for damages, should the cases be referred to the International Court of Justice? This is certainly an area where those who have specialized in aviation law and international law will have an opportunity to study the consequences of the alternatives open to us and provide sound advice.

There are several other problems which need solution in accordance with the public interest.

Rules and regulations are needed to insure that space vehicles and aircraft will not interfere with each other.

Space vehicles need to be identified and registered, and attention should be given to the coordination of launchings.

When space vehicles reenter the atmosphere and land on territory belonging to other nations, it will be necessary to make bilateral or multilateral arrangements defining arrangements which are mutually satisfactory.

And, finally, we need to analyze the kind of organization we are likely to require for the administration of international rules and regulations. As you know, we established the International Atomic Energy Agency to deal with certain nuclear problems. We must consider whether this type of arrangement is feasible for handling the problems of space, and also whether it is politically practicable. There are numerous specialized organizations which might be called upon to administer certain types of regulation. For example, the World Meteorological Organization is already engaged in handling data about the weather. The International Telecommunication Union has special functions in the communications field. The International Civil Aviation Organization has responsibilities for aviation. These are only a few of the organizations which must be studied in order to determine what roles, if any, they may play in future satellite developments.

As lawyers, I know you must be aware of our need for definitions which will have the same meaning to all people. How are we to define spacecraft as distinguished from aircraft? Is a vehicle such as the X–15, which may operate in airspace and outer space, an aircraft, a spacecraft, or both? How shall we define spacecraft so that the definition does not also apply to intercontinental ballistic missiles? These are not theoretical questions. The exact meanings of such words and terms will be needed when international agreements and treaties are written. We cannot afford misunderstandings.

Problems in semantics will, of course, exist so long as human beings are human, but it was reassuring to learn the other day that one of the chimps in training for a space mission at Cape Canaveral was having the same trouble. We have some pretty smart chimpanzees on the cape, they tell me. One of them ran out of reading material the other night and asked his keeper to bring him a couple of books, the Holy Bible and Darwin's "Origin of Species."

The next morning, the keeper returned to the cage to find its occupant pacing the floor in deep consternation. The chimp held the Bible in one hand and Darwin in the other. He was pondering the books and the look of misunderstanding that clouded his hairy features prompted the keeper to ask what his problem was.

"I've spent a sleepless night," the chimp said. "I can't figure out from these books whether I am my brother's keeper or my keeper's brother."

Now I think the legal profession has very special qualifications for clarifying situations and preventing misunderstandings. You have training and experience in collecting facts, in evaluating all your information, and in determining the best course to follow toward a specific objective.

Above all, we need a working partnership between the lawyers and the scientists. They have a mutual interest in establishing feasible rules and regulations for the orderly conduct of space activities. Scientists can make available to the lawyers the technical facts which must be taken into account in devising controls to promote the use of outer space for peaceful purposes.

I share your pride in the great law college in Oklahoma University and her past and future. The establishment of the space law library here typifies her leadership. A new structure of law requires of its builders the same care and conscience that has brought our civilization to its present glory.

The English philosopher and critic, John Ruskin, commenting on his nation's humanitarian advancements of the 19th century, defined the ethical considerations we must keep in mind, whether our endeavor be for land, wood, water or space. Ruskin said:

"Therefore when we build let us think that we build forever. Let it not be for the present delight, nor for present use alone. Let it be such work as our descendants will thank us for; and let us think, as we lay stone upon stone, that a time is to come when those stones will be held sacred because our hands have touched them, and that men will say, as they look upon the labor and wrought substance of them, 'See, this our fathers did for us.' "

That admonition was heeded well at the moment in history, nearly 100 years ago, when it was uttered. The legal profession of which we are rightfully proud has built its reputation on these principles. And though only the first few stones have been laid so far in its foundation, the noble purposes of this calling can and must contribute to the building of a mighty edifice of space law—a shelter for the orderly extension of man's control over his tiny corner of God's universe.

THE COLD WAR VETERANS GI BILL ENDORSED BY ASSEMBLY OF NORTH CAROLINA

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, the General Assembly of the State of North Carolina some time ago adopted a joint resolution steadfastly supporting the proposed cold war GI bill, S. 349, and has forwarded to our Senate Veterans' Subcommittee a copy of it, certified on May 4, 1961.

The GI bill, introduced by 37 Senators in January, would provide educational and vocational training for the 4½ million young men and women who have met the military manpower needs of the Nation during the period of the cold war.

An estimated 35,000 North Carolina veterans would go to school or enter vocational training during the first 5 years of the operation of the bill. The previous GI bills have already added some 259,000 educated and trained veterans to North Carolina's reservoir of trained manpower, and, Mr. President, I think it is safe to say that these citizens have played leading roles in the dynamic economic growth that has taken place, and is continuing, in the great State of North Carolina.

In its resolution, the North Carolina General Assembly takes particular note of the self-liquidating character of the cold war GI bill and points out that the education of cold war veterans will be more than repaid to the public treasury through increased taxes resulting from higher incomes of such veterans. The increased income to veterans, arising out of their higher education level, will more than pay the entire cost of the World War II GI training program by 1970. The resolution reads in part as follows:

Whereas the education of millions of veterans has contributed to an increase in the educational level of this country and has produced a major national asset which has contributed much to the economy of this country; and

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

Whereas it is believed that as long as the draft is continued that all persons serving in the Armed Forces should be extended the educational opportunities enjoyed by veterans serving prior to February 1, 1955; and

Whereas it has been demonstrated that the investment in the education of such veterans will be more than repaid to the public treasury through increased taxes resulting from higher incomes of such veterans.

Another way to look at it is to check the figures of the Bureau of the Census which show that the training received by veterans under the World War II GI bill is worth a billion dollars more a year in taxes to the Government, than without that training.

I ask unanimous consent that there be printed at the end of my remarks a certified copy of the resolution from the General Assembly of the State of North

Carolina, with all the reasons the general assembly set out for the enactment of this much needed legislation, which I believe deals with one of the most critical subjects before the Congress of the United States.

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

RESOLUTION 62

Joint resolutions memorializing the Congress of the United States to extend education benefits to veterans of the Armed Forces who entered or who enter the service subsequent to February 1, 1955

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

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

Whereas the education of millions of veterans has contributed to an increase in the educational level of this country and has produced a major national asset which has contributed much to the economy of this country; and

Whereas reliable statistics have proved that increased income to veterans arising out of their higher education level will more than reimburse the National Treasury of the entire cost of the GI training program by 1970; and

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

Whereas it is believed that as long as the draft is continued that all persons serving in the Armed Forces should be extended the educational opportunities enjoyed by veterans serving prior to February 1, 1955; and

Whereas it has been demonstrated that the investment in the education of such veterans will be more than repaid to the public treasury through increased taxes resulting from higher incomes of such veterans: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the house of representatives (the senate concurring):

SECTION 1. The General Assembly of North Carolina does hereby memorialize the Congress of the United States to extend GI educational benefits to all veterans who entered, or who enter, military services from and after February 1, 1955, and that such educational benefits be extended so long as the provisions of the draft law exist.

SEC. 2. Upon adoption of this resolution, a copy thereof shall be mailed to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States, and to each Member of the Congress from the State of North Carolina.

SEC. 3. This resolution shall become effective upon its adoption.

In the general assembly read three times and ratified, this the 9th day of June 1959.

L. E. BARNHARDT,
President of the Senate.
ADDISON HEWLETT, JR.,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

Examined and found correct:

FRED HOLCOMBE
(For Committee).

THE FIFTH WHEEL IN DEFENSE

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, the Cincinnati Post and Times Star is one of the great newspapers of my State of Ohio. It is of importance in the Scripps-Howard newspaper organization. Its editor, Dick Thornburg, was formerly Washington correspondent for Scripps-Howard.

In the issue of May 3, 1961, under the caption of "Fifth Wheel in Defense," the Cincinnati Post and Times Star published the following editorial:

Civil defense, with its screeching sirens and its snowstorm of conflicting pamphlets, is something to frighten young children and nervous adults at a time when the Nation needs spunk. Its spending is a waste. Its arm-banded functionaries would be in the road of police and firemen, in the event of real national emergency.

Current appropriation for civil defense is $60 million. The new director has been talking about $300 million, sounds like he'd settle for $104 million. He's presenting his case to a House committee.

The editorial continues as follows:

Senator STEPHEN YOUNG, Ohio Democrat, speaks our piece:

"By reason of poor planning, confused thinking, negligence, maladministration, inordinately high salaries and colossal ineptitude, the paid officials and employees charged with defense of civilians in event of war have managed to squander more than $1 billion since 1951.

"My view is that the defense of civilians is too important to be entrusted to civilians wearing arm bands. As in Canada and England, it should be under the direction of those trained and experienced in defense—the Armed Forces of the United States."

I hope that later the majority of Senators will join with me in voting to curtail the sought for appropriations, because in truth and in fact civil defense as now conducted is a $1 billion boondoggle.

IMMIGRATION LEGISLATION

Mr. LONG of Hawaii. Mr. President, I am happy to cosponsor S. 1809, which has been introduced by the distinguished minority leader, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN]. This bill is identical to H.R. 6300, introduced by Congressman WALTER, of Pennsylvania, on April 13, 1961.

During these troubled times, it is important that we reevaluate our national goals and policies. In a reappraisal of our foreign relations at this critical juncture, the need for reform in our immigration policies stands out.

In my estimation, no more important service could be performed in the name of justice, humanity, and our own national self-interest, than improvement of our immigration laws. We must not forget that those laws reflect, in large degree, the character of our Nation. The billions of dollars appropriated annually for foreign aid cannot offset the impressions caused by inequities and shortcomings in our immigration policies.

There is much work to be done in the immigration field, but unfortunately, as in civil rights, progress is slow. If we want to continue to call the non-Communist countries our friends, we must begin improvements, for prolonged delay would be a blow to our national prestige abroad. This bill, I believe, is not the complete answer, but it would be an effective step in the right direction.

Briefly, I would like to direct attention, Mr. President, to the quota reserve program which I consider the most important feature of this bill. This bill establishes a quota reserve consisting of the annually unused quota numbers which will be allocated for the use of relatives of U.S. citizens and lawfully resident aliens. Every country of the world having an immigration quota of less than 7,000 annually will have access to the quota reserve proportionate to the respective country's participation in the sum total of all annual quotas under 7,000. This program, if enacted, will permit members of scattered families abroad to be united with relatives already in our midst. This was the pledge in the 1960 Democratic platform, and one which in principle I believe is acceptable to all Members of this distinguished body. I hope that introduction of this bill in the Senate will expedite consideration of immigration reform which I feel is vitally important to our national self-interest. The time for action has come.

Finally, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD the estimated quota increase based on section 5 of this bill, and the number of persons registered for preference quota visas as of February 1, 1961.

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

Application of formula for redistribution of unused quota numbers under H.R. 6300 applied to quota reserve available on July 1, 1960

For the fiscal year ending July 30, 1960, there were 51,095 quota numbers unused. Ninety-nine quota areas, and seventy-six subquotas having annual limitations of less than 7,000 would participate as follows:

Quota area	Annual quota	Percentage	Share in quota reserve [1]
Austria	1,405	2.55	1,303
Belgium	1,297	2.36	1,206
China	105	.19	97
Czechoslovakia	2,859	5.19	2,652
Denmark	1,175	2.13	1,088
Estonia	115	.21	107
Finland	566	1.03	526
France	3,069	5.57	2,846
Greece	308	.56	286
Hungary	865	1.57	802
Italy	5,666	10.29	5,258
Japan	185	.34	174
Latvia	235	.43	220
Lithuania	384	.70	358
Netherlands	3,136	5.70	2,913
Norway	2,364	4.29	2,192
Poland	6,488	11.78	6,019
Portugal	438	.80	409
Rumania	289	.53	271
Spain	250	.45	230
Sweden	3,295	5.98	3,056
Switzerland	1,698	3.08	1,574
Turkey	225	.41	210
U.S.S.R.	2,697	4.90	2,504
Yugoslavia	942	1.71	874
74 minimum quotas	7,400		
76 subquotas	7,600	[1] 27.25	[2] 13,920
Total	55,056	100.00	51,095

[1] It should be noted that these quota numbers would be available only to aliens within the classes of relatives of American citizens and permanent resident aliens specified in sec. 5 of H.R. 6300.

[2] Each minimum quota and each subquota would participate at the rate of 0.18163 percent and would receive 92.8 quota numbers.

Registered demand for 2d, 3d, and 4th preference quota visas as of Feb. 1, 1961 [1]

Quota	Annual limitation	2d preference	3d preference	4th preference	Total
Albania	100	7	7	14	28
Asia-Pacific	100	10	26	6	42
Australia	100	15	2	117	134
Austria	1,405	12	25	68	105
Bulgaria	100	10	11	38	59
China	100	7	15	98	120
Chinese persons	105	814	570	945	2,329
Cyprus	100	6	5	250	261
Danzig	100		2	8	10
Denmark	1,175	3	7	7	17
Estonia	115	1	3	22	26
Finland	566	6	32	63	101
France	3,069	49	48	162	259
Guadeloupe			12	10	22
British subquotas:					
Antigua		3	13	21	37
Bahamas		9	18	21	48
Barbados		34	42	318	394
Bermuda		2	3	2	7
British Guiana		12	35	212	259
British Honduras		10	36	64	110
British Virgin Islands		1	95	131	227
Grenada		5	12	37	54
Hong Kong		1	2	13	16
Jamaica		254	77	620	951
Malta		1	2	355	358
Montserrat		1	18	48	67
St. Christopher		2	34	32	68
St. Vincent		1	7	23	31
Trinidad		9	40	190	239
Greece	308	681	949	5,548	7,178
Hungary	865	168	579	987	1,734
Iceland	100		1	2	3
India	100	12	114	69	195
Indonesia	100	1	7	29	37
Iran	100	19	17	120	156
Iraq	100	32	38	101	171
Israel	100	13	151	97	261
Italy	5,666	2,289	6,036	131,053	139,648
Japan	185	329	119	317	765
Jordan	100		2	16	18
Korea	100	5	23	68	96
Latvia	235	8	9	99	116
Lebanon	100	27	32	151	210
Libya	100	2	6	7	15
Lithuania	384	11	18	167	196
Morocco	100	18	13	298	329
Netherlands	3,136	13	27	89	129
Antilles			3	3	6
New Zealand	100	1	1	2	4
Norway	2,364		14	5	19
Pacific Islands	100			6	6
Pakistan	100		6	10	16
Palestine	100	16	143	229	388
Philippines	100	573	459	647	1,679
Poland	6,488	117	130	3,976	4,223
Portugal	438	214	478	3,433	4,125
Rumania	289	175	70	546	791
San Marino	100	1	6	27	34
Spain	250	84	75	617	776
Switzerland	1,698	8	6	12	26
Tunisia	100	11	6	201	218
Turkey	225	275	30	561	866
Union of South Africa	100	8	4	9	21
U.S.S.R.	2,697	57	28	123	208
United Arab Republic	100	66	92	457	615
Yemen	100		1		1
Yugoslavia	942	194	343	1,730	2,267
Total		6,713	11,505	155,707	173,925

[1] Data listed refers to petitions approved and not to number of aliens potentially covered by each petition.

REORGANIZATION OF THE MARITIME ADMINISTRATION

Mr. LONG of Hawaii. Mr. President, the New Frontier is in evidence in many ways today, not the least of which is the resolute manner with which the ever-present problem of the independent regulatory boards and agencies has been attacked. Even before inauguration day, President Kennedy had before him a report on these agencies, and interest in their improvement has continued unabated. The Congress already has before it reorganization plans for the Security and Exchange Commission and the Civil Aeronautics Board.

Today I would like to draw the attention of the Senate to yet another agency—the Federal Maritime Administration, including the Federal Maritime Board. The regulatory powers of the Maritime Board are great, but are in part overshadowed by the promotional functions of the Maritime Administration.

It is not surprising that there is discontent with the performance of an agency that is vested with two such incompatible jobs, and I suggest that reorganization to terminate such incompatibility is necessary. Something very like the Maritime Administration once existed in the old Civil Aeronautics Authority established in 1938 as an umbrella agency for all matters of civil aviation, but this agency was short lived. Two years later Presidential reorganization plans divided the agency. Other changes have taken place since, but the distinction between promotion and regulation persists, and I submit that it is high time such a distinction be made with respect to maritime service.

It is my desire, Mr. President, that the Congress be given a reorganization plan for the Maritime Administration at the earliest possible date. Nowhere in the United States is effective regulation of maritime shipping more important than in my own State of Hawaii. We live by the sea, our products go to all the world by the sea, and it is urgently in our interest that sea traffic to and from our island State serve the public welfare. We doubt that the present Maritime Administration is now or ever can be equipped to do the regulatory job we need, which is comparable to the regulation of rail and truck transport in the mainland States.

We need a regulatory agency that can work unimpeded by the need to promote and uncluttered by other matters. Furthermore, Mr. President, we need this kind of an agency now. I hope that the administration can lay before us a plan to secure a truly regulatory body before too many days go by.

THE MONROE DOCTRINE AND INTER-AMERICAN TREATIES

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, the American people have been subjected to considerable confusing propaganda to the effect that our inter-American treaties are so worded as to preclude any so-called intervention by the United States in Cuba. This propaganda appears to rest on the false assumption that there has not already been Sino-Soviet intervention in the area covered by the Monroe Doctrine and, particularly, in Cuba. In the May 3 issue of the Washington Evening Star appeared two letters which deal knowledgeably with this subject, and I ask unanimous consent that these letters be printed in the RECORD as part of my remarks.

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

MONROE DOCTRINE VERSUS INTER-AMERICAN TREATIES

For the past few days I have been reading in your paper and in other papers a number of statements about the recent Cuban incident, the most recent one being the letter signed by Diego Aguila de Monteverde in the Star. Mr. Aguila de Monteverde talks about the convention on duties and rights of the states (nonintervention pact of Montevideo) as enjoining the United States from doing anything about the Communist regime of Fidel Castro in Cuba.

I am one of the seven Latin American delegates who in 1933, in Montevideo, drafted the nonintervention pact of Montevideo. I was one of the Cuban plenipotentiary delegates to the VII International Conference of American States; but what is happening in Cuba today, and it is a pity that Mr. Aguila de Monteverde and some other people cannot see it, is that the nonintervention pact has been violated by the Communist internationale. We never wanted to put a stop to the military and diplomatic intervention of the United States in Latin America, as practiced up to 1933, to open the way for the intervention of the Soviet Union in Latin America, that we have today. The case of Cuba is quite clear. There we have the intervention of Red China, openly flouting the principle of nonintervention.

Furthermore, all this sanctimonious respect for the convention on duties and rights of the states, of Montevideo (nonintervention pact), fails to take into consideration that inter-American treaties against intervention did not stop at Montevideo in 1933, but were reasserted in Lima, in Havana, in Panama, in Washington, in Rio de Janeiro, in Bogotá, in Caracas and in Santiago de Chile as recently as 1959, all

the time stating that the Republics of the two Americas were against intervention by the totalitarians of the right and the totalitarians of the left and should oppose it. Those who did not oppose Communist intervention in Hungary, Indochina, Greece, Tibet and so forth, by the Soviet Union and by Red China now present themselves as the champions of nonintervention when there is Soviet and Chinese intervention in Cuba. Playing with words, with the sovereignty of the nations and with the freedom of peoples dominated by the Communists.

HERMINIO PORTELL-VILA,
Professor (in Exile), University of Havana.

In the letter by Diego Aguila de Monteverde in the April 29 issue of the Star, under the caption "Monroe Doctrine Versus Inter-American Treaties," are to be found quotations from the Treaty of Montevideo and from the Charter of the Organization of American States, signed in Bogotá on April 30, 1948.

The writer, in the closing paragraph, states that the Treaties of Montevideo and Bogotá must be respected by the U.S. Government if this country is to remain the land to which the world can look as the supporter of such basic principles as self-determination, liberty, and justice for all men and for all nations.

Conceding the points in the preceding paragraph, it would be fair to ask whether Diego Aguila de Monteverde has given sufficient thought to whether his statements might further weaken the stand that must be taken in order to maintain freedom in this country and in all other countries not yet gobbled up by the Communists.

There is one thing that we must keep in mind. The Roosevelt era differs vastly from the Eisenhower and Kennedy era as far as the concert of nations is concerned. We must also remember the dignity of any one of the nations, including the United States of America. There must be a limit to the vilifications of one Castro, who, incidentally, is no respecter of the Charter of the Organization of American States. Why is it that Monteverde failed to make due note of that part of article 13 of the Treaty of Bogotá, which reads "* * * respecting, at the same time, the principle of universal morality and of human rights"? In this connection, let us ask what excuses we can find for Castro that would outweigh his betrayal of his own country, now essentially a Russian satellite and a danger to all inter-American States. In the same connection, we must also ask whether the time has come to slap down the traitor and tyrant in question and ask for the unqualified support of all other Latin American States and of those within Cuba who claim the right to be free—all in the name of human and of national dignity. Let us not forget that in the last analysis the Communists are engaging us in an unprecedented war, a real and ugly all-out war.

OSCAR E. MOLLARI.

THE INTENTIONS AND OBJECTIVES OF THE COMMUNISTS

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, there appeared in a recent issue of the Washington Post a very timely and direct article by Mr. Stewart Alsop pointing out the facts of life about the intentions and objectives of the Communists in general and Premier Khrushchev in particular. I wish that everyone in the United States could read this article and particularly those members of the President's advisory group to whom Mr. Alsop makes reference. I ask unanimous consent that this article also be printed in the RECORD.

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

KHRUSHCHEV REALLY MEANS IT

(By Stewart Alsop)

The rather special circumstance of a brother's demanding a couple of weeks of column writing as a wedding present is hardly likely to be repeated. So this is doubtless the last column under the above byline that will ever appear in this space. This reporter therefore feels a bit like a dying man who wants to be remembered for his famous last words, but can't think of any. The best I can do is: Khrushchev really means what he says.

The British could never quite bring themselves to believe that Hitler really meant the crazy things he said in "Mein Kampf." But Hitler did mean them, because he was crazy.

Nikita Khrushchev is not crazy. Unlike Hitler, he has no irrational impulse to play Samson in the temple. But it is important to realize that Khrushchev and those around him are rational within the limits imposed by the essentially irrational doctrine of Marxism-Leninism. This doctrine makes it possible for Khrushchev, like the White Queen, to "believe six impossible things before breakfast," as when he remarked, in Walter Lippmann's fascinating interview with him, that he considered President Kennedy merely an agent of the Rockefeller interests.

No doubt Khrushchev really believes this. More important, there is no doubt at all that he really believes that what his idol Lenin called "the cause of creating a world-wide Soviet Republic" is sure to triumph, and rather soon now. Indeed, in recent months he has been predicting that triumph more confidently than ever before.

He has been quite explicit, moreover, about how the triumph is to be achieved. He announced gloatingly more than a year ago that "the world balance of power has now turned sharply in favor of the Socialist countries." In his dispute with the Chinese Communists, he has ruled out the use of this power in a global nuclear war in order to insure the triumph of the "world-wide Soviet Republic." But, he says, "we shall make the imperialists jump like fishes in a saucepan, even without war."

By "imperialists" he means us, and in southeast Asia, Cuba, and elsewhere, we have indeed been jumping like fishes in a saucepan. Moreover, Khrushchev has also been quite explicit about what he means by "without war." He means without the kind of war which might destroy the Soviet Union. Other wars are dandy. "We support wholeheartedly and without reservation all national liberation wars," he said a few weeks ago.

This is the kind of war Khrushchev and the Chinese and Indo-Chinese Communists have been promoting in southeast Asia. It is wholly predictable that there will be more such wars, not only because Khrushchev means what he says, but because he must prove to the Chinese that he is, as a Communist, more royalist than the king.

Once you assume that Khrushchev means what he says, certain things become clear. One is that the cold war will go on, perhaps for generations. When the Kennedy administration took office, there were those in the Kennedy inner circle who talked hopefully of negotiating a "package deal," which would include arms control and a mutual agreement to "call off the cold war." These hopes have now, of course, turned to ashes.

The reason they have turned to ashes is simple. To ask the Communist leaders to forbear to thrust for Communist power in any area they deem vulnerable is to ask them to cease to be Communists. This is from their point of view nonnegotiable. The alternative is an agreement by our side not to respond to Communist thrusts, and to await meekly the destruction of our system. From our point of view, this also is surely nonnegotiable.

As in the Korean truce or the first Berlin blockade, it is possible to negotiate with the Soviets temporary accommodations which reflect the current realities of power. Unfortunately, the current realities of power are suggested by the fact that, if President Kennedy had intervened in either Cuba or Laos—let alone both—he would have had to commit just about the entire pathetic corporal's guard of conventional forces at his disposal. It is not surprising that Khrushchev was not much frightened by the President's bold words about Laos.

Mr. Kennedy's first job is thus to right the real power balance. If the job is done, there is no reason to despair, despite the recent disasters. For the other side has grave weaknesses which are less visible than ours, and the President, although he has blundered badly, is still capable of offering the leadership the West so desperately needs. But the job will be expensive and painful, and it will not be done unless we recognize that when Khrushchev predicts that our system will be destroyed by his, he means just that. If all this seems a bit obvious and unsubtle, so are most last words.

RECORDS OF DOCUMENTARY MATERIALS DEALING WITH THE CIVIL WAR

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, as a part of the 100th anniversary of the War Between the States, efforts are being made in Virginia to have returned records and papers which were removed from the State during the war.

A great service would be rendered if State and local records, family papers, and documentary materials and manuscripts of all kinds carried away during the Civil War were returned to institutional repositories in the State where they would serve a useful purpose.

In this connection, the Virginia Historical Society, on April 20, 1961, unanimously adopted a resolution which I ask, with unanimous consent, to have published at this point as a part of my remarks.

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

Whereas various State and local records and family papers of great historical interest and value are known to have been carried out of Virginia by Federal soldiers during the War Between the States; and

Whereas it is believed that much of this material is still in the custody of descendants or relations of these soldiers, who, if properly approached, would be willing to return the materials to institutional repositories in the State, where the materials would serve a useful purpose; and

Whereas the Commonwealth has created a Virginia Civil War Commission to commemorate the 100th anniversary of the conflict during which the aforesaid losses of historical materials were sustained: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Virginia Civil War Commission be and hereby is requested to utilize the media of its organized publicity

program in soliciting, on behalf of the institutional repositories in the State, any manuscript materials which were removed or appropriated from Virginia agencies during the period 1861–65.

OLIVE BRANCH AND LIGHTNING BOLTS—THE STRATEGIC AIR COMMAND

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, the last time I visited the headquarters of the Strategic Air Command in Omaha I had the great pleasure of having lunch with Miss Alice Widener, one of our distinguished writers who writes for the publication "U.S.A.," published in New York City. Miss Widener has written an article about the Strategic Air Command entitled "Olive Branch and Lightning Bolts." The article was so thought provoking that I would like to give an opportunity to all Senators to read the article, and I therefore ask unanimous consent that it may be printed at this point in the RECORD in my remarks.

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

OLIVE BRANCH AND LIGHTNING BOLTS—A REPORT ON THE STRATEGIC AIR COMMAND, U.S. AIR FORCE

(By Alice Widener)

They that have power to hurt and will do none,
That do not do the thing they most do show,
Who, moving others, are themselves as stone,
Unmoved, cold, and to temptation slow;
They rightly do inherit heaven's graces,
And husband nature's riches from expense;
They are the lords and owners of their faces,
Others but stewards of their excellence.
—*William Shakespeare, Sonnet XCIV.*

PREFACE

On March 21, 1946, the Strategic Air Command, U.S. Air Force, was established with the following mission:

Peacetime: To maintain a force capable of deterring aggression and to preserve the peace on terms acceptable to the United States;

Wartime: To destroy the enemy's warmaking capability and his will to fight.

This awesome mission is symbolized by the crest of SAC, our Strategic Air Command—a mailed fist holding an olive branch and lightning bolts.

Today, SAC bears responsibility for more than 90 percent of the free nations' nuclear striking force. Today our lives rest in SAC's mailed fist. Without aerospace lightning bolts in its grasp, this fist would be the hand of a corpse and the green olive branch would be a speck of dust fallen on an American wasteland.

Nevertheless, there are those who would persuade our country to cast away the lightning bolts in its mailed fist, and to shroud the olive branch in a white flag.

For more than a decade, I have studied the propaganda of these persuaders in the Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists, in Pugwash statements, in many of the tracts and pamphlets put out by the more than 2,000 foundation-subsidized think centers at universities, at the Fund for the Republic's Santa Barbara Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions, and at the United Nations.

Professing to be an elite destined to save us from thermonuclear war, these propagandists mislead groups among us into adopting attitudes that undermine our will to resist Communist domination and that propel us toward committing national suicide.

These propagandists seek to persuade us that we must trust the Communists, that we must exert moral leadership by disarming unilaterally, that we must halt the tiresome dialogue of the cold war and accommodate ourselves to communism, that we must hold back SAC from massive retaliation against the Soviets and Red Chinese if they were to start a war, and that we must despise the officers and men of SAC as would-be mass executioners.

In all their propaganda, these persuaders—sick with fear and lusting for Socialist political power—never suggest that the Soviets and Red Chinese should accommodate themselves to us and our ways of freedom, that they should take the risk of accepting a first nuclear blow, that they should disarm unilaterally, that they should despise and repudiate the officers and men of the Red armed forces.

And all the while that these "think center" members of a self-styled elite try to persuade us to run the risk of national extermination, time, devouring time, is threatening to do its worst—to us.

Believing that time is not of the essence but is the essence, I decided to go and see SAC and try to find out precisely why the "think center" propagandists want us to hold it back.

The days I spent at SAC headquarters, Offutt Air Force Base, Omaha, Nebr.—April 14 to April 23, 1961—were the busiest and most strenuous of my life.

I came away convinced that either SAC will save us or the Reds will kill us.

Therefore I feel compelled to share with my fellow Americans all that I learned about the U.S. Strategic Air Command.

PART I. WHAT SAC DOES

We sleep, but SAC never does.

Sixty seconds a minute, unceasingly, SAC—our Strategic Air Command—works wide awake.

SAC's airborne alert never folds its wings to rest on earth. SAC's radar eyes never shut as they scan the skies. SAC's global signals system never stops pulsing along sound waves. SAC's positive control over the "go code" to strike back at a deadly foe never relaxes.

We sleep, but SAC never does.

What is the origin of SAC's tireless force? Is it scientific, technological, industrial? Is its constant protection over us a gift bestowed by a god sprung from a miraculous machine?

SAC's strength is indeed scientific, technological, industrial. But its origin lies in a way of Air Force life. It is a dynamic way, freely chosen by a group of men and women who are dedicated to peace as a profession, and who always are willing to watch over us.

In an airplane on the trip from New York City to Omaha, April 14, I sensed dimly a fact that later overrode all and cleared my mind of confusion derived from too much reading, at home and abroad, in English and other languages, of misleading propaganda voiced by some leading self-styled "intellectuals." Despite their claim to the contrary, it is true that each man is an individual different from every other, and that the horrors and wonders of sciences have not rendered man obsolete.

For several hours in the plane, I read, wrote, and chattered with a seat neighbor while a bridge game went on across the aisle. The players in uniform were SAC officers trained in the complex science of advanced aviation. They were not bridge experts, but their game was superior—hard fought, sparkled with wisecracks, tempered with courtesy only, and enjoyed in brotherly companionship. Playing the game, they behaved in a good traditional way which, as Plutarch described in antiquity "reflected one another's breeding."

Later, at a motel near SAC Headquarters, Omaha, I noticed that the desk in my room was too narrow for comfortable work at the typewriter and asked for a bridge table. Sitting there hour after hour, while I wrote three newspaper columns about SAC, I often thought about the airborne bridge game. Somehow, the diamonds, clubs, spades and hearts symbolically colored my writing; and my first impressions, based on the players' attitude toward one another, proved to be so truly indicative of the general man-to-man SAC relationship that I understood it better for having observed the card game.

I spent all Saturday morning at briefing sessions. SAC works on Saturdays. The officers who gave the briefings were clear-headed, well prepared and eager to answer questions. Col. Don Foster, director of SAC information, sat beside me. He was very patient, never condescending to an absolute tyro, and quietly considerate.

On a movie screen, in color and with sound, there unfolded before me a new world.

Time, so short, so long

For us Americans, it is a world in which there is at most a 30-minute interval of warning time between notice of a coming life-or-death struggle and our taking active part in it.

In the past, military commanders relied on future time for planning and they discussed the strategy and tactics of offensive and defensive action in terms of days, weeks, months, years. Today, the SAC commanders plan strategy and tactics in terms of minutes and seconds in present time and lead their lives accordingly. No member of SAC, from the commander in chief at his desk in headquarters to the lonely air watchman at a remote desert or glacier post, can while away time or let consciousness of it slip from his mind. And every man of SAC is willing to be the selfless servant of time for our defense in these times of clear and present danger.

Paradoxically, the short time element governing SAC creates extremely long working time. The Strategic Air Command keeps a major part of its 270,000-man force on continuous 24-hour, 7-days-per-week ground alert. The average workweek of a readiness plane crew is 76 hours. Alert duty entails personal and physical hardship, for the crews must endure separation from their families and confinement in close quarters located in an area suitable for immediate plane takeoff.

Marvelously, alert duty is also maintained in the air. Now, at the very moment you are reading this, a part of SAC is airborne. Heavy bombers and jet stratotankers are aloft. A duplicate command post too is airborne, commanded by SAC generals capable of making vital decisions if SAC's underground cement-enclosed command post and its three surface alternates were destroyed by the enemy's thermonuclear weapons.

Now, too, at this moment, there is instantaneous worldwide communication among all SAC bases.

Fate, in aerospace

Yes, we are living in a new world in our nuclear age. And though our feet tread on earth, our fate hangs in aerospace.

Few of us are aware that March 21, 1961, marked the 15th anniversary of SAC and the 15th year of success for our American concept of deterrence, which is to keep the peace by letting the enemy know every day that attack on our Nation or its allies will result in his own destruction.

"Since the prime purpose of our military forces is to prevent war," says Gen. Thomas D. White, Air Force Chief of Staff, "they will be most effective if we never have to use them. Our power, however, will be sufficient as a deterrent only so long as it convinces potential enemies that aggression against us and our allies is profitless."

For this reason, the motto of SAC is "Peace Is Our Profession."

On a movie screen during the morning of April 15, I saw the tools of SAC's profession—the names tell a tale of scientific discoveries, of technological feats, of industrial achievements. The names also tell a tale of failure and success, of progress and consolidation, of dynamic exertion and lull, of vast sums of money spent and of far greater sums needed.

On screen, I saw the B–52 Stratofortress and the aging B–47 Stratojet, the SM-Atlas intercontinental ballistic missile, the SM-Titan ICBM and the B–58 Hustler medium bomber, the SM–80 Minuteman ICBM, the GAM Hounddog missile and the GAM–87 Skybolt.

Also, I saw an artist's drawing of the B–70 Valkyrie heavy bomber which—they say in high earthly Washington, D.C., places—we Americans are too poor to finance, make in quantity, and send aloft. However, we are rich enough, they also say in high Washington places, to try to subsidize with billions of dollars the economic growth of population explosions which—according to a statement made April 24 by Eugene Black, president of the World Bank—are timed at one birth per second in Asian and Middle Eastern lands least able to afford it.

Alone, but together

After gazing at pictures of planes and missiles meant for aerospace, it was a staggering experience to go down and down into the underground at SAC Headquarters and see the command post there.

Not being scientifically informed, I cannot describe the electronic systems set up, or rather, set down there. But I can say that this sealed-off, cement-enclosed place is like a Salvador Dali stage setting illuminated and ornamented with living, breathing jewel-like lights, and weird clocks, and panels of pushbuttons like myriad keys of an organ-like orchestral instrument to be played by military virtuosos.

In time of thermonuclear attack, the personnel of SAC's underground command post would be wholly isolated. They would breathe their own decontaminated air, eat their own uncontaminated food, drink their own purified water. Yet, unless SAC Headquarters were to suffer a direct hit, the underground generals and their staffs would be in constant worldwide communication with SAC's airborne forces and its missile sites.

Within the timespan of 3 minutes, I saw and heard underground SAC communications personnel—wearing earphones and keeping eyes glued on rows of dotlike lights—flip switches on a switchboard not much bigger than a dashboard on a car, then talk to and hear from SAC men on base at or in planes over Okinawa, Newfoundland, Saudi Arabia, England, Spain, Brazil, Morocco, and other far distant bases.

Yes, I saw electronic miracles, but it takes men to make the miracles work and to make sense out of them.

Because men are men and SAC knows it, there is a system called "positive control" in the headquarters underground command post, in the three alternate surface command posts, and in the duplicate airborne command post.

This system prevents accidental launching of SAC's nuclear striking force. Many propagandists try to persuade the American public that "one psychotic SAC sergeant can get us into a nuclear war." This is not true. If, God forbid, we should be attacked by an enemy, SAC forces will be unleashed only on coded orders, known as the "go code," issued on authority from the President of the United States himself. There is foolproof direct communication between the SAC command and the White House and Pentagon.

Officially, SAC describes positive control as follows:

"SAC aircraft on constant alert take off at reliable indication of attack and head for enemy targets. These planes can be recalled at any time in event of a false alarm, but will turn around at a positive control point unless they receive orders to continue."

The weapons in alert aircraft are not armed until the bomber is ordered to attack. No one man can arm a nuclear weapon. Arming is achieved by coordinated effort of several crew members or missile personnel under "go code" authority.

Despite these facts, certain propagandists continue to assert the contrary and thus foster unwarranted fears among some Americans, and near-hysteria and panic among others.

Why do these self-professed "humanitarians" spread such untruths? They assert that they wish to spare us all from unnecessary suffering. To my mind, fear is most terrible suffering; he who spreads unwarranted fears is sadistic.

When I went to SAC, I myself was half brainwashed by the fearmongers. At headquarters, I met men and women who do not pretend to be without justifiable fears, but who hold in rightful scorn those prophets of doom who cultivate and propagate needless fears.

No one at SAC tries to minimize the potential horrors of thermonuclear war; everyone at SAC lives a life wholly dedicated to its prevention.

PART II. WHAT SAC MEN AND WOMEN ARE

At 9 o'clock on Monday morning, April 17, I had the privilege of meeting Gen. Thomas S. Power, commander in chief, Strategic Air Command, U.S. Air Force.

His eyes are blue and clear. Their gaze is direct, their expression realistic and inspired.

"It is our mission," the general explained, "to see and foresee the designs of an enemy, and to devise the versatile strategy and tactics that will deter and frustrate him."

Listening to General Power, I was struck by the mental similarity between him and Gen. Douglas MacArthur. It lies, I think, in each man's versatility, courage, and extraordinary geopolitical vision. These are superior qualities which characterize General MacArthur and Sir Winston Churchill. These are the special qualities that mark their greatness in military leadership. General Power will equal their stature, if put to the test by time and history. This is certain.

"It would be folly," he said, "for us to rely solely on any one weapon system."

To operate the mixed SAC weapon systems, General Power explained, there must be a professional force of officers and airmen with superior knowledge and skill. "The challenge faced by SAC in maintaining deterrent strength," he said, "is the most severe ever posed to a military organization."

The most important element for successful meeting of this challenge, the general believes, is the individual excellence of each man and woman among trained and dedicated personnel with a will to victory.

The general was not mouthing a platitude. He was speaking a truth that should be known and fully understood by every American.

I found this out when I went, that afternoon, to a trailer without wheels resting on a concrete ramp only a short sprint away from a KC–135 jet Stratotanker built to carry 250,000 pounds of fuel. Inside a trailer, a four-man crew was on alert, ready to perform the regular SAC feat of takeoff within 15 minutes after receiving an alarm signal.

In a small trailer living room, the 25-year-old navigator was studying a college textbook on English literature. At his elbow was a pile of 2-inch-thick technical manuals to be studied and restudied. Intelligent and ambitious, the navigator was lovelorn, pining away for his wife. They were married only 6 months ago.

The aircraft commander too was passionately in love—with flying. "Anything the enemy can do, we can do better," he said. "And anything we don't already know, we'll learn—fast."

The pilot loved flying and people. "We in this crew respect each other," he said earnestly. "Maybe our ideas about some things might be different. We chew the fat a lot. But we sure do see eye to eye on the job."

The boom operator was a thin, blond young staff sergeant. He told me about his job. His name is Richard D. Stafford and this is what he does: Lying on his belly and staring through a small glass window in the bottom of the tail of a KC–135 jet Stratotanker flying 600 miles an hour at an altitude of 35,000 feet, Stafford measures accurately with his own eyes the vital distance of only 20 to 30 feet between the tanker and the B–52 bomber being refueled.

The crew and I chewed the fat for a while. Then they took me through a KC–135 and down into the tail where Stafford operates the refueling boom.

"We pilots and navigators see to it that the tanker and bomber arrive at our rendezvous in the skies," the commander explained. "Then, suddenly, all depends on Stafford."

There, in the tanker tail, I understood the full import of the truth that General Power told.

If the "go code" ever were given to attack, all would depend on men like Stafford, on the highly trained, dedicated, professional SAC crews, and on all officers and men of our Armed Forces with courage and will to victory.

The captain's wife

There are many women at SAC with such attributes.

At supper in the officers' club, I had a long talk with Capt. "Chuck" Deare and his wife, Betty. She works as a secretary in the underground command post. She and Chuck have a 3-year-old son who grew bored at a children's movie being shown at the club and toddled into the dining room to join us at table.

"At first when I worked underground I used to grow terribly upset," Betty said. "I kept thinking about what would happen if I were safe there while Chuck and the baby were killed above ground."

I didn't say anything. Underground, I had had the nightmarish thought that perhaps a day would come when the staff underground were the sole survivors at the base after a thermonuclear bomb hit.

"One day, above ground, Chuck took the baby to town in the car. I stood outside in the garden and waved goodby," Betty Deare went on. "When the car was out of sight, I suddenly realized that a fatal accident could happen and I might never again see them alive. Then I would be in the same position above ground as underground."

She put down knife and fork, reached over to pat her little boy on the head, and smiled at her husband. "And so," she added, "I quit thinking fearful thoughts."

From what I heard and overheard at SAC Headquarters during 10 days, it seems everybody there does as Betty Deare did. Unusually self-disciplined and knowledgeable people, they are keenly aware that SAC Headquarters is a prime target for enemy attack. They can visualize much more vividly than most Americans the actual situation of thermonuclear war, not the fictionalized "On the Beach" version of it.

Fortunately for us all, the SAC personnel don't usually indulge in fearful thinking, and if they do momentarily fall into it, they

soon quit it—fortified by faith, commonsense, a sense of humor, and a deep feeling of service to our Nation and the cause of freedom.

PART III. WHAT SAC NEEDS

On Thursday, April 20, General Power, a rated command pilot with combat experience, invited me to go on a tour of the completed Atlas missile site in Wyoming and the Titan missile site under construction in Colorado.

During lunch in the cafeteria at Francis E. Warren Air Force Base, Wyo., the general was notified that a jurisdictional labor union strike had halted work at the Titan site.

When we arrived there, the elevators had been stalled by the strikers. To go underground, it was necessary to climb down a circular staircase inside a well only 30 inches in diameter but more than a hundred feet deep. Since 85 feet is the height of six stories of a modern building, the circular but vertical descent was a physical ordeal.

I made it—backward. Going forward, I grew too dizzy. Also, I somehow controlled my tendency to vertigo when I stood on a narrow board scaffolding and looked down into the pit—178 feet below ground—where Titan will stand erect. But I could not control my indignation at the labor union leaders for halting work on a major national defense effort and thereby hurting the security of all Americans.

The climb out of Titan was a greater strain than the climb down. I gripped the wood rail so hard that next day my arms were stiff.

When at last we stood above ground the cool air felt icy on my cheeks, for I was boiling mad.

I don't know who are the labor union officials responsible for the outrageous jurisdictional strike at Titan. But I should like to see them go down and up those stairs. Also, I should like to see them forced to live for just 1 week the life led by SAC officers and airmen manning the missile sites. Believe me, they don't work a 30-hour week with 4 days off for leisure. Nor do they receive a single cent of overtime pay, much less time and a half.

Prior to visiting SAC, I had written articles and newspaper columns about the leftwing "hold back SAC" campaign. It can be fatal to America. Now, since I visited SAC, I am convinced that a part of this leftist scheme is to deny to SAC the proper personnel incentives and rewards so urgently needed to maintain its highly skilled, expensively trained and strictly professional force.

In our country, we are patsies for hue-and-cry propaganda about any group whom the leftwingers decide are overworked and underpaid. But I have seen nothing in leftwing publications such as the Bulletin for the Atomic Scientists, the New Republic, The Nation, the Reporter magazine or any left-liberal journal or newspaper about the overworked, underpaid men of SAC and of the entire Armed Forces.

Outside and inside

In the airmen's messhall, I talked to a sergeant who bears responsibility for the serving of 3,600 meals a day. The day begins at 5 o'clock in the morning and ends at midnight. Owing to the exacting nature of SAC's work and the staggered timing, many of the personnel cannot sit down to regular breakfast, lunch and dinner at customary eating hours.

The SAC mess sergeant earns $240 per month. Since many servicemen's benefits have been taken away, he must pay regular prices for much of what he and his family need. And—the mess sergeant pays income tax. Recently, he was offered a job "outside"—as SAC men say. In the outside he could earn $11,000 per year managing a series of hotel coffee shops.

"Why didn't you take the job?" I asked.

He flushed and said, "I'm kinda used to it here."

I silently doubted that this was his real motive and pressed for a more precise reason.

"Well, ma'am," he said, glancing around the messhall at the quiet, exceptionally well mannered men and women eating there, "I guess you could say it's because I know what SAC is doing. Without it, there probably wouldn't be any outside."

Probably, there wouldn't, at least, not as we know it. The United States would be a satellite state, a people's republic under domination by Khrushchev and his Red ruling circle.

My conversation with the mess sergeant led me to inquire into the SAC personnel situation. The more I learned about it, the more indignant I grew. Toward the end of my visit, I sat down late at night and typed a newspaper column which stated:

Modern warfare allows no time to correct errors and make up for lacks after the shooting starts. This is why our Strategic Air Command, SAC, must have a professional force of mentally alert, highly trained and skilled personnel.

Today, most of us civilians think of our military forces as drawn from a vast national resource of manpower easily available for our defense in time of crisis. We have the comfortable feeling that in time of dire need our men would respond to the Nation's call.

They would. But there won't be time enough for a call. And even if there were, most men would be useless to SAC.

In many ways, SAC is like a great symphony orchestra requiring only the best men and best replacements. These men must have years of training in handling delicate instruments, years of experience in teamwork, and ability to give a perfect performance. It is impossible to create such a body from untalented personnel. It is impossible to create such a body within a short space of time.

The biggest problem in SAC today is how to retain its highly trained, gifted, and dedicated personnel, and how to attract quality personnel for replacements.

SAC knows what it needs, but the public doesn't. Therefore, SAC isn't getting what it should have. Surely, an informed public will make their voices heard. Once they understand the problem, they will ask Congress to take care of it pronto, if not sooner.

From everywhere in our Nation, I receive letters from patriotic Americans asking, "What can I do to help our country?" Now that I have seen SAC, I can reply to the letters, "Help SAC."

It is easy to understand what SAC needs. The officers and men need the incentives and rewards that will in some measure compensate them for the hard way of life they lead. They do not expect to receive what civilians are paid for comparable jobs in industry and in commercial aviation. But they would like to have and certainly do deserve:

1. Promotion opportunity;
2. Alert duty pay;
3. Adequate housing;
4. Restoration of service benefits.

Modern warfare requires higher grade but fewer personnel. Restrictions of the present Officers Grade Limitations Act are such that chances for promotion in SAC above the grade of captain are very slim. Under a Defense Department directive, promotions between airman first class and chief master sergeant are too few.

The readiness of nuclear forces-in-being requires ground and airborne alert duty. This is the hardest kind of duty in which the workweek is 76 hours.

Everybody knows about civilian demands for "overtime pay" in a 30-hour work week. Gen. Thomas S. Power, commander in chief, wants SAC's alert crews to receive an extra $10 for each 24-hour period spent on continuous alert. This is a paltry sum. The men should receive it.

Modern nuclear warfare requires that SAC maintain bases and missile sites in remote places where weather conditions and loneliness are acute. Surely, the men and their families stationed at such bases and sites should be able to have decent housing at low rents.

In civilian life, "fringe benefits" are the order of the day. In military life, service benefits have been steadily decreased. This is flagrantly unfair. Period.

Working here at SAC Headquarters, any writer in his or her right mind can soon see that SAC is our major deterrent to war and our primary hope of victory in war. Without SAC, probably there would not now be a United States of America. It is suicidal for us not to give SAC what it needs.

It was early Sunday morning, April 23, when I said goodby and thank you to newfound friends at SAC. In the plane, as it flew halfway across America during my trip home, I kept thinking about the new nuclear world I had glimpsed in Nebraska, Wyoming, and Colorado.

Graphically, Dr. Edward N. Teller described it when he said, "The world in which we live today will disappear, and tomorrow will be unimaginably better or very much worse. Whether the great dream of a free society composed of individuals who can be individuals and who are free, whether this dream will survive, this is up to us."

In the Soviet empire, people have no free choice.

In the free world, its exercise is our privilege and agonizing problem.

Who will prevail among us?

Lord Bertrand Russell says, "Rather Red than dead." Gen. Thomas S. Power, commander in chief of SAC, says, "Rather dead than Red."

At home in my own room, Sunday evening, I felt tired but serene. By the time the plane had landed at Idlewild International Airport in New York, I had chosen to go along with General Power and all like-minded Americans and, like Betty Deare, I had quit thinking fearful thoughts.

In the dark at bedtime, I said an old prayer with new faith and understanding:

"Now I lay me down to sleep,
I pray the Lord my soul to keep;
If I should die before I wake,
I pray the Lord my soul to take."

Then I prayed for loved ones, for all men and women in our Armed Forces, and went to sleep, gratefully aware that up in aerospace, SAC was wide awake.

(Military strength for war becomes political strength for peace when it is supported by the sum total of every deterrent inherent in a strong and united nation. For deterrence is more than bombs and missiles and tanks and armies. Deterrence is a sound economy and prosperous industry. Deterrence is scientific progress and good schools. Deterrence is adequate civil defense and a stable professional military force. Most of all, deterrence is the determination of the American people to prevent and, if necessary, to fight and win any kind of war, whether hot or cold, big or small. So long as our citizens show such determination with both words and deeds, I am confident that the Strategic Air Command will accomplish its primary mission—to help preserve an honorable peace for this Nation and for all other nations in the free world.—Thomas S. Power, General, U.S. Air Force, commander in chief, Strategic Air Command.)

THE COST OF DRUGS

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, a few days ago I received a letter from a constituent in Ravenna, Ohio, pointing out

an experience that she had in the purchase of drugs. Her husband had worked for the Pennsylvania Railroad for a period of 42 years. He was forced to retire because of an asthmatic condition. Treating her husband was a Dr. Tucker, of Mount Gilead, Ohio. He provided her husband with a drug at a cost of $4 for 2 ounces. The drug had a curative effect on her husband. Then the doctor died. The administrator of the doctor's estate sold the prescription to an Illinois drug company, the Northfield Laboratories of Northfield, Ill. Her husband again being in need of the medicine, contacted the residence of the former doctor at Mount Gilead, and was told that the prescription had been sold. In the letter the writer of the letter says that when she bought the drug from the former doctor, she had paid $4 for 2 ounces. After the prescription had been sold to the drug company, she had to pay $15 for 2 ounces, at another drugstore. She asks that this matter be called to the attention of the appropriate committee of the Senate. It is for that reason that I mention the receipt of the letter, and ask unanimous consent that it may be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

RAVENNA, OHIO, *April 26, 1961.*

HON. FRANK LAUSCHE,
U.S. Senator, State of Ohio,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I am registering this complaint to you hoping you will get it into the hands of the committee appointed for investigation of medical costs. It may not do any good but if we don't make such cases known, how are people in our circumstances ever going to be able to have medical care.

Five years ago my husband had to retire after 42 years with the Pennsylvania Railroad in Cleveland due to an asthma and heart condition. As you know railroad pensions are very meager for the percentage we paid in over the years. We had been taking him to an asthma clinic in Mount Gilead, Ohio, which was run by Dr. Tucker and Dr. Robinson. A year ago Dr. Robinson had a heart attack and passed away and about 2 weeks later Dr. Tucker was killed in an auto accident. So we could not get the medicine any longer and we were much concerned as it was the only medicine that gave Mr. Beery relief when he would have his very serious attacks.

A few months ago we received a letter from the doctor's estate telling us the prescription had been sold to a Northfield Laboratories in Northfield, Ill. If we would send in the card with our doctor's name they would get in contact with him and the medicine would be available to us again.

Last week Clark's Drugstore in Ravenna called us that the prescription was ready for us. When we bought the medicine from Dr. Tucker it cost us $4 for 2 ounces but at Clark's Drugstore it cost $15 for 2 ounces. We paid for it but only because Mr. Beery does need it so badly but it is just too expensive at this rate for our pension income. To us it seems uncalled for because the same medicine has been in use for years. It entailed no research or production of any new drug.

We folks need medical help as well as people with higher incomes but how can we have it when things like this are going on? I am registering with you a vigorous protest against such practices.

Mr. LAUSCHE, I can easily see how such revolts as Laos, Cuba, and the many others can happen in our United States with the extreme pressures on the small-income people from the exorbitant taxes collected from us and used in such extravagance; unnecessary exorbitant medical costs, terrific high costs of food and clothing, etc. From reading letters being sent to editors of newspapers; hearing the attitudes expressed in the various clubs and church meetings I attend; in the comments among our friends and my fellow employees; strikes we are having all over; and the increase in small and large thefts; from all these I can see the very beginnings of just such rebellion in the United States.

The pressures brought by the wealthy people on the lower salaried peoples have brought downfall of great nations all through history and it could be the near future destiny of the United States, which, I am sure, few of us want to see.

I sincerely feel that only quick action by our elected Government officials to alleviate such pressures and wasteful use of collected taxes can avoid terrible troubles in the United States already beginning to broil. Wasteful use of our tax money in the extravagant parties being given by the Kennedys and many other instances of unnecessary waste completely detrimental to the mental attitudes and the welfare of the citizens who can scarcely survive financially and pay the heavy taxes collected from them.

J. EDGAR HOOVER OUTLINES PROGRAM TO COMBAT JUVENILE DELINQUENCY

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, the current issue of the Reader's Digest contains an article by J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, which I consider to be of great significance.

The article describes the effects of so-called juvenile delinquency on many parts of our country, and then explains how this terrible malady is being effectively combated by the Boys' Clubs of America and the Boy Scouts. Another Hoover—former President Herbert Hoover, who for 25 years has exerted his great influence on behalf of the Boys' Clubs movement—recently estimated that there is a minimum need in the United States for 1,000 Boys' Clubs serving 1 million youngsters. At present 575 clubs are serving about 600,000 boys.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article by Mr. J. Edgar Hoover be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

THESE FIGHTERS AGAINST YOUTH CRIME NEED YOUR HELP

(By John Edgar Hoover)

(The appalling increase in youthful crime is a symptom of a much larger problem: a growing moral decay that affects us all. Here, the dean of American crime fighters specifies the steps we must take if we are to survive as a great nation.)

This Nation is hurtling toward a frightful internal crisis. Indeed, I am convinced that we have already reached a crossroads we have been heading for since the beginning of World War II; and that if we fail to admit the deadly nature of this crisis and to meet it quickly and aggressively, we will pay with the life of our Republic.

The crisis manifests itself in what some call juvenile delinquency, and what I call youthful criminality, for that is what it is. I refer to the vicious acts of vandalism, wanton brutality and mounting savagery which typify today's arrogant teenage gangs.

One night last summer, five youths between the ages of 15 and 18 viciously attacked two families in a Chicago park. After beating both husbands senseless with baseball bats, stabbing them with switchblade knives, and robbing them, these five terrorists turned upon the two pregnant mothers and brutally raped them while the two 3½-year-old children of one mother watched, weeping and horrified.

"They held a knife at my throat and threatened to kill my two little children if I resisted," one of the women said. "We pleaded with them, but they paid no attention."

Convicted of rape and assault each of the five young thugs received 65-year sentences. The sentencing judge recommended that the youths never be paroled.

Tragically, similar acts of brutal violence are perpetrated daily across the country by rampaging teenage criminals. Blazing headlines of murder, sadism, and gang warfare toll the depredations of youthful criminals. An 18-year-old California art student obtained money to purchase books by robbing elderly people. Known as the "mugger bandit," he committed six vicious attacks on elderly victims which netted him $70. Two of the victims, both elderly men, subsequently died as the result of the violent assaults. In describing his actions, the youth commented, "I picked on old men because they could not fight back."

Today youthful offenders account for one-half of the burglary and larceny arrests in this country and nearly two-thirds of the arrests for automobile thefts. And their rate of participation in more serious crimes—assault, robbery, rape, murder—is steadily rising.

If we are to continue living in a free and decent society, we must do much more than halt this trend; we must reverse it. Preoccupied with the pursuit of wealth and luxury, we seem to have lost touch with our basic traditions—work, discipline, duty, honor. But if this Nation is to survive, we must give our youngsters more chance to know and revere the spiritual concepts which are the real sinews of greatness.

We can help them best by committing ourselves unreservedly to a battle that an all-too-small vanguard of dedicated Americans has been fighting for us for years—the professional leaders and part-time volunteer workers of such groups as the Boys' Clubs of America, Girl Scouts and Boy Scouts, YMCA and YWCA, Police Athletic Leagues, and Catholic, Protestant and Jewish youth organizations. The results these groups achieve continually reaffirm my faith in the strength and appeal of the American idea, and my conviction that American youth, if given the opportunity, will eagerly accept honorable challenge.

Here are some heartening examples:

During the 8 years following World War II there was a 61-percent increase in juvenile crime in Louisville, Ky. But during the same period there was a 52-percent decrease in one of Louisville's poorest, toughest areas. No new industry moved into this neighborhood to upgrade incomes; there was no decrease in the youth population; housing conditions were not improved. One thing happened: a Boys' Club was established there.

Within 5 years after a Boys' Club was organized in a delinquency-ridden area of Schenectady, N.Y., there was an 80-percent decrease in youthful crime in that neighborhood. Results like these can be found in many of the 383 cities where 575 Boys' Clubs of America serve 600,000 lads.

The formula is simple. It consists of a genuine, active adult interest in youth; a deep respect and sympathy for the individual boy and girl, tempered with rigid,

tough-minded adherence to the legal and moral principles which are the cornerstones of any decent society; and, above all, an unwavering faith in our youth, and Job-like patience in helping every youngster realize the best that is in him.

This formula has worked countless times. At the end of World War II one neighborhood just west of Chicago's Loop was virtually an armed camp, torn by bloody juvenile gang wars. The streets were not safe for women, night or day; children could not be sent to the grocery store with cash.

For 10 years various social agencies tried to deal with these gangs with little success. Then, in 1955, a young Boys' Club extension worker whom we shall call Richard West began hanging about the pool halls and candy stores where the dominant, most vicious gang met. For months he studied the boys, listened to them, tried to talk with them. It wasn't easy. These boys came from homes filled with fearful frictions. Most had quit school. The gang was their refuge from the hostile world around them.

Rebuffed and threatened time and again, West doggedly shadowed the gang. When members were arrested, he would appear in court with them and speak in their behalf. He made the gang aware that arresting officers and judges listened to him. He was on call day and night for advice and whatever help he could provide.

Finally, one by one, gang members began coming to him with their problems. They found he could arrange loans when there was serious need—medical or dental problems, lack of food in the home. West kept watching, waiting for a display of interest he could seize on as a foundation for launching these youngsters into productive lives. Then he found it. Several times each week they would wander to a nearby high school to watch in absorbed silence as an ROTC unit performed military drill. Talking with the boys, West found they had deep respect for the kind of discipline which could produce precision drill. Here was a chance to get them active in a field in which they could win what they needed and wanted most desperately and had never had—adult support and praise.

From Government surplus West obtained Army uniforms. Combat helmets were painted bright blue and white. Drums and bugles were provided. The boys learned fast. As a gang this group had flourished under iron discipline. Now the same discipline drove them toward perfection in military drill. Interest in gang feuds and hoodlumism faded. They concentrated on mastering the fast, tricky cadences of the drill repertoire. Soon they were taking part in civic parades, performing at sports events, and on television.

Their success as a drill team fired the imagination of rival gangs. Before long the drill teams in this area included more than 400 youngsters who had once belonged to 17 different gangs. A Boys' Club was built in the center of the area. Here boys worked off excess energy in all kinds of sports and discovered new interests in handicrafts, science, photography, and drama. Gang structures disintegrated. Boys' Club workers stayed in close touch with parents, kept pointing to the worth and potentialities of their sons, awakened parental enthusiasm for the boys.

As a result of concerted adult direction and encouragement, many of these boys returned to high school; others found jobs and completed their high school requirements during evenings in the Boys' Club library.

Today this Boys' Club thrives with a membership of more than 1,000. This area, 5 years ago a spawning ground for big-time crime, is now a respectable neighborhood whose citizens can walk the streets unafraid, with pride in their children and hope for the future.

Some communities have done much to combat youthful criminality through wholesome recreational programs for their children. Great progress is being made in areas where men and women care enough to do something about the problem. Seven years ago, the vast Surrey Lane area of St. Louis, Mo., faced with a growing juvenile crime problem, did not have a single park or community center. Parents and youngsters of Surrey Lane went into action. With great effort and hard work they converted a tract of land, once a swamp, into a recreational area covering 31 acres. They raised money, cleared the land, built roads and constructed recreational facilities. And they did it as a family project—father and son, mother and daughter, young and old alike, united in the common endeavor. Today, with over 2,000 youths participating in recreational activities, Surrey Lane's juvenile crime rate is practically nil. Last year, the Freedoms Foundation at Valley Forge, Pa., honored Surrey Lane with the Nation's first place award for a community program.

The Boy Scout movement, too, has proved that when a worthy challenge is promoted among youngsters, it takes. In one year the crime rate in East Harlem was more than double that of any other section of New York City. Youthful gangs kept the 64-square-block area in terror. Scouters moved in. First they sold scouting to the ruler of the ruling gang, an 18-year-old whom police suspected of organizing the gang wars which racked the community. Soon that gang—11 boys—was a Scout troop, dedicated to the principle of helping people instead of hurting them.

More than 150 police departments in the United States now sponsor Boy Scout units, with some police officers serving as Scout leaders. We in the FBI are proud of the fact that nearly 50 percent of our FBI agents are former Boy Scouts.

In no instance have the Boys' Clubs of American or Boy Scouts designed special programs for dealing with problem boys. They have succeeded simply by providing adult friendship, guidance, worthy challenge, a desire for the rewards of disciplined living. Their achievements are a monument to the intrinsic worth of our youngsters, and a powerful lesson for us all.

It is long past time that every one of us understood the deadly nature of the sickness in our society and went to work on the cure. Each one of us must help turn back the tide of moral laxity and public apathy which threatens us. Our youth movements have proved it can be done. We must get interested in our children again—in what they read, see, hear and do.

And we must get tough with ourselves. We must stop governing our lives by expediency. Nothing is so infectious as example.

We must measure our every act by the same single, simple, stringent criterion that made us a great nation: "Is it right?"

IMPROPER CONFINEMENT AND TRIAL OF MOISE TSHOMBE

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I do not pose as an expert on the internal affairs of the rapidly emerging nations in Africa. I am not a member of the Committee on Foreign Relations. I do not know the merits or demerits of the claims of the many factions which are now contending in the Congo. Certainly I do not undertake to refute any charges of criminal acts which have been laid against Moise Tshombe, who is now being detained against his will after having left his own domain under a pledge of safe conduct which was, at least impliedly, supported by the United Nations.

Mr. Tshombe may be guilty not only of all the crimes with which he has been charged, but also of those recorded in the Decalogue. However, it is not in keeping with our generally accepted sense of fairplay to resort to palpably dishonorable means to trap even a criminal. In my opinion, as a practical matter, if this man is tried, after having been seized while operating under a pledge that he would not be molested, the usefulness of the United Nations has been destroyed from this day hence ever to settle by negotiations issues between groups within any of the newly emerging countries or to settle any controversies between any of the smaller nations of the earth.

What sane person would leave his own domain to go to an area where he knew he would be surrounded by enemies if he could not trust a pledge of safe conduct which was extended to him? I am confident that this action can have the most far-reaching consequences on the future usefulness of the United Nations, just when that organization was showing some small promise of being a real factor in achieving world peace. Furthermore, I believe that if no protest is lodged by the United Nations, it will be construed as a policy of that body of refusing to support that sense of honor inherent in men, and as an acceptance of the doctrine that the end justifies the means in all cases.

I have not heard this conduct condemned by our great metropolitan press, which so often poses as the keeper of the character and the honor of the world. They often speak of due process of law, but I have not heard that any of them has undertaken to criticize the violation of solemn promises that resulted in this man's seizure while under the white flag.

Tshombe may be so guilty that the United Nations should organize a military force and send it into his capital to arrest him and try him for his crimes; but if the United Nations approves of a procedure of luring any man from his own bailiwick under a pledge of safe conduct, and then arresting, trying, and executing him, it will be a fatal blow to the hopes of the world that the United Nations can negotiate and keep the peace by settlement of differences.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I understand the Senator from Georgia is taking exception to the reported method in which Tshombe was induced to move from circles where he was among friends to enter into a land where he was surrounded by enemies, under the promise that he would be given protection in his travels; and that then, when he got there, he was seized and is now to be tried for high crime.

Mr. RUSSELL. That is exactly what I am calling to the attention of the Senate and of the country. I cannot help feeling that this action goes much further than those who have dealt with it have considered. It goes to the very life of the United Nations. I do not know how much the United Nations had to do with the arrangements for the conference, but they have been, at least im-

pliedly, claiming to settle the differences in the Congo by negotiation instead of by arms.

It will never be possible to get those who have differing opinions and conflicts of interest in the new countries, and indeed between the new countries and the old countries, to sit down around a table and undertake to talk over their difficulties instead of fighting them out, if a man is faced with the certain knowledge that he may suffer the fate of Tshombe if he leaves his own domain to sit at a conference table.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I express my concurrence with the views expressed by the distinguished Senator from Georgia. If conferences are to be had and differences to be settled, the very foundation of their success requires that when the participants come to confer, they shall be protected against the use of the power of the area into which they have come, and that they not be subjected to an abuse of promises when safe conduct has been assured.

Mr. RUSSELL. I thank the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. HRUSKA. I add my concurrence to the statement of the Senator from Georgia. My recollection goes back to the later days of the Hungarian revolution of 1956 and 1957, when one of the leaders of that revolution sought sanctuary and haven in one of the neutral Embassies located in Budapest. He was induced to leave that Embassy on the promise of the Communist leaders that if he joined in the conference and the effort to reconcile the differences between the revolutionaries and their opponents, he would be given safe conduct. He was promptly taken into custody. My recollection is that he was removed to a prison and eventually disappeared from the scene. It is my further recollection that he was actually executed.

We can expect such conduct on the part of the Communist forces and of the Communist government; but to have the United Nations suffer an incident such as that just described by the Senator from Georgia is to reduce the United Nations to a level of which it is not deserving.

I fully concur in the position taken by the distinguished Senator from Georgia.

Mr. RUSSELL. I thank the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. COOPER. The Senator from Georgia has raised very properly an important question. I think a distinction can be made between the power and role of the United Nations in the Congo, and the power of Mr. Kasavubu, who is the head of the regime which arrested Mr. Tshombe.

As I understand, the United Nations is in the Congo to preserve peace and order, and to assist the states and factions in the Congo to establish a government of their choice. The United Nations representatives did not arrest Mr. Tshombe.

The Senator from Georgia is correct when he says that it is unthinkable that a leader should be asked to negotiate under a pledge of safe conduct and then be arrested and held in custody when he did not agree with those who invited him.

I doubt that the United Nations forces have authority to order the release of Tshombe. However, the United Nations could exercise the same kind of concern about the arrest of Tshombe that it exercised about the arrest of Lumumba. A resolution providing for an inquiry and investigation of the arrest of Lumumba was adopted in the United Nations. And after Lumumba was killed a resolution asking that the facts surrounding his death be investigated was adopted by the United Nations.

I agree with the Senator from Georgia. To date, I have not seen any evidence of concern by the United Nations about the arrest of Tshombe—and in saying this, we do not pass on the merits of his position—we are talking about the method of his seizure.

Mr. RUSSELL. I expressly disclaimed any judgment on the merits of the issues under discussion.

Mr. COOPER. The question is one of law and order.

Mr. RUSSELL. I thank the Senator from Kentucky. As I recall, Lumumba was not arrested when he was under a pledge of safe conduct from those who seized him.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. SYMINGTON. As usual, the Senator from Georgia has brought up a matter which is most important; and it should worry everyone who is interested in freedom.

The Senator from Georgia has stated the fact that he is not a member of the Foreign Relations Committee. However, he knows a great deal about our foreign relations.

As a member of the Foreign Relations Committee, I wish to report to the Senator from Georgia that a man who has a high position with the United Nations in that area of the world, at an informal luncheon the other day expressed his grave concern about that proceeding. He said that it was true that Mr. Kasavubu did represent his government; but that, on the other hand, Mr. Tshombe was there as a guest. And he did not see how, under those circumstances, Mr. Tshombe could be arrested.

To the best of my knowledge, that point has not heretofore been brought out.

I wish to say that, not only because of my great respect for the Senator from Georgia; but also, because of what I know about the situation, from the standpoint of the future of the United Nations, in which I firmly believe, I am much concerned about this matter.

Mr. RUSSELL. I thank the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield to me?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I congratulate the Senator from Georiga for bringing up this important matter.

As a member of the Foreign Relations Committee, I wish to say that I, too, was very much disturbed and concerned when I read of the proceeding to which the Senator from Georgia has referred.

The Senator from Georgia has referred to an arrangement by which the United Nations brought together the representatives of certain nations, in an attempt to overcome their differences and reach an arrangement whereby they could live together. If, in connection with such an arrangement, one man is permitted to arrest his enemies and put them on trial or put them before firing squads, once that is permitted to happen, then, I quite agree with the Senator from Georgia, there would seem to be no prospect that nations would in the future listen and respond favorably when they were asked to meet for a conference.

Mr. RUSSELL. I thank the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. It seems to me that the distinguished Senator from Georgia has raised a very fundamental question. If it is to be possible for a man to be arrested when he comes, as the head of his nation or as the head of a group, or in any other capacity, to meet with representatives of other nations or groups to discuss an effort to end a conflict, no one will in the future attend such conferences. They will think too much of their skin, to do that.

As I understand, the meeting was encouraged by the United Nations and by our Government. So it seems to me that the distinguished Senator from Georgia is correct when he says we should take an interest in this matter.

It is my hope that the United States and the United Nations will take an interest in it, because, like the Senator from Missouri, I have always been a great supporter of the United Nations. But if the United Nations allows such a precedent to be set, I fear it will be discouraging for future negotiations under the auspices of the United Nations.

So the distinguished Senator from Georgia has performed a great service, I believe, by bringing up this matter.

Mr. RUSSELL. I thank the Senator from New York.

I merely wish to say that if one were to fire on a white flag of truce, it would be a long time before another flag of truce would be sent forward, in an effort to conduct peaceful negotiations. A flag of truce has generally been recognized as a means of obtaining immunity from attack, for the purpose of seeking a peaceable solution to issues between nations, or between nations and rebels, or even between the forces of law and outlaws. In this case, the flag of immunity is being trampled in the dust.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Under the order previously entered, the Senate proceeded to consider executive business.

AMBASSADOR TO IRAN

The Senate resumed the consideration of the nomination of Julius C. Holmes, of Kansas, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Iran.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the unanimous consent agreement, there will be 2 hours of debate on the nomination of Julius C. Holmes, of Kansas, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Iran, and that time is to be equally divided between the majority leader and the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS], and the Senate has automatically gone into executive session.

Mr. METCALF. 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. METCALF. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further proceedings under the quorum call be suspended.

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

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, I yield such time as he may wish to the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON].

Mr. SYMINGTON. I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, I should like to comment now on several aspects of the private transactions involving Mr. Holmes which were dwelt on extensively during the discussion on this floor last Thursday.

Statements were made to indicate that Mr. Holmes sought to escape the penalty on technicalities and did not, as he had testified, seek a trial on the merits.

Mr. President, I have noted the court records following Mr. Holmes' indictment. The facts are that the day the indictments were returned, February 23, 1954, Mr. Holmes was most anxious for prompt disposition of the matter. His counsel suggested the date of May 15, 1954, as a trial date.

According to the court records, counsel for the Government objected, but the court, at Mr. Holmes' insistence, set the date for May 17.

Counsel for the Government subsequently sought to postpone this date. That resulted in Mr. Holmes' counsel bringing a motion before the court on April 30 which requested that the court order the case set for trial on May 17; or, if the other defendants were not ready, sever the case as to Mr. Holmes' rights, guaranteed by the sixth amendment to the Constitution. This was in order to obtain for Mr. Holmes the right to a speedy and public trial.

The Government opposed this motion, on the representation of Government attorneys that they could not be ready and that severance of the case was not practicable. Therefore, court denied the motion.

At this point I should like to quote from Mr. Holmes' affidavit dated April 30, 1954, more than 6 months prior to eventual dismissal:

I appeared personally at the arraignment and opening of the indictments on February 23, 1954, when my counsel requested the setting of a date for trial at the earliest possible time. Chief Judge Laws set May 17, 1954, as the trial date.

Because it is necessary for me to establish my innocence of the charge made against me before I will be able to resume my career in the Foreign Service of the United States, a trial at the earliest possible date is essential to avoid further irreparable injury to me. In addition, I have been advised by competent officials in the Department of State that they consider it important to have my status determined as speedily as possible.

Holmes' motion, dated 30 April 1954:

The defendant Julius C. Holmes relies on the right guaranteed by the sixth amendment to the Constitution that in all criminal prosections the accused shall enjoy the right to a speedy and public trial. In view of the fact that this indictment was returned on April 23, 1953, the Government cannot in good faith maintain that it is not as yet prepared to try the case. Indeed, if 13 months after the return of the indictment the Government is still not prepared to try the case, the case should be dismissed.

It is recognized that this is a case involving multiple defendants, and if any of the defendants in this case has reason not to desire a trial thereof during the current April term, the constitutional right of the defendant Julius C. Holmes to a speedy trial should not be prejudiced thereby, and the case should be severed as to him, and the case as so severed promptly tried.

Wherefore, the defendant Julius C. Holmes prays that this court make and enter an order:

1. Setting this case for trial on May 17, 1954, or as soon thereafter in the current April term as shall be convenient to the court; or

2. In the event any of the defendants herein does not desire a trial during the current April term, severing the case as to the defendant Julius C. Holmes and setting such case as so severed for trial on May 17, 1954, or as soon thereafter during the current April term as suits the convenience of the court.

Mr. President, on June 18, 1954, Mr. Casey and Mr. Klein moved to dismiss the indictments on claims of insufficiency and immunity.

Mr. Holmes declined to participate in these motions because, as he stated at the time—and repeated in his testimony before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee—that he did not want to jeopardize his opportunity for a prompt disposition on the merits; and he did not, under any circumstances, want to avail himself of what might be considered a technical defense to these unwarranted charges.

I state these facts at some length to present Mr. Holmes' attitude toward the trial of these actions.

Mr. Phleger, legal adviser to the Secretary of State, had this to say regarding Mr. Holmes in the memorandum dated February 1, 1955:

Subsequent to his indictment, Holmes pressed for an early trial, volunteered to and did testify before a grand jury, waiving immunity, and in all possible ways sought to vindicate himself.

While dealing with the Phleger opinion, may I invite the attention of my colleagues to another statement made on the floor last week.

A sentence quoted was attributed, I am sure inadvertently, to Mr. Phleger.

As quoted, it omitted important words which showed that the statement was not Mr. Phleger's, but a statement of Mr. Olney, Assistant Attorney General.

I also quote the conclusions of Mr. Phleger as expressed in the memorandum of February 1955.

Based upon my examination of the grand jury testimony and other data—

Which, may I add, Mr. President, included the Hoey report—

it is my opinion that Mr. Holmes' actions in this matter do not render him unfit to be a diplomatic representative of the United States. I understand that Mr. Holmes has a record of long and valued service to the United States, both in the Foreign Service and in the Armed Forces. While his actions in this matter subjected him to an indictment for violation of law, the indictment was dismissed on motion of the Government. It is my opinion that the quality of his actions should not detract from a judgment that on the basis of his record he can be expected honorably to discharge the functions of a diplomatic assignment.

A good deal of attention was given to the fact that Mr. Holmes and his associates were the sole shareholders in the American Overseas Tanker Corp.

As was pointed out in the hearings before the Foreign Relations Committee, and also in several statements made last week, the record does not bear this out.

Once again, I refer to the document on page 34 of the recent hearings before the Foreign Relations Committee, which lists the stockholders as of June 26, 1950.

I also invite the attention of Senators to the Tax Court opinion referred to last Thursday.

In this opinion, the Tax Court clearly recognizes the fact that there were a number of stockholders in the corporation.

It was also directly stated last week that arrangements had been made to sell the three tankers to the United Tanker Corp. even before title was taken by Mr. Holmes and his associates.

Apparently a good deal of this contention was based on the memorandum of January 19, 1948.

This memorandum is a part of the record of the Hoey committee. A careful examination reveals that it is unsigned, and contains the phrase "American Overseas Tanker is willing to consider the sale to United Tanker."

Much is also made of the letters of January 24 exchanged between National Tanker Corp. and United Tanker.

Let me emphasize again that a careful reading of these letters reveals that they contain an option to sell and are not a contract of sale, as was stated last week.

I should like to make several additional comments on the so-called three-tanker transaction. The facts as to the transaction were brought out fully in the Hoey committee report and in the hearings which preceded it. They were

brought out in the recent hearings before the Foreign Relations Committee.

We have now again in the record of these debates the contracts under which National Tanker gave a bareboat charter on its three ships to United Tanker, with the details of the financing arrangements and the option to United to purchase the stock of National. Nothing new has been added to the record in these debates.

It has been asserted and reasserted that these transactions were some sort of concealment and misrepresentation to circumvent the law.

On the question of concealment, so far as this transaction is concerned, the record is clear that the fact that Chinese interests were supplying substantially all the capital behind United Tanker was fully disclosed to the Maritime Commission. I read a paragraph giving the facts on this into the record last Thursday.

At four points in the application for the tankers, specific and accurate statements were made about details of the proposed arrangements.

Next, I want the RECORD to include the opinion of Mr. Francis Goertner, Assistant General Counsel of the Maritime Commission, dated February 3, 1948.

Mr. Goertner took note in his opinion that all the class A stock of United was held by China Trading & Industrial Development Corp., which provides substantially all the capital of the corporation.

But because of the various restrictions in the charter, including the requirement that the majority of the outstanding stock shall at all times be held by citizens of the United States, and that no person shall be eligible for election as a director who is not a citizen of the United States, Mr. Goertner concluded:

> Thus in my opinion the necessary requirements of a citizen of the United States within the meaning of section 2 of the Shipping Act of 1916, as amended, are complied with by the United Tanker Corp. and the corporation must be considered as one within the meaning of the act.

This was the opinion of the counsel for the Commission administering the law; and he had all the facts before him.

Mr. President, this is of course a complex transaction, one in which lawyers, or Senators, might differ from Mr. Goertner's opinion.

Now the Tax Court case has been cited, involving the profits on this transaction, the case which the Stettinius family and other stockholders carried to the Tax Court.

The lawyers tell me what the Tax Court really did here was hold the group of 26 stockholders who realized a profit on the National shares to have received dividends in this amount as stockholders of AOTC, the predecessor corporation which held the five tankers.

There was the Meacham case, an action brought by the Government for the forfeiture of one of the three tankers on the grounds which have been mentioned here—that these arrangements were in effect a transfer to foreign registry in violation of the act.

The case went to the Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit. Two of the judges upheld the Government's contention.

Let me emphasize, this was not a criminal case. Chief Judge Parker, however, upheld the legality of the transaction.

Because of its relevance to some of the remarks in the debate the other day, I take the liberty of quoting from Judge Parker's opinion.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the opinion be printed in the RECORD without my reading it. It is a somewhat long opinion of Judge Parker, approving the position taken by Mr. Holmes and by Mr. Holmes' counsel. If any Senator prefers to have the opinion read, I should be glad to do so.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HICKEY in the chair). Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Missouri?

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

> I think, however, that United was from the beginning a citizen of the United States within the meaning of the statute.
>
> This was the view of counsel for the Commission who had the facts before him. It was also the view of some of the ablest and most distinguished law firms of the country in handling matters of great importance to the clients whom they represented; and I find nothing in the the record upon which to base a contrary conclusion.
>
> The fact that Chinese interests supplied the capital upon which United operated is not material, and I think it equally irrelevant that the class A stock, held by the Chinese, was to receive nine-tenths of the profits of the corporation, whereas the class B stock, held by citizens of the United States, was to receive one-tenth, and that upon dissolution the assets were to be divided in like proportion. This was merely giving to the class A stock some of the qualities of preferred stock, not taking the control of the corporation from the class B stock, which represented a majority of the voting power.
>
> It is the control of the corporation which counts under the statute, not the investment of funds or the right to earnings. * * * The majority of the stock of United was at all times in citizens, the majority of the voting power was in citizens, there was no contract or understanding by which the majority of the voting power could be exercised in behalf of a noncitizen and control of the corporation was not conferred upon or permitted to be exercised by noncitizens.
>
> At all times the control of the corporation was in the hands of its directors, who were substantial and upstanding citizens of the United States, and who owned the stock by which they could hold themselves in office. The fact that they had paid an insignificant sum for the stock is immaterial; for the ownership of the stock gave them absolute control of the corporation which any court would recognize and enforce.
>
> The amount paid for class A stock was likewise an insignificant amount compared with the business in which the corporation was engaged. The capital upon which the corporation was operating was obtained from loans; and there is nothing in the statute or its history to indicate that the sort of control which a creditor has over his debtor would suffice to nullify for the purposes of the statute the legal control inherent in stock ownership.
>
> * * * * *
>
> There is nothing in the record to justify the contention that the stock held by citizens of the United States was held by them in trust for noncitizens. On the contrary, the evidence is that the corporation was set up for the purpose of complying with the statute and there is nothing to justify an inference that U.S. citizens who accepted its stock were engaged in an attempt to evade the law or to perpetrate a fraud upon the Government.
>
> And I find nothing in the record to justify a finding that United was in fact dominated and controlled by the Chinese. No such inference can be drawn from the fact that the Chinese procured or furnished funds with which the corporation operated or that a number of Chinese were employed in its operations. * * *
>
> So far as the carrying on of the business of the corporation was concerned, this consisted for the greater part in the management and operation of vessels upon which bareboat charters were held, and such operation and management was in the hands of Sieling and Jarvis, American shipping agents.
>
> I think, therefore, that United was a citizen within the meaning of the statute.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, before the case could be taken to the Supreme Court, the Government settled the suit.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I yield.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Will the Senator tell me what type of settlement the Government made in this instance?

Mr. SYMINGTON. This was a civil case. I honestly do not know what the settlement was in the Meacham case. I will find out, and have it established for the record.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. It seems to me that it is important to know. The Government apparently won the case, so far as the Court of Appeals was concerned, by a divided opinion. I was curious to know if the court ever finally decided whether the transaction was legal or not legal, even though I know there is a difference of opinion about it.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I think my friend from Louisiana makes a good point. I shall be glad to find out and give him the information. I wish to read the last part of the opinion of Judge Parker.

Judge Parker said:

> There is nothing in the record to justify the contention that the stock held by citizens of the United States was held by them in trust for noncitizens. On the contrary, the evidence is that the corporation was set up for the purpose of complying with the statute and there is nothing to justify an inference that U.S. citizens who accepted its stock were engaged in an attempt to evade the law or to perpetrate a fraud upon the government.
>
> And I find nothing in the record to justify a finding that United was in fact dominated and controlled by the Chinese. No such inference can be drawn from the fact that the Chinese procured or furnished funds with which the corporation operated or that a number of Chinese were employed in its operations. * * *
>
> So far as the carrying on of the business of the corporation was concerned, this consisted for the greater part in the management and operation of vessels upon which bareboat charters were held, and such operation and management was in the hands of Sieling and Jarvis, American shipping agents.
>
> I think, therefore, that United was a citizen within the meaning of the statute.

Mr. President, I mention these two cases not to indulge further in legal debate, but to show that, contrary to assertions and reassertions, this cannot

be represented to the Senate as a flimsy subterfuge which no one with a straight face could countenance.

These were seriously conceived transactions which competent counsel at the time believed complied with the law, and which as great a jurist as Chief Judge Parker held years later to have fully complied with the law, and which a number of distinguished Americans besides Mr. Holmes took part in knowingly and publicly.

Some of us agree with Mr. Goertner and Judge Parker on the law; some obviously do not.

But I submit that this record cannot be summarily disregarded or brushed aside. Nor can it be suggested that Mr. Holmes, along with Secretary of State Stettinius and Admiral Halsey, are dishonored for having had a hand in it.

One final comment on the three-tanker transaction. There has been inserted in the record, before the committee and in these debates at several points, the concluding language of the Hoey committee report which, as Senators will remember, recommended action by the Department of Justice.

Following this recommendation the Department of Justice appointed several special assistants who had the Hoey committee records and full powers of the Department of Justice for future investigation.

As I have previously stated, 90 indictments were returned on the five-tanker transaction; but I think we must take note of the fact that the Department of Justice never acted on the three-tanker transaction, and so far as I am aware, never called them in question in any criminal action of any kind.

Reference was made last week to the fact that Mr. Holmes has friends in Washington.

He does, and I am one of them, and proud of the fact.

This is an example. I now read into the RECORD a letter written to the State Department when Mr. Holmes returned to the Foreign Service in 1948.

It is brief and to the point and reads as follows:

GENTLEMEN: I am informed that Julius Holmes, former brigadier general of the U.S. Army, is seeking reinstatement in the Department of State.

General Holmes served in an important capacity under my immediate direction from September 1942 until the end of 1944. Through him and the section which he headed was handled most of the great volume of business of my headquarters that required consultation with the governments of France, Belgium, Luxembourg, and the Scandinavian countries. He supervised military government in the combat areas of Sicily, Italy, and northwest Europe and was a constant adviser to me in matters dealing with foreign governments. In all these tasks General Holmes demonstrated extraordinary tact, judgment, and skill.

I consider General Holmes to be a man of highest character and of unusual efficiency and devotion to duty. Perhaps I can best express my opinion of his qualifications by saying that, if I should again be faced with problems similar to those that fell to me during the European campaigns of World War II, I would make every possible effort to secure General Holmes as an assistant for service in a capacity identical to the one he then occupied.

Sincerely,

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

That Mr. Holmes continues to be held in this high regard by the former President of the United States is evident from the remarks on Thursday by the distinguished junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON].

That the present holder of that office shares this view is evident from the nomination.

I respectfully suggest that spreading again before the Senate the details of these transactions which have been raked over many times in the past 12 years has not disclosed anything new, and in my judgment has not produced any facts on which the Senate can base a rejection of Mr. Holmes.

The question in issue, as I stated the other day, is his character and integrity.

I submit that the record does not permit any justifiable doubt as to the integrity or good faith of Mr. Holmes.

In fact, as I have stated, and now repeat, I believe that, in Government and out, he has conducted himself with the propriety expected of a man of the highest caliber and integrity.

The record is now clear that it is in the national interest to vote for the confirmation of the nomination of Mr. Holmes to this important post; and I am confident that a large majority of my colleagues will do so.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SYMINGTON. Before yielding, I ask the Chair how much time has been consumed?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has used 23 minutes.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I am glad to yield to my friend from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I have tried to follow the debate. As the Senator from Missouri knows, I, as a member of the committee had some doubts about the nomination, but I must say that I am very much impressed with any man—Mr. Holmes or anyone else—who would decline to be acquitted of a charge of a crime on a technicality. As a lawyer, my advice to any man charged with committing a criminal act, would be to get out of the charge in any way possible. If a man declines to be acquitted on a technicality and asks to be tried on the merits of the charge, I must say that such an attitude makes a favorable impression, so far as the man's character is concerned.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I thank my able and distinguished friend from the great State of Louisiana. He is a fair and just man.

Mr. Holmes, of course, knew that his reputation was on the line and that his future in the service of his country if any, depended upon the results of a trial. Therefore, he did his very best over a period of time to obtain such a trial, to which he felt he had a right under the sixth amendment of our Constitution.

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

Mr. SYMINGTON. I am glad to yield to the distinguished Senator from Kansas.

Mr. CARLSON. The distinguished Senator from Missouri mentioned that Mr. Holmes had friends in Washington. I should like to mention that he also has friends in Kansas. Last Thursday in debate I stated that I supported the nomination. Mr. Holmes is from Lawrence, Kans. He is a Kansan, and his family is an old, established family there.

I have received a telegram from Dolph Simons, editor of the Lawrence Journal-World, which is the newspaper in Lawrence, Kans. It reads as follows:

U.S. Senator FRANK CARLSON,
Washington, D.C.:

For the good of our Nation and in fairness to the man, I earnestly hope you will strongly support approval of Julius Holmes.

DOLPH SIMONS.

I know very definitely that the people of Kansas are watching the debate today. They have a high regard for Julius Holmes and his family. I sincerely hope the Senate will confirm the nomination.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I thank the Senator.

With the permission of the acting majority leader, I should be glad to yield time at this point to my friend from Delaware.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I intended to ask the Senator from Kansas a question, but I shall wait.

Mr. SYMINGTON. We have now consumed about half of our available time. I suggest that the Senator from Delaware might wish to speak at this point.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Whenever the Senator from Missouri has finished.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Does the Senator prefer that we continue?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I prefer that the Senator from Missouri continue until he is ready to yield the floor.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I am only asking the Senator his wishes. I want to observe what he would like to have done.

I yield to the distinguished senior Senator from Connecticut whatever time he wishes.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I rise in support of the nomination, and in that connection I wish to discuss two points. The first is the question of legality, around which so much of the debate has centered, involving the ship deals, and so forth.

All of us have heard this subject discussed over and over again, and I wish to make it very clear that I believe that Mr. Holmes, in participating in the ship deals, used very bad judgment. I wish he had not done it. I rather suppose that he, too, wishes that he had not been involved in those deals. I have observed over the years that when men step out of their chosen professions and get into extraneous business deals from time to time, they exercise bad judgment and often regret it very much indeed. I believe this is such a circumstance.

The important question is, Did Mr. Holmes do anything that was illegal? Did he do anything that was absolutely

wrong in the eyes of the law, aside from the question of business judgment? I believe we have in the record some excellent advice. In the first place, the legal adviser to the Secretary of State under Secretary Dulles was Mr. Herman Phleger, one of the outstanding lawyers in the United States, a man who is as well known in the legal profession in California as any other individual in that profession, I believe. He himself made a very careful study of this whole situation. In the questioning of Julius Holmes before the Foreign Relations Committee the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON], in speaking of Mr. Phleger, asked Julius Holmes whether Mr. Phleger had taken any position in this matter. Mr. Holmes said that Mr. Phleger had. He said, "He certified to the Secretary of State that he had reviewed the record and that there was nothing in it that would impair me for a Presidential appointment."

Senator SYMINGTON. He reviewed the record—will you repeat that, please?

Mr. HOLMES. He reviewed the record and gave his opinion to the Secretary of State that there was nothing in my part of these proceedings which in any way impaired me for Presidential appointment.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BUSH. I will not yield at this time. If the Senator will indulge me, I should like to finish my remarks; then I will yield to him if I have time remaining.

This was brought out also by the remarks on the Senate floor last week by the distinguished Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON] who at that time recounted his conversation with Herman Phleger, Secretary Dulles, and the President. He said that the President refused to withdraw the name of Julius Holmes at that time, although it had been recommended by THRUSTON MORTON for political and tactical reasons, in order to avoid other fights with the Senate on matters like the Trade Agreements Act, in connection with which a little difficulty was being encountered at that time.

Mr. Phleger was not content with relying entirely on his own judgment, and he asked for a legal opinion from an independent law firm, which in this case was the firm of Davis, Polk, Wardwell, Sunderland, and Kiendl, one of the outstanding law firms in the East, as everyone in the legal profession knows.

The brief they submitted is found at page 142 of the hearings. In a letter with which they submitted the brief to Mr. Phleger they make this comment—and this I believe is the clincher on the question of the ship deals:

We have attempted to make this memorandum completely factual and to avoid argument in Mr. Holmes' behalf, permitting the facts to speak for themselves. At the same time, however, we would want you to know of our firm conviction that there was no justification in fact or law for this indictment and that Mr. Holmes, as we understand the facts, conducted himself in connection with this transaction with complete propriety and honor.

With these comments I leave the ship deals and turn to other matters on the constructive side, in behalf of Mr. Holmes. There is a great deal on that side, Mr. President. I was interested, in looking at the hearings, in the questioning by the majority leader, Senator MANSFIELD, as follows:

I am happy to note that you are before this committee as Ambassador to Iran.

That is the Senator from Montana, the majority leader, and a member of the Foreign Relations Committee for the past 9 years, speaking. He says he is happy to note this. He goes on to say:

I have had the pleasure of coming into personal contact with you in various parts of the world, and I must say publicly that I have always been impressed with the way you have conducted affairs and with the way you have represented our country in your assignments.

Some years ago didn't you write a rather comprehensive report about the African Continent?

Mr. HOLMES. Yes, sir; I did.

Senator MANSFIELD. Was that report ever published?

Mr. HOLMES. I think not, Senator.

Senator MANSFIELD. How long ago was that report made?

Mr. HOLMES. It was made at the end of 1958, after I concluded a trip, a political survey, of Africa for the Secretary of State, and I believe the date was late January of 1959.

Senator MANSFIELD. In your opinion, how did that report stack up with developments subsequent to its being made?

Mr. HOLMES. Well, I have had certain gratification, personal gratification, which one always has in such circumstances that, having foreseen in that report some of the events which have occurred.

The Senator from Montana conducted this examination to bring out that Holmes had had a special assignment on African affairs and had appraised the situation correctly.

I do not believe he could have done it without his long expert background in the Foreign Service.

We are talking about a man who served in the Foreign Service under four Presidents of the United States, and who was appointed by Franklin D. Roosevelt to be Assistant Secretary of State toward the close of World War II. Under President Truman he was sent to Great Britain, to the Court of St. James, and served there under four of our Ambassadors as the First Minister. Shortly afterward he was nominated by President Eisenhower to be Ambassador to Iran. The history of that nomination was outlined by the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON] last week. I shall not repeat it.

I have known Julius Holmes for some 25 years. I knew him when he first represented the United States at the World's Fair in the late 1930's. I do not support him here as a personal friend, although I consider him a friend. He is not one of my close friends, but one that I have known and respected for his very outstanding service to the United States. I support him on his record.

During World War II, as has been brought out, Mr. Holmes had one of the most amazing records of any civilian soldier. He made the entry into north Africa with Gen. Mark Clark, on the famous submarine cruise, on which he was accompanied by Jerauld Wright, then Captain Wright, and now a four-star admiral, and commander of the Atlantic Fleet and of all the NATO forces.

This was a remarkable event. It took great courage and required men who could be completely trusted and depended upon, not only for their courage, but also for their intelligence. His record during the war was a distinguished one. At the end of the war he had risen to the rank of brigadier general in the Army. As the Senator from Missouri has pointed out recently, he served on General Eisenhower's staff in southern Europe. General Eisenhower has made known his feelings about General Holmes in the letter which has just been referred to, and in other ways, including his nomination of Mr. Holmes to be Ambassador to Iran in 1955.

I believe that one of the most telling witnesses with whom I have ever talked regarding Mr. Holmes is Mr. Henry Wriston, formerly president of Brown University, now chairman of the Council on Foreign Relations, in New York, and chairman of the American Assembly. Mr. Wriston not only holds these distinguished offices, but he has also made a special study of the State Department and the career service in the State Department. He is credited with having "Wristonized" the Foreign Service of the United States. He told me a few years ago—I think it was in 1958—at the American Assembly in Arden, N.Y.:

Julius Holmes is the ablest man in the Foreign Service Corps of the United States.

Not one of the ablest; but he said:

In my judgment, he is the ablest man in the Foreign Service Corps of the United States. The President should submit his name to the Senate and make it clear that Holmes is so good that he deserves this action by the President.

He was disappointed that Holmes had allowed his name to be withdrawn, as outlined by the distinguished Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON] during 1955.

I think the comments of President Wriston constitute one of the highest civilian endorsements which one could ask for a Foreign Service officer, if not the highest. Accordingly, I believe President Kennedy acted wisely, fairly, and justly in submitting the nomination of Julius Holmes. I thought the same way in 1955, when President Eisenhower submitted Mr. Holmes' name to the Senate.

We have for consideration the nomination of a Foreign Service officer who has served with distinction under Franklin D. Roosevelt, under Harry S. Truman, under Dwight D. Eisenhower, and under President Kennedy.

What has Mr. Holmes been doing lately? If he were not trustworthy, if he could not have been depended upon to get results, he would never have been sent to Hong Kong, which is the most sensitive diplomatic post in the world today, right on the edge of Communist China. Hong Kong is the best source of intelligence we have as to what is taking place in Communist China. I visited our consulate there, where Mr.

Holmes is the consul general, the highest post not having ambassadorial rank; a post far more important to us than our embassies in many other countries, as I feel certain any Senator who has visited Hong Kong would agree. It is one of the most sensitive posts in the world today. Mr. Holmes has served there with distinction. We can bet our boots that the Foreign Service organization would not have sent Julius Holmes to Hong Kong if they did not believe he was a highly dependable, capable American citizen, as well as a thoroughly trained, competent Foreign Service officer of the State Department. The Foreign Service Corps is proud of his standing and jealous of his integrity and honor.

I myself doubt that even today there can be found in the Foreign Service an officer who is more widely respected than Julius Holmes. That is why I speak in favor of his nomination. That is why I ask Senators on this side of the aisle—and on the other side of the aisle, too—to support his nomination. I beg of them not to strike down a Foreign Service officer of this quality, after 35 years of service, during a critical time in our history, when our Nation is faced with the gravest dangers which have ever confronted it in time of peace. Do not strike down a man who has served his country so well, and who remains in a position to render very valuable service in another very sensitive post, in Iran, to which this administration has, in my judgment, wisely nominated him.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, will the Senator from Connecticut yield?

Mr. BUSH. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The Senator has been speaking of the service record of Mr. Holmes. I do not believe anyone has questioned his service record. I should like to ask the Senator from Connecticut, as he has reviewed the tanker transactions—both the three-tanker deal and the five-tanker deal—and the participation by Mr. Holmes therein, if he believes that Mr. Holmes' participation was quite proper in these business transactions?

Mr. BUSH. I have told the Senator from Delaware, and I said on the floor a moment ago, that I do not believe Mr. Holmes was well advised to be in those deals. No; I do not think so. But I am pushing that aside. It was a mistake, which I freely grant to the Senator, but I do not believe it was enough of a mistake to strike this man down, after 35 years of Foreign Service, at a time when we need him. The Senator from Delaware may be worried about the man's integrity or honor on account of the ship deals. However, Mr. Holmes has been in places repeatedly where everything depended on his loyalty, his honor, his courage, his experience, and his integrity; and every time he has measured up to the requirements.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Perhaps, but we cannot just close our eyes to this chapter of his life.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. Holmes' name would not be before the Senate today unless he had measured up to the requirements.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I do not wish to get into an argument on his talents. The point I make—and I do not believe we can escape it—is that Mr. Holmes had some responsibility in the tanker deals. Since we started debating Mr. Holmes' nomination, I have heard some of his friends refer to him as naive, stupid, and perhaps a little unethical when he got into these tanker deals.

Should the Senate be asked to confirm as ambassador the nomination of a man whom his own friends refer to as naive, stupid, and a little unethical? That is what disturbs me. I do not say that we should necessarily hold against a man something improper he may have done 10 or 12 years ago if that man claims it was a mistake and expresses regret.

The Senator from Connecticut is aware of the fact that Mr. Holmes insisted before our committee that he saw nothing wrong with what he did at the time. Looking back at the transaction, Mr. Holmes insists he still sees nothing wrong. He said that if a similar opportunity presented itself tomorrow he would do the same thing all over again. Therefore, we must proceed on the basis that Mr. Holmes sees nothing wrong with conspiring with a foreign group to circumvent the law and help them get title to American tankers when an easy dollar is involved.

I do not believe the Senator from Connecticut would say that what Mr. Holmes did in connection with the tanker deals, whether he was connected with the Government or not connected with the Government, should be condoned.

Mr. BUSH. I fully appreciate the position of the Senator from Delaware. I respect him highly, as he knows. There is no other Senator who holds the Senator from Delaware in higher regard than I do. I have always commended him for his watchfulness and diligence in considering these cases with great care. I can understand the feelings of the Senator from Delaware in this instance. But I have tried to explain my position, too. I have read only a part of the opinion of the eminent law firm of Davis, Polk, Wardwell, Kiendl & Sunderland. I have explained my respect for that firm. I have quoted Herman Phleger, who I challenge anyone to say is not an outstanding lawyer in California, and the United States, too, or he would not have been legal adviser to Foster Dulles, as he was. He told Foster Dulles that this transaction was all right. Davis, Polk says it was all right. In my book, those opinions are very good opinions—very good ones indeed.

Once more, I say to the Senator from Delaware, I do not like the business deals in which Mr. Holmes participated. I would not have been involved in them myself. But I would not strike down this Foreign Service officer because I think he made a bad mistake in a field entirely foreign to his own activity. He should not have meddled in business deals about which he knew nothing. I myself believe he was used. He was used by people who thought that it would be helpful to have in their business a man who had his great war record. However, I do not believe he had enough business experience to realize that this was a bad deal.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Connecticut yield to me for a minute?

Mr. BUSH. I yield.

Mr. SYMINGTON. If we do not have sufficient time left on our side, I ask the Senator from Delaware if he will be kind enough to yield some of his time, if we need it.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Yes, I certainly want the Senator from Missouri to have as much time as he needs; however, I do not believe I have had a chance to use any of our time yet.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I offered time to the Senator. He is speaking on my time now.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The time being used wherein I have asked question of the Senator from Connecticut may be charged against my time.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I thank the Senator from Delaware for his courtesy.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Connecticut yield?

Mr. BUSH. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I merely wish to say to the Senator from Connecticut that in my opinion he has made the most effective and the most persuasive argument which possibly could be made in behalf of Mr. Holmes. The Senator from Connecticut has not attempted to justify the "deal." He has said it was a mistake—a mistake that a man inexperienced in business would be likely to fall into. To my mind, that is a sound argument.

But to argue that the "deal" was completely free from any infirmities, and that those who disagree are wrong, to my mind is not sound.

I respect the military career of the nominee. I respect the efficiency with which he has served. But I cannot agree when it is argued, in an attempt to convince me, that the transaction was completely free from infirmity.

Mr. BUSH. I thank the Senator from Ohio.

I should like to say one further word, if the Senator who has yielded to me will be so kind as to yield a little longer. I have known men—and I include my own father, who was a successful and respected businessman in the State of Ohio, and who had a great career in business—who have made mistakes when they stepped outside the field with which they were familiar. When my father stepped outside the field with which he was familiar, and in which he was active for 40 years, and became involved with a group of promoters in an extraneous deal, no matter how smart he was—and he was a smart man—he was "had" by the promoters, and that experience cost him a great deal of money. In that respect, his experience was somewhat different from that of Mr. Holmes, who made some money.

The point I make is that I have seen that sort of thing happen many times. Frequently, those who step outside the field in which they are experts make very bad mistakes of judgment. I believe that is what Mr. Holmes did in connection with the tankers.

In conclusion, if no other Senator wishes to ask me questions, I think all

four Presidents of the United States have been correct in nominating Mr. Holmes to the very important and sensitive positions to which he has been named; and I hope my colleagues on this side will support the nomination.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I yield 10 minutes to the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. MILLER. I thank the Senator from Delaware for yielding to me.

Mr. President, I must say that it is with considerable regret that I must speak and vote against confirmation of the nomination of Julius C. Holmes to this very important position.

I have listened to the debate and I have read the record. I certainly wish it understood that I respect the opinions which have been expressed, particularly those expressed by the distinguished Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH] and the distinguished Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON].

But after going through the record and analyzing the various statements which have been made in connection with this case, the thing that has persuaded me to such an extent that, in good conscience, I cannot vote to support the nomination, is the record in the Tax Court case.

That record appears in 32 Tax Court, page 564, the case of Julius C. Holmes and Henrietta A. Holmes, docket 62571, decided in 1959 by the Tax Court of the United States.

To clarify what I am discussing now, that case arose over the question of whether the sale of certain stock by Mr. Holmes and his associates constituted long-term capital gain or whether it was ordinary income.

Three corporations were involved. The first was American Overseas Tanker Corp. of which Mr. Holmes was one of the four or five stockholders. The second was the National Tanker Corp., which was organized subsequent to the formation of what we call the AOTC—the American Overseas Tanker Corp. The third was the United Tanker Corp., to which the stock of the National Tanker Corp. subsequently was sold.

The Tax Court case arose out of the sale to the United Tanker Corp. of the stock of the National Tanker Corp., owned by Mr. Holmes and his associates, the identical stockholders of the American Overseas Tanker Corp.

In order to keep in perspective the various transactions, I point out that on December 31, 1947, so the opinion of the Tax Court recites, the American Overseas Tanker Corp. filed an amendment to its original application to the Maritime Commission for tankers; and in the amendment it was recited that the Commission had approved the sale of five tankers to AOTC for Panamanian registry, and had allocated three tankers to AOTC for American registry; and it was stated that the purpose of the amendment was to restate the desire of AOTC to purchase 12 additional tankers, the unallocated portion of the 20 tankers covered by the original application and amendments thereto.

In support of the renewed request, the application stated:

> The corporation intends to operate their tankers and to remain in the tanker operating business.

So originally the Maritime Commission was under the impression that the American Overseas Tanker Corp. was to operate the tankers.

The next thing of significance occurred on January 19, 1948, 19 days later. On that date there was an unsigned memorandum in which it was stated that Mr. Casey and Mr. Klein, two of Mr. Holmes' associates, had had discussions, on behalf of American Overseas Tanker Corp., with the interests identified as United Tanker Corp., a Delaware corporation, relative to the sale of three tankers.

The memorandum recited that:

> American Overseas will form a new Delaware corporation for the specific purpose of taking title to these three ships.

The memorandum goes on to indicate how the financing of the transaction will ultimately be handled by the United Tanker Corp.

The next thing occurred 4 days later, on January 23.

On that date the National Tanker Corp. was organized, to carry out the memorandum of agreement.

On January 24, the day after the National Tanker Corp. was organized, in consideration of United Tanker Corp.'s execution of an agreement to finance all this purchase, an irrevocable option to purchase all the stock of National was given to the United Tanker Corp., but not to be exercised before September 15 of that year. The idea behind that, of course, was to permit more than 6 months to pass, so that long-term capital gains on the sale of the National stock would be achieved, for tax purposes.

The next transaction was on January 31, 1948; and this is the important transaction. On that date, the Chief of the Bureau of Operations of the U.S. Maritime Commission addressed to National a letter in which he stated:

> Reports have reached the undersigned that these vessels have been offered by you for resale to other interests. We would very much appreciate a prompt statement from you as to whether or not you have in mind the resale of these vessels now or at a later date.

The reply by Mr. Casey one of Mr. Holmes' associates, was, on behalf of the National Tanker Corp., by letter dated February 2, 1948, that National intended to bareboat charter these vessels to another American company:

> It is the present intention of this corporation to retain title to these vessels indefinitely.

That was the statement in the face of the memorandum of agreement

That was the concealment to which the Hoey committee referred, because if that reply had not been given to the Maritime Commission, we can be quite sure that the entire tanker transaction would have been off.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, would it disturb the Senator's line of reasoning if I were to ask a question at this point?

Mr. MILLER. Not at all; I am glad to yield.

Mr. KEATING. Is there any evidence that Holmes knew of this letter from Casey to the Maritime Commission? Does that appear anywhere?

Mr. MILLER. There is no evidence that Holmes knew anything about this particular letter that has been brought to my attention.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield so I may add something to the answer?

Mr. MILLER. Yes. Let me first pursue this a minute further.

Mr. Holmes was a stockholder and an officer, a vice president and a secretary, of this corporation, in whose behalf Mr. Casey, the president, wrote the letter. The inference naturally can follow that he, in that responsible position, either should have known or did know about this particular transaction. However, I know of nothing in the record which reveals that he had read it or knew of it.

Mr. KEATING. I agree with the distinguished Senator from Iowa that the statement was, clearly—and it was found to be by the committee—just about as much of a misrepresentation as anything could be. If Mr. Holmes was a party to that statement, it seems to me to go to the very crux of the problem we are confronted with, as to whether he was an unwitting dupe in that transaction or a part of it.

Mr. MILLER. I appreciate the comments of the Senator, but I would like to make clear that I am not imputing any knowledge on the part of Mr. Holmes of this transaction. I have my own reason, which I shall advance shortly, for voting against the nomination; but I want to give the background of this situation so we can see the results of the concealment and the fact that profits were obtained, not only by Mr. Casey, the principal, but by Mr. Holmes and others, under these circumstances.

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

Mr. MILLER. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. Holmes was asked about this letter which Mr. Casey wrote, saying there was no present intention of selling the tankers. I think an examination of the testimony before the committee will show that he said he would have written a letter, but not in that language.

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

Mr. MILLER. I would be happy to yield, but first I should like to complete the chain of events.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Will the Senator yield for 30 seconds?

Mr. MILLER. Yes.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I wish to thank the Senator from Ohio for bringing this matter to the attention of the Senate. I confirm what he said about Mr. Holmes' opinion of that unsigned memorandum. I think it is important to note that Mr. Holmes said he did not know of the unsigned memorandum at the time it was written.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I suggest a reading of page 73 as a reference to what I have stated.

Mr. MILLER. Following these transactions—following this letter, following this concealment—on page 583 of the Tax Court opinion appears this finding of fact:

National [Corporation] was liquidated in December 1949, and all of its assets were transferred to the United [Tanker Corporation].

Following the sale of the stock of National Tanker Corp. to United, the stockholders reported long-term capital gain on the profit. The profit amounted to $449 per share for each $1 of cost. It was out of this transaction that the tax case occurred.

The opinion of Judge Raum—and I might point out this was an opinion without any dissent by any member of the Tax Court—said this:

Respondent's determination, on the other hand, proceeds upon the assumption that the substance underlying this apparently simple sale of stock was entirely different; namely, that the purported sale of the National stock was merely the final step in a transaction designed essentially as a sale of the three American-flag tankers or the right to acquire them by AOTC to United at a profit of $450,000 to AOTC, accompanied by a simultaneous distribution of that profit to stockholders of AOTC (or their nominees), and that such distributions are taxable as ordinary income. Respondent's position treats National merely as a convenient device employed to accomplish the result which was thus planned from the beginning.

We think the evidence supports the latter view.

The Tax Court saw through this series of transactions for what it was, and held against taxpayers.

My point is, granted Mr. Holmes knew nothing about this letter from Mr. Casey to the Maritime Commission, the fact remains he benefited very materially from these transactions. If I might be permitted to, I would say this benefit constituted "tainted money."

Mr. Holmes has never, to my understanding, offered to pay back to the Federal Government the profits received from these transactions. He received the benefit and he has used these profits for his own purposes.

Granted that he may have been used by some very sharp operators in this transaction, he himself derived personal financial benefit to a great extent.

I think this is a very untimely nomination, particularly in view of the message that the President of the United States delivered to Congress just recently, asking for a code of ethical conduct in the Government. I should like to quote briefly from the President's message, in which he said:

No responsibility of Government is more fundamental than the responsibility of maintaining the highest standards of ethical behavior by those who conduct the public business * * * this principle must be followed not only in reality but in appearance. For the basis of effective Government is public confidence, and that confidence is endangered when ethical standards falter or appear to falter.

He wound up his statement by saying:

I realize, too, that perhaps the gravest responsibility of all rests upon the office of President. No President can excuse or pardon the slightest deviation from irreproachable standards of behavior on the part of any member of the executive branch. For his firmness and determination is the ultimate source of public confidence in the Government of the United States. And there is no consideration that can justify the undermining of that confidence.

I state my real reason for not being able, in conscience, to support this nomination is that I fear an undermining of public confidence in this nomination. Granted the transactions took place between Mr. Holmes' intervals of Government service, today, of all days, is not a time when we should have one iota of undermining in the confidence of the people in their Government.

I mention this particularly in the case of Iran, which is in a very strategic and critical area. I think our representatives from the United States to Iran must be above reproach, not only in their public service, but in their private lives.

For that reason, I simply cannot, in conscience, support this nomination.

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

Mr. MILLER. I yield.

Mr. BUSH. There is one point I should like to emphasize. There is no incident at any time in connection with Mr. Holmes' services to the Government of the United States where there is anything in his record except plus marks. There has not been one incident brought out that was not to his credit. The ship deals—which I wish never had taken place, and I am sure he does, too—took place while he was out of the Government service. I hold no brief for them. I defy anyone, however, to point to anything in his 35 years' service to the Government of the United States which shows anything but a distinguished or excellent record. I hope this fact may appeal to the Senator from Iowa. I appreciate what the Senator has said. I am glad he quoted President Kennedy's message on the matter of conflict of interest and the propriety of one's conduct in service. I do not yield to the Senator in the importance which I attach to the same matter about which the Senator has spoken.

I think they are of the utmost importance. I suggest that the record of Julius Holmes for 35 years can be examined without finding anything in it which is not excellent so far as the United States is concerned. I thank the Senator for giving me an opportunity to make that point.

Mr. MILLER. I am more than happy to afford the opportunity to my good friend from Connecticut.

As the Senator from Ohio expressed himself a few moments ago, I think this is the most important feature of the argument by the proponents. It is a matter of weighing equities. Perhaps I am a little old fashioned. However, I have seen cases of distinguished members of the military service, with unblemished records, whose future has been blotted out because of one incident which reflected on themselves and the service.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Iowa has expired.

Mr. MILLER. Will the Senator from Delaware yield me 1 more minute?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield 1 additional minute to the Senator from Iowa.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. MILLER. I would feel entirely different in regard to the nomination if Mr. Holmes had said he would return the money to the Government, but there is nothing in the record to indicate any desire on his part to do so. Everyone seems to say, "He made a mistake." If he made a mistake, let us clear up the mistake and at least have returned to the Government the profits which were made as a result of these transactions. If Mr. Holmes did not know anything about them, it seems to me the highest code of ethics would warrant his going to the Government and saying, "I will have no part of this. Here is the tainted money. I am returning it."

Nothing like that appears in the record. For that reason I simply cannot, in conscience, support the nomination.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I thank the Senator. I add, before I yield to the Senator from Kentucky, that not only has Mr. Holmes not made any effort to return the money to the Government or correct the error, if it might be said to be an error, but also when he discussed the matter before the committee, what disturbed me even more was his continual insistence that he saw nothing whatever wrong with the transaction. Not only when the transactions took place did he see nothing wrong, but he said that if he had an opportunity to do it all over again today he would do so. That was the damaging admission on the part of Mr. Holmes, so far as I am concerned.

For us to confirm Mr. Holmes on his premise that neither he nor his two associates, Mr. Casey and Mr. Klein, did anything wrong when they engaged in these questionable tanker deals is asking too much.

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

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. MILLER. What my colleague from Delaware has expressed with regard to what was stated to the committee by the nominee is undoubtedly the reason why Mr. Holmes has not come forward to say, "I will return the money." He received a benefit from it. He wants the benefit. I suggest that he should not have his cake and eat it, too.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. How much times does the Senator from Delaware yield to himself?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky is recognized.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I shall vote against confirmation of the nomination of Mr. Holmes.

This is a very difficult decision for me. I have known Mr. Holmes for sev-

eral years. I have the highest regard for his contributions to this country, both in the diplomatic service and in military service during World War II.

I do not know of any Senators for whom I have higher regard than the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH] and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON]. They are friends, and men whose judgment I hold in great respect.

Because this is a difficult decision to make, I desire to say a few words about it.

I do not say that Mr. Holmes' conduct in respect to the tanker deal was illegal. It does appear to me, however, that one who spent such a long time in the service of the United States, in very important positions, should have had a better understanding of the questions involved in the transaction and should have exercised great care in finding out whether the transaction in which he engaged was within the scope of the regulations of the Maritime Commission. Most important of all, he should have inquired whether it was in the interests of the United States, because he had been a servant of the United States in very important positions.

I know that to many people this kind of argument may appear to be somewhat self-righteous. It also may appear to me of retribution against a man who has a record of long and distinguished service to his country.

It may appear to be a high standard to require, but if we cannot require a high standard of those who have served in the highest positions in this Government and of those who are nominated to serve in high positions, at what point can we require a high standard? Of whom can we require high standards?

This administration has sent many nominations to the Senate. In the main, they have been excellent nominations and they were confirmed without question. But we have been asked to confirm the nominations of a few whose records appeared to be questionable, or whose records deserved more careful consideration by the administration.

Among others, I have voted to confirm the nominations of several appointees chiefly because of the precedent that the Senate should support to the fullest extent possible, the President's appointments.

I repeat the question. If we cannot apply the highest standards of understanding and knowledge of the implications of transactions which are engaged in to those who have had experience in Government, at what point in the Senate shall we apply such standards?

I understand that in a few days there will come before us the nomination of a man who was tried for a traffic violation. According to what I have heard, later the man falsified his Form 57. We shall be requested to decide what to do about his confirmation. I do not know the man, and I do not prejudge him.

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

Mr. COOPER. Probably he is a man without experience.

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

Mr. COOPER. I will yield to the Senator. I think the time has come when we must look more carefully at these questions.

I shall finish in 1 minute, and then I shall yield to the Senator.

I was impressed by the remarks of the Senator from Iowa. The administration has asked correctly, that high ethical standards be observed by those in Government. The administration should ask such standards of Members of Congress as well as the executive branch. Perhaps we could do better. The administration should adhere to its own standards.

It is time for the Senate to make a start toward achieving those high standards.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware is recognized.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. How much time does the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, how much time have we remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware has 32 minutes remaining.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. How much time is there for the other side?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Fourteen minutes.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I yield myself 15 minutes.

Mr. President, first I wish to say that the war record or the service record of Mr. Holmes is not an issue before us today. What we are discussing is the confirmation of a man to be Ambassador to a very important country as an official representative of the United States.

This is a man who just a few years ago was unanimously condemned by a Senate investigating committee as having taken an active part in a highly improper if not actually illegal get-rich-quick tanker deal.

At that time Julius Holmes, the man we are being asked to confirm as an Ambassador joined two others, Joseph E. Casey and E. Stanley Klein, in purchasing eight tankers from the U.S. Government and then transferred these tankers over to foreign-owned and foreign-controlled companies in obvious violation of the clear intent of the law.

In one instance this group received $450,000 on a $1,000 investment without taking any risk whatever. In another case they pyramided a $100,000 investment into $2,800,000 by turning tankers over to another foreign group, again in clear violation of the intent of the law.

This transaction was bitterly denounced in a unanimous report of a Senate committee and was denounced editorially by leading newspapers throughout the country as a slick if not actually illegal deal.

Much has been said in recent months by both congressional committees and the Attorney General of the United States about the need for higher moral standards and greater integrity in private industry.

By confirming Mr. Holmes as an Ambassador to Iran the Senate will be placing a cloak of respectability upon shady deals maneuvered for the purpose of making a fast buck when such shady deals involve Government officials.

Are we to establish a lower standard of morals for Government service than is required of private industry?

How can Congress or the Department of Justice point the finger of scorn at questionable business practices while closing our eyes to slick deals involving Government officials?

President Kennedy in a recent message to Congress emphasized the need for the establishing of a higher code of ethics and higher moral standards as a requirement for Government service. I quote from his message:

> No responsibility of government is more fundamental than the responsibility of maintaining the highest standards of ethical behavior by those who conduct the public business. There can be no dissent from the principle that all officials must act with unwavering integrity, absolute impartiality and complete devotion to the public interest. This principle must be followed not only in reality but in appearance. For the basis of effective government is public confidence, and that confidence is endangered when ethical standards falter or appear to falter.
>
> Ultimately, high ethical standards can be maintained only if the leaders of government provide a personal example of dedication to the public service—and exercise their leadership to develop in all government employees an increasing sensitivity to the ethical and moral conditions imposed by public service. Their own conduct must be above reproach.

Certainly it cannot be said that Mr. Holmes is above reproach when we consider his active participation with Joseph Casey and Stanley Klein in these two highly questionable tanker deals.

Several years ago Mr. Holmes and his two associates—Joseph E. Casey and E. Stanley Klein—were engaged in these highly questionable tanker deals in which they placed the making of a fast buck above the national interest.

Some Members of the Senate have raised the question as to whether or not Mr. Holmes had repented of the errors which he made when joining in this questionable transaction 10 or 12 years ago.

During the recent hearings before the Senate Finance Committee I asked Mr. Holmes whether he saw anything wrong with the two transactions at the time he, Mr. Casey and Mr. Klein were buying these tankers from the Government and selling them to a foreign-owned company. His answer was most emphatically that he did not see anything wrong with what he and his associates had done.

I then asked Mr. Holmes whether or not he saw anything wrong with the transaction as he looked back over the 12 years and saw how the deals had ultimately turned out. Again his answer was "no" and indicated that if given the opportunity he would do the same thing over again today—although he did qualify this last statement by saying that if he knew that a congressional committee was going to get actively interested he might decide it was not worth it.

In other words, Mr. Holmes sees nothing wrong with what he did, and he would

do it again if he knew he would not get caught.

At the time Mr. Holmes and his associates purchased eight tankers from the Maritime Commission there was a law prohibiting their sale by the Government to foreign-owned or foreign-controlled companies. It was likewise illegal for an American company after purchasing these tankers from the Government to resell them to foreign-owned or foreign-controlled companies without having obtained the prior approval of the Maritime Commission. The purpose of this provision was to guarantee that these tankers would remain under the control of the U.S. Government.

By circumventing the law, or at least the intent of the law, Mr. Holmes and his two associates sold all of these tankers to companies which were both foreign owned and foreign controlled.

Mr. Holmes tries to claim that they did get the approval of the Maritime Commission, but every member of the Maritime Commission emphatically denied when testifying under oath before a senatorial committee that any notice had been given concerning the proposed sale or that any approval had been obtained.

I quote the Hoey committee's report confirming this statement:

> There is no credible evidence that Mr. Morris or any other representative of the United Tanker Corp. group made a complete disclosure to the Commission concerning the arrangements between the Casey group and the United Tanker group which were entered into as early as January 1948.

What is even worse, one of these eight tankers, the *Kettleman Hills*, which the Holmes-Casey group turned over to a foreign owned and controlled company was subsequently leased to Soviet Russia. The tanker was then used by Russia for the purpose of transporting oil from Rumania to ports in Communist China and North Korea.

Mr. Holmes tries to shrug off responsibility for what this foreign-owned company did with the tanker after his company sold it. But we must not overlook the fact that this tanker came into the possession of these foreign owners as the result of highly irregular, if not actually illegal, maneuvering on the part of Mr. Holmes and his associates.

The Hoey subcommittee which investigated these sales in 1952 strongly denounced these transactions as morally wrong and clearly in violation of the intent of the law.

Mr. Holmes and his two associates, in violation of the clear intent of the law and without taking any financial risk at all received $150,000 clear profit for each tanker they turned over to this foreign group. Therefore, they cannot dodge some responsibility for what happened.

The most bitter denunciation of this transaction whereby one of these tankers was chartered to Soviet Russia for use in transporting oil to Communist China and North Korea came from former Secretaries of Defense Louis Johnson and George Marshall.

Beginning with October 1949 and extending through October 1950 they wrote a series of letters to the Secretary of State bitterly denouncing the use of these American tankers to transport Russian oil and emphasized that such action was definitely detrimental to the security of the United States.

It was not until December 1950, 6 months after the outbreak of the Korean war that the use of these vessels in Russian trade was stopped.

Now, what excuse did Mr. Holmes and his two associates give for selling this tanker, the *Kettleman Hills*, and two other tankers to this foreign-owned and foreign-controlled company?

They said they considered the company to which they sold the tankers—the United Tanker Corp.—to be an American owned and controlled company because the company had only four stockholders, three of whom were American citizens. Therefore they reasoned that the company was 75 percent American owned and controlled.

What Mr. Holmes, Mr. Casey, and Mr. Klein did not disclose was that at the time they exercised the option this company—the United Tanker Corp.—which was buying these tankers was capitalized for $2,500,006. Of this $2,500,006 capitalization the one foreign stockholder, a Chinese citizen, owned $2,500,000 while the three Americans had invested in the company exactly $2 each or a total of $6.

How naive can any man be? By what line of reasoning can anyone with a straight face claim that three men with a total investment of only $6 in a $2,500,006 corporation can control its operation? As if this claim were not ridiculous enough it developed that the foreign stockholders had an option to buy even this small amount of stock from these Americans at a price of $10,000 for each man.

Obviously, these three men merely got $10,000 each for the use of their names just as Mr. Holmes and his two associates got $150,000 per tanker for the use of their names in getting title to three tankers from the U.S. Government for the purpose of turning them over to this foreign group.

This is but one example of the many flimsy excuses advanced by Mr. Holmes and his associates to justify the series of shady and highly irregular procedures surrounding many of the transactions involved in the purchase of eight tankers, every one of which was ultimately transferred to foreign owned and controlled companies. All of these transfers were made without the legal approval of the Maritime Commission.

Last Thursday I placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD details of all these transactions showing how Mr. Holmes and his two associates pyramided $101,000 into a $3¼ million profit by buying eight tankers from the U.S. Government and then transferring and selling them to foreign-owned companies in clear violation of their contract with the Government and in clear violation of the intent of the law.

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH] quoted at length from the legal opinion which was submitted to the Department of State by the New York law firm of Davis Polk Wardwell Sunderland & Kiendl, in which they completely exonerated Mr. Holmes of having done anything wrong. We recognize them as one of the great law firms in our country. I, too, have read that memorandum, and as the Senator from Connecticut claims, it gave a clean bill of health to Mr. Holmes.

But I point out that at the time the memorandum was prepared for the State Department by this law firm, the law firm was on a retainer and being paid by Mr. Holmes. This memorandum was prepared by Mr. Holmes' own lawyers. Certainly they cleared their client; what else would one expect?

I do not recall in my lifetime ever seeing a lawyer prepare a memorandum in which they said, "Our client is guilty." We all know that if we were to ask for the legal opinion of the law firm which represented the accused at the time of his trial, certainly the legal opinion which we would expect to get would be one that would exonerate the man. Based upon Mr. Holmes' own testimony, this law firm was on his payroll at the time it prepared the memorandum.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Taking note of what the Senator from Delaware has said about the ability of Mr. Holmes to drive a sharp bargain or to use certain ability, I ask him whether he has ever found that Mr. Holmes, when in the employ of the Government and occupying a position of trust, used his ability against the interests of the United States?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Neither do I ever recall any such instance involving Jimmy Hoffa. But surely that does not mean we would vote to confirm a nomination of Jimmy Hoffa to be Secretary of Labor.

Whether a man is working in the Government or out of the Government, he has a responsibility to be honest. The fact that Mr. Holmes was out of the Government service at the time these questionable transactions took place does not in the least excuse him of his responsibilities.

No stronger denunciation of these tanker transactions of Mr. Holmes and his associates were ever made than the statements of two former Secretaries of Defense, Louis Johnson and George Marshall. Both of these men in their official capacities denounced these ships being placed under foreign ownership and engaging in traffic which was detrimental to the interests of the United States of America.

Remember, one of these tankers which they sold to a foreign group was promptly leased to Russia for use in transporting oil to Red China and North Korea. This traffic with Russia took place in the period immediately prior to and just after the outbreak of the Korean war.

The mere fact that Mr. Holmes did not perform the acts about which I have spoken while he was on the Government payroll does not excuse him from his responsibility.

Again I say I am not passing judgment as to whether or not Mr. Holmes actually violated the law, but certainly he violated the clear intent of the law.

I join the Senator from Ohio in paying respect to the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH] for his approach to this question of Mr. Holmes' confirmation. Even though I differ with the conclusions of the Senator from Connecticut at least he was frank enough not to defend these tanker transactions.

Much has been said about the indictment being dropped. Last Thursday I incorporated into the RECORD a memorandum prepared by the Department of Justice pointing out that the indictment was dropped only on a technicality of the law. I was informed that the reason the three-tanker deal did not appear in the indictment was that it took place in 1948 and that the statute of limitations had run. The Hoey committee reported in 1952. Therefore the indictment was based only upon the five-tanker sale which took place in 1950.

The Department of Justice made it very clear that it was asking for a dismissal of the Holmes indictment because it felt honor-bound to do so as a result of an agreement entered into with the court at the time the court ordered the dismissal of Mr. Casey's indictment.

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] quoted Mr. Goertner, an official of the Maritime Commission, as having given clearance of the sale of the three tankers on February 2, 1948, by declaring that the corporation was a citizen corporation. The record will not support this statement.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD an excerpt from the Hoey committee report beginning at the bottom of page 13 and extending over and including all the first three paragraphs of page 14, wherein it was pointed out that Mr. Goertner had not been furnished all the facts concerning the financial backing of the United Tanker Corp. at the time of his ruling.

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

During this same period, and particularly during January 1948, Francis B. Goertner, assistant general counsel of the Maritime Commission, received two telephone calls from Mr. Newbold Morris and another call from Mr. Wasson requesting an opinion as to whether or not the United Tanker Corp. satisfied the citizenship requirements within the meaning of section 2 of the Shipping Act of 1916. Both Morris and Wasson called Goertner's attention to the original application which indicated that substantially all of the capital investment in the United Tanker Corp. would be provided by China Trading & Industrial Development Corp., but no mention was made of the fact that as of that time, United States citizen stockholders had invested only $6 in a corporation which several months later would be capitalized at about $2,500,000, all with Chinese funds. On February 3, 1948, Goertner replied to the inquiries of both Morris and Wasson by stating that it was his opinion that the United Tanker Corp. was a citizen corporation. This was one of particular importance to the United Tanker Corp. in view of the language of section 9 of the Shipping Act of 1916, which reads in part as follows:

"It shall be unlawful, without the approval of the Maritime Commission, to sell, mortgage, lease, charter, deliver or in any manner transfer * * * to any person not a citizen of the United States * * * any vessel or any interest therein owned in whole or in part by a citizen of the United States and documented under the laws of the United States."

About a week previously, on January 24, 1948, the National Tanker Corp. had given United Tanker Corp. an irrevocable stock option without the prior approval of the Maritime Commission.

There is no credible evidence that Mr. Morris or any other representative of the United Tanker Corp. group made a complete disclosure to the Commission concerning the arrangements between the Casey group and the United Tanker group which were entered into as early as January 1948.

It should also be noted that at about the same time, Mr. Gerald Helmbold, Chief of the Bureau of Operations of the Maritime Commission, directed a letter dated January 31, 1948, to the National Tanker Corp. After stating in his letter of January 31 that reports had reached him that the three vessels had been offered by the National Tanker Corp. for resale to other interests, Helmbold stated:

"We should very much appreciate a prompt statement from you as to whether or not you have in mind the resale of these vessels now or at a later date."

Under date of February 2, 1948, Mr. Casey, as president of the National Tanker Corp., in a letter to Mr. Helmbold replied in part as follows:

"It is our intention to bareboat charter these vessels to another American company. It is the present intention of this corporation to retain title to these vessels indefinitely. Obviously, no statement can be made at this time as to what its position may be with respect to resale at some time in the future."

This statement was made by Mr. Casey within one week after he and Klein, as representatives of the National Tanker Corp., had turned over the actual control of the stock and business operations of the National Tanker Corp. to the United Tanker Corp. on January 24, 1948. In view of that fact, which was well known to Casey, it is obvious that Casey's reply to Helmbold was false.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. In the Hoey committee report, it was pointed out that Mr. Goertner, at the time he rendered this hypothetical decision, did not have access to all of the facts as they were later discovered.

I will not further delay the Senate. Last Thursday I outlined in rather extensive detail the two different transactions, one transaction involving the sale of five tankers and the other involving the sale of three tankers. These transactions are fully outlined in the RECORD of last Thursday.

These transactions were unanimously condemned by a respected committee of the Senate, under the chairmanship of the late Clyde R. Hoey.

I conclude by asking unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point that portion of the Hoey committee report, in which the committee analyzes both the five-tanker deal and the three-tanker deal, as well as the committee's conclusions. This report referred to Mr. Holmes and his associates as "shrewd and calculating businessmen" who, by circumventing the law, were able to make a fast dollar.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I ask unanimous consent that the portions of the committee report identified above be printed as a part of my remarks, along with the names of the Members of the Senate who signed this unanimous report.

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

This entire investigation has demonstrated to the subcommittee how various groups of shrewd and calculating businessmen and attorneys, through an intricate series of corporate and financial transactions, were able to realize substantial profits by taking advantage of the confusion and mismanagement which marked the administration of the surplus ship disposal program by the old Maritime Commission. Had the Commission administered that program in a businesslike manner and in accordance with the clear intent of the law, it would have been impossible for the individuals and firms involved in this inquiry to have engaged in activities which violated the spirit and, in many instances, the actual letter of the law.

At the present time, a libel action by the Government looking toward the forfeiture of the tanker *Meacham*, which was owned by the Meacham Corp., a subsidiary of the China International Foundations, Inc., is pending in Federal courts. The Department of Justice is also making an examination into the acquisition, chartering, and resale of tanker vessels by the American Overseas Tanker Corp., the China International Foundation, Inc., the North American Shipping & Trading Co., Inc., and the United States Petroleum Carriers, Inc., as well as the various affiliates and subsidiaries of these firms involving a total of 47 vessels. It is the purpose of that inquiry to determine whether civil as well as criminal action should be taken against these corporations and the responsible officials and representatives of these firms.

The subcommittee is of the opinion that there appears to be sufficient evidence of violations of the civil provisions of the Merchant Ship Sales Act in these tanker transactions to warrant prompt action by the Department of Justice. In addition the concealment and misrepresentation of pertinent facts by various officers and representatives of the firms involved in this inquiry in their dealings with the Maritime Commission leads the subcommittee to believe that various criminal statutes may have been violated by these individuals. In view of the long delay which has already occurred in making final determinations in these cases, it is the recommendation of the subcommittee that the Department of Justice take prompt and vigorous action to bring these cases to a logical conclusion.

This is a unanimous report of the subcommittee.

CLYDE R. HOEY,
Chairman.
JOHN L. MCCLELLAN.
HUBERT H. HUMPHREY.
THOMAS R. UNDERWOOD.
JOSEPH R. MCCARTHY.
KARL E. MUNDT.
RICHARD M. NIXON.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The Senator from Illinois desired to speak. I prefer to have a quorum call first, and then have the Senator from Illinois speak. How much time remains?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware has 16 minutes remaining.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I start by making a parliamentary inquiry. What is the business before the Senate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and

consent to the nomination of Julius Holmes to be Ambassador to Iran?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I ask that question because I wish to emphasize the point that the business before the Senate is the selection of an Ambassador to Iran. Some of the debate might have suggested to a listener that it was an impeachment proceeding; or that we were passing upon the merits of a business transaction.

Now, I do not know the merits of the question which has been discussed so ably and effectively by the Senator from Delaware but I am under the impression that it was explored by the Justice Department and dropped. However the question that seems to me to be paramount is this: Who is the best man we can find to send to Iran? I asked that question of a Senator on the floor, who who is well informed in the Foreign Service. He told me that probably Mr. Holmes was one of the finest Foreign Service officers we have ever had. He did not know where we would find his equal to send to Teheran today.

I was in Teheran in 1945, at a time when the Russians were there, along with forces of the United States. We were operating the railroad there under an agreement which the British had made. The time for the Russians to leave Iran had passed. The fear was expressed that they were not going to leave. Eventually they left and we left but it was a ticklish situation.

Iran is up against the Iron Curtain, Mr. President, and to visit Teheran is to realize how sensitive is the Ambassador's post there. The country borders directly on Russia. The situation there is one of the hot spots of the world.

I should like to feel that in selecting an Ambassador for Iran we were taking the best man we could get for that post.

If we do not take Mr. Holmes, where do we go?

Has anyone suggested a better man?

This is the man who was entrusted with the vital mission which required secrecy, ability, and courage, when he went into Africa with Mark Clark.

This man was the executive officer in Eisenhower headquarters when the plan was set up for the invasion of Normandy.

This is the man who has been in Hong Kong, possibly the most sensitive point on the Red frontier.

If we were here passing upon the merits of the business transaction which all agree took place when Mr. Holmes was not an officer of the Government, the situation could be different so far as I am concerned. But today it seems to me my responsibility is to vote on a nomination, to vote on whether I think Mr. Holmes would be a good man in the critical post of Teheran.

No one has suggested that he is ineligible for that post by reason of lack of ability or by reason of lack of experience. On the other hand, everything points to the belief that this man knows how to look after the best interests of the United States in the most sensitive posts.

Because that is so, I shall vote to confirm his nomination.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, how much time have we remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri has 11 minutes remaining. The Senator from Delaware has 16 minutes remaining.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT].

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, the Senator from South Dakota has just expressed sentiments with which I agree. I know of no one who has been more useful in recognizing the threat of expanding imperialist communism in its onward march in Asia than has the consul general from Hong Kong, with whom I have had many discussions on the subject.

Prior to his service in Hong Kong, the consulate general was in the hands of various other persons. I recall distinctly the shock which I experienced a decade or less ago in speaking to the previous consul general there. I inquired of him whether any member of the consulate spoke Chinese. Our largest consulate general is, I believe, in Hong Kong, and surely in Hong Kong, of all places, one would expect a member of the consulate to have some familiarity with the language of China—at least, some familiarity with the Manchu dialect and with the language of the people of Canton, if nothing more. The consul general advised me that he knew of no one in the consulate who spoke Chinese. Then his face brightened, and he said:

> Oh, yes; there is one person in the consulate who speaks Chinese. He is the janitor.

Then he brightly reassured me. He said:

> As a matter of fact, he is Chinese.

That was an appalling situation, which I mentioned on my return and on other occasions in discussions with American diplomats in Asia.

I know the high esteem in which Mr. Julius Holmes is held among American diplomats in Asia. I know that since he has become consul general, the number of persons in the consulate who speak Chinese is now 19. They are political experts. They are familiar with what takes place in Red China. They are able and qualified men. Under the direction and leadership of Consul General Holmes, they have given us, indeed, an insight and a window into Red China, which under lesser leadership we were denied.

Mr. President, based on my knowledge of the qualifications of Mr. Holmes, I shall support the confirmation of his nomination.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I express my appreciation to the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT] and the distinguished Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE]. I have great respect for the views and insight of both of them.

I pay a special tribute to the distinguished senior Senator from Connecticut, who I believe has stated the case as well as it could be.

I am chairman of the subcommittee of the Committee on Foreign Relations which considers matters relating to Iran. It is especially important, in my opinion, to have representing the United States in Iran a man of experience and integrity as both President Eisenhower and President Kennedy have felt Mr. Holmes to be.

We have been over and around business transactions, tax cases, the law and its implications, and records to the point where it would now take a Philadelphia lawyer to analyze this dispute fully. However, of all the committees of Congress, I know of no committee which tries harder to perform its duties and functions diligently than does the Committee on Foreign Relations. After listening for many hours to a discussion of the qualifications of Julius Holmes, this committee reported the nomination favorably by a vote of 12 to 4. Because some of the outstanding members of the committee will not be here today, I shall read their names into the RECORD. These are the Senators who supported the nomination:

J. W. FULBRIGHT, of Arkansas, chairman.

JOHN SPARKMAN, of Alabama.

HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, of Minnesota, who, I might add, voted for the Hoey report, and is now in favor of the nomination of Julius Holmes.

MIKE MANSFIELD, of Montana, the majority leader.

WAYNE MORSE, of Oregon.

RUSSELL B. LONG, of Louisiana.

ALBERT GORE, of Tennessee.

FRANK CHURCH, of Idaho.

STUART SYMINGTON, of Missouri.

THOMAS J. DODD, of Connecticut.

BOURKE B. HICKENLOOPER, of Iowa.

FRANK CARLSON, of Kansas.

Four members of the committee voted against confirmation of the nomination.

One member of the committee was not declared because of his absence due to illness in his family.

Mr. President, we could continue with this discussion for many days. However, I believe the record has been established, on both sides of the aisle, that the nomination of this able public servant should be confirmed, so that he may in the future represent the United States in a vital part of the world, as he has in recent years.

Mr. President, how much time have I remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri has 2 minutes remaining.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I reserve my 2 minutes for the majority leader.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I may as well admit that I was somewhat troubled in reaching a decision on whether to vote for the approval of the nomination of Mr. Holmes to be Ambassador to Iran. I believe the President did not exercise the best judgment when he nominated Mr. Holmes for this position.

I do not question the ability of Mr. Holmes. I do not question that the deals with the Maritime Commission and with others, which were consummated during the 2 or 3 years when Mr. Holmes was not in Government employ, were legal. Probably they were legal. For many years I have questioned the pro-

priety of the laws relating to the operations of the Maritime Commission.

However, it seems to me that at this time, when we are trying to put our country in the best light before all the other peoples of the world, and particularly in view of the President's message concerning the qualifications of Government officials, which was sent to Congress recently, it would be unwise on the part of the Senate to press this nomination.

I had hoped that a position might be found for Mr. Holmes in which his talents could be used without raising questions not only in the minds of the people of the United States, but also, perhaps, in the minds of people in other countries.

In view of this situation, I have decided that I cannot vote to confirm the nomination of Mr. Holmes to be Ambassador to Iran.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator from Vermont yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I will yield if I have time.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Did the Senator from Vermont, in his study of the situation find any incident in which Mr. Holmes, as a Government official, operated against the best interests of the United States? Was he in any way incapable in the performance of his duties in Hong Kong?

Mr. AIKEN. I do not know. I understand he performed his service very well in Hong Kong. Nevertheless, there were 2 or 3 years when he was not an official of the United States, and it was during that period that the question was raised, perhaps not so much as to the legality but as to the propriety of the transactions which he helped to carry out.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I think all the arguments on both sides of the question have been presented, except that I understand the distinguished Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] wishes to speak on behalf of the nomination, and the distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] will speak in opposition.

I wonder if we might not agree to have a quorum call, the time for the quorum call not to be charged to either side. Following the quorum call, the Senator from Montana and the Senator from Illinois will speak, and then the Senate will vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. How much time does the Senator from Delaware reserve for the quorum call?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the time for the quorum call not be charged to either side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none. 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, we are coming to the concluding moments of the debate on the question of confirmation of the nomination of the Honorable Julius C. Holmes, of Kansas, to be Ambassador to Iran.

I think the so-called tanker deal has been threshed out on a number of occasions, so that every Member of the Senate understands the situation as it was and the implications which have been raised since that time. It is not for me to go into any more detail, because I think the record has been laid bare.

But I do wish to urge the Senate to give its most serious consideration to the fact that Julius Holmes has served in a number of outstanding positions, as a career officer in the Foreign Service of the United States. He has served in practically all continents except Australia.

I had a chance to observe him personally, while he was our Minister at London, following the Second World War, after he had completed military service with the U.S. Army.

I have watched him, personally, in his service as our consular agent—I believe that was the term—at Tangiers, in what was French Morocco. At that time he also held the rank of Minister.

I know that he worked in the Department of State, and that he conducted the earliest preliminary survey covering the future of the continent of Africa. I have had a chance to read that report, and in my opinion it was remarkable in what it had to say as to what was likely to occur in the emergent nations comprising that continent.

Just last fall I visited Hong Kong, and there I had a chance to observe at first hand what Mr. Holmes—still with the rank of Minister—was doing in behalf of our country in that most difficult and most sensitive post. As a matter of fact, I spent approximately 3 days with him, going over his activities there as consul general. I wish to say that I was tremendously impressed by his activities there, as I had previously been impressed by his activities at London and at Tangiers, because of the outstanding work he was doing in behalf of our country.

So I appeal to the Senate in behalf of a man who has served for approximately 30 years in the Foreign Service of the United States, and has served his country well, both as a member of its uniformed forces and as a member of its Foreign Service; a man who, I think, will make a great Ambassador to Iran; a man for whom I was happy to vote, when his name was before the Foreign Relations Committee, some 5 years ago; a man for whose nomination I shall be pleased to vote today.

So, Mr. President, I hope the Senate will very shortly confirm his nomination.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time available to the Senator from Montana has expired.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, let me inquire how much time remains.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Eleven minutes remain under the control of the Senator from Delaware. No time remains under the control of the other side.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] the remainder of the time under my control.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois is recognized for 11 minutes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, a great many years ago, when I was still on a college campus, pursuing, among other things, an insurance course, it was the custom to get some high-pressure insurance salesman to give the class a lecture every week. I recall one, in particular—a very fine, very distinguished gentleman, who related the story of getting an appointment with J. Pierpont Morgan. Mr. Morgan knew the insurance salesman was coming to see him, and said he would give him 3 minutes on a busy morning.

When the high pressure salesman had a chance to speak to Mr. Morgan, he said:

> Mr. Morgan, I want you to take out this very substantial insurance policy; and I will give you one reason for taking it out. When you do, the story about it will appear in all the press, in all the journals, in all the insurance magazines; and the impact upon the young people of America of the point that insurance is a good investment will be terrific.

It was on that point that he made his sale.

With respect to the pending nomination, I think I am less concerned about the capacity of Mr. Holmes, his fine family, and the possibility of marring a career, than I am about the impact of this nomination on the young people of America.

I think the record clearly shows that Mr. Holmes was in the Foreign Service. To be sure, he had an honorable career. To be sure, he is a man of capacity, diligence, and competence. To be sure, he has a son who now is in the Foreign Service. To be sure, he has a fine family. But the fact remains that Mr. Holmes got out of the Foreign Service; and that in that 2-year period he made four or five business ventures, including one which called for an investment of $10,000 in the stock of the tanker corporation, for which he received, so the testimony shows, $280,000.

We have set up all sorts of safeguards around the Interstate Commerce Commission, so that if one has ever been in the Commission, he cannot practice before the Commission for a 2-year period thereafter. We have set up safeguards so that men in the Internal Revenue Service cannot practice in that forum for a period of 2 years after they leave it.

Without reflecting for a moment on the character of Mr. Holmes, or whether there was any illegality in this action—because I doubt it very much; I do not even speculate on the morals that are involved—I do say there are going to be millions of youngsters in this country who will say, "Well, there is the technique. Get the information that is necessary. Team up with somebody. Lay a little modest chunk of money on the line, and then build it up to $280,000."

Immoral? Far be it for me to pass on it. Illegal? I doubt whether its illegality has been fully demonstrated. But I

do not believe there is any person indispensable to the Foreign Service, notwithstanding what his record may have been shown to be in all the past years. I do know youngsters will read the record, and I do know they will say, "You can put down a couple of dollars and skim off the cream, if you know where to go and whom to see."

The name of Joe Casey appears all the way through. I remember Joe Casey, of Massachusetts, when he served in the House of Representatives. I thought he was one of the most personally attractive persons I ever encountered in my life. I know he was a man of capacity. I know he was a skillful lawyer. I remember when he set up an office downtown and when these things started to happen. And so here are Stanley Klein, and Joe Casey, and Mr. Holmes, who got themselves involved in a tanker deal. His conscience can be clear. It is no sin, in my book, to make money. It is no sin to run $10,000 up to $280,000. But here was a man who dropped out of the Foreign Service, after a long and honorable career, who took 2 years off to make a wad, and then came back to the Foreign Service; and now we are expected to approve his nomination. I shall never offer anything in derogation of his character. I shall say nothing to asperse his reputation. I do not want to hurt anybody. This is an unfortunate situation, but I start from a broad premise:

No. 1, there is no indispensable man in the Foreign Service—I do not care who he is.

No. 2, in view of the moral sentiments expressed in the President's own message to the Congress on conflict of interest, and so forth, I am not going to get that close to the line today and give my approval to this nomination.

I do not know Mr. Holmes. I think Charles Lamb once said, in the essays of Elia, "You cannot dislike somebody whom you know."

But it is not a question of dislike with me. It is not a question of his capacity. It is not a question of how good a job he did at Hong Kong. The question is, How many millions of youngsters will say, "That is the way to work in Government. Move yourself up. Get a broad knowledge. Go all through the spectrum. Know where the deal is to be made. Run $10,000 up to $280,000. Get a second deal, and then go back in the Government."

That has no great appeal to me. The emphasis here has been upon the character of Mr. Holmes. I offer nothing to impute other than good character. The emphasis has been on his capacity. But if there is anything bigger or more important than Julius Holmes, it is the homefront of America and the necessity for not disillusioning a lot of young people who are now regarding the star of public service and who hope someday to come into that service, either at the Federal or State level. And so my position involves no dislike. It involves no spleen on my part. I am just thinking, Can the nominee do a better job in Iran than anybody else? Or is it far more important to preserve the confidence of our people in the character of those who are to be approved? And that has to include all the rather singular circumstances that were involved in the case.

It is a tragedy for a man of good family and an honorable career to involve himself in that kind of position, and then make it necessary, in the exercise of our responsibility as the confirming branch of the Congress, to have to pass judgment on it. In doing so, I will take the perspective of what I think would be a good juryman, put the evidence all together, and decide that the good of the country comes first, and that means the confidence of the people in the moral stamina and robustness of the country.

For these reasons I feel impelled to withhold my vote from confirmation of the nomination of Mr. Holmes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator form Delaware has 2 minutes remaining.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The remainder of the time has been yielded back. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Julius C. Holmes to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Iran? The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. ERVIN (when his name was called). Mr. President, on this vote I have a pair with the junior Senator from Texas [Mr. BLAKLEY], who is absent. If he were present and voting he would vote "yea." If I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "nay." I withhold my vote.

The rollcall was concluded.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS] are absent on official business.

I further announce that the Senator from Texas [Mr. BLAKLEY] is necessarily absent.

On this vote, the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH] is paired with the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT]. If present and voting, the Senator from Idaho would vote "yea" and the Senator from Utah would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] is paired with the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART]. If present and voting, the Senator from Minnesota would vote "yea" and the Senator from Indiana would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR] is paired with the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES]. If present and voting, the Senator from Oklahoma would vote "yea" and the Senator from New Hampshire would vote "nay."

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS], and the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] would each vote "yea."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER], and the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPEL] are necessarily absent.

On this vote, the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT] is paired with the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH]. If present and voting, the Senator from Utah would vote "nay" and the Senator from Idaho would vote "yea."

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] is paired with the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY]. If present and voting, the Senator from Indiana would vote "nay" and the Senator from Minnesota would vote "yea."

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] is detained on official business and is paired with the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR]. If present and voting, the Senator from New Hampshire would vote "nay" and the Senator from Oklahoma would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 63, nays 17, as follows:

[Ex. No. 1]

YEAS—63

Anderson	Hayden	Moss
Bartlett	Hickenlooper	Mundt
Beall	Hickey	Muskie
Bible	Hill	Neuberger
Burdick	Holland	Pastore
Bush	Jackson	Pell
Byrd, W. Va.	Javits	Proxmire
Cannon	Johnston	Randolph
Carlson	Jordan	Robertson
Carroll	Keating	Russell
Case, N.J.	Long, Mo.	Saltonstall
Case, S. Dak.	Long, Hawaii	Scott
Chavez	Long, La.	Smathers
Clark	Magnuson	Smith, Mass.
Cotton	Mansfield	Stennis
Ellender	McCarthy	Symington
Engle	McGee	Talmadge
Fong	McNamara	Thurmond
Fulbright	Metcalf	Wiley
Hart	Monroney	Yarborough
Hartke	Morton	Young, Ohio

NAYS—17

Aiken	Dirksen	Miller
Allott	Douglas	Prouty
Boggs	Dworshak	Smith, Maine
Butler	Hruska	Williams, Del.
Cooper	Kuchel	Young, N. Dak.
Curtis	Lausche	

NOT VOTING—20

Bennett	Eastland	Kerr
Blakley	Ervin	McClellan
Bridges	Goldwater	Morse
Byrd, Va.	Gore	Schoeppel
Capehart	Gruening	Sparkman
Church	Humphrey	Williams, N.J.
Dodd	Kefauver	

So the nomination of Mr. Julius C. Holmes to be Ambassador to Iran was confirmed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of the nomination.

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

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. 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.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATION, 1962

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 173, H.R. 5000.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 5000) to authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H.R. 5000) to authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Armed Services, with an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

TITLE I

SEC. 101. The Secretary of the Army may establish or develop military installations and facilities by acquiring, constructing, converting, rehabilitating, or installing permanent or temporary public works, including site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment, for the following projects:

INSIDE THE UNITED STATES

Continental Army command

(First Army)

Fort Devens, Massachusetts: Operational facilities, $626,000.

(Second Army)

Camp A. P. Hill, Virginia: Training facilities, $284,000.

Fort Knox, Kentucky: Operational and training facilities, and utilities, $492,000.

Fort Meade, Maryland: Maintenance facilities, supply facilities, medical facilities, and administrative facilities, $2,211,000.

Camp Pickett, Virginia: Training facilities, $396,000.

Fort Ritchie, Maryland: Troop housing, $305,000.

(Third Army)

Fort Benning, Georgia: Operational and training facilities, $10,524,000.

Fort Bragg, North Carolina: Operational facilities, and maintenance facilities, $521,000.

Fort Campbell, Kentucky: Utilities, $618,000.

Fort Rucker, Alabama: Operational and training facilities, and maintenance facilities, $1,571,000.

Fort Stewart, Georgia: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, and administrative facilities, $1,240,000.

(Fourth Army)

Fort Bliss, Texas: Supply facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing, and utilities, $455,000.

Fort Hood, Texas: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, and supply facilities, $3,054,000.

Fort Sill, Oklahoma: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, hospital and medical facilities, and utilities, $8,695,000.

(Fifth Army)

Fort Riley, Kansas: Troop housing, $99,000.

Fort Leonard Wood, Missouri: Troop housing, community facilities, and utilities, $4,081,000.

(Sixth Army)

Camp Irwin, California: Family housing, utilities, and ground improvements, $3,650,000.

Fort Lewis, Washington: Operational facilities and maintenance facilities, $524,000.

Fort Ord, California: Maintenance facilities and supply facilities, $1,357,000.

Yuma Test Station, Arizona: Maintenance facilities, administrative facilities, and utilities, $388,000.

Technical services facilities

(Chemical Corps)

Army Chemical Center, Maryland: Research, development, and test facilities, and medical facilities, $4,029,000.

(Corps of Engineers)

Fort Belvoir, Virginia: Operational and training facilities, research development, and test facilities, and maintenance facilities and utilities, $1,499,000.

(Ordnance Corps)

Aberdeen Proving Grounds, Maryland: Utilities, $472,000.

Savanna Ordnance Depot, Illinois: Utilities, $382,000.

(Quartermaster Corps)

Atlanta General Depot, Georgia: Maintenance facilities, $231,000.

Fort Lee, Virginia: Utilities, $84,000.

Quartermaster Research and Engineering Center, Natick, Massachusetts: Research, development, and test facilities, and troop housing, $3,812,000.

Richmond Quartermaster Depot, Virginia: Administrative facilities and community facilities, $600,000.

Sharpe General Depot, California: Operational and training facilities, $202,000.

(Signal Corps)

Fort Huachuca, Arizona: Operational facilities, $2,228,000.

Lexington Signal Depot, Kentucky: Utilities, $33,000.

(Medical Service)

Walter Reed Army Medical Center, District of Columbia: Medical facilities, $45,000.

(Transportation Corps)

Fort Eustis, Virginia: Training facilities, $1,253,000.

United States Military Academy

United States Military Academy, West Point, New York: Training facilities, $4,222,000.

Defense atomic support agency

Clarksville Base, Tennessee: Utilities, $238,000.

Sandia Base, New Mexico: Operational facilities and community facilities, $1,744,000.

Army component commands

(United States Army Air Defense Command)

Various locations: Operational facilities, supply facilities, administrative facilities, and utilities, $1,417,000.

(Alaska Command Area)

Various locations: Operational facilities and utilities, $5,951,000.

(Pacific Command Area)

Aliamanu Military Reservation, Hawaii: Utilities, $36,000.

Schofield Barracks, Hawaii: Maintenance facilities and supply facilities, $918,000.

Various locations: Operational facilities, $814,000.

OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES

(Ordnance Corps)

Kwajalein Island: Research, development, and test facilities, supply facilities, community facilities, utilities, and ground improvements, $1,546,000.

(Army Security Agency)

Various locations: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, medical facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing, community facilities, utilities, and ground improvements, $7,765,000.

Army component commands

(Pacific Command Area)

Korea: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, medical facilities, troop housing, community facilities, utilities, and ground improvements, $10,635,000.

Fort Buckner, Okinawa: Operational facilities, supply facilities, hospital facilities, and community facilities, $6,676,000.

Camp Tomlinson, Japan: Operational facilities, $50,000.

Guam: Real estate, $80,000.

(European Command Area)

Germany: Operational and training facilities, troop housing, and utilities, $6,423,000.

Classified locations: Operational facilities and utilities, $3,105,000.

(Caribbean Command Area)

Fort Allen, Puerto Rico: Utilities, $381,000.

Fort Clayton, Canal Zone: Community facilities and utilities, $582,000.

SEC. 102. The Secretary of the Army may establish or develop classified military installations and facilities by acquiring, constructing, converting, rehabilitating, or installing permanent or temporary public works, including land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment in the total amount of $6,245,000.

SEC. 103. The Secretary of the Army may establish or develop Army installations and facilities by proceeding with construction made necessary by changes in Army missions, new weapons developments, new and unforeseen research and development requirements, or improved production schedules, if the Secretary of Defense determines that deferral of such construction for inclusion in the next military construction authorization Act would be inconsistent with interests of national security, and in connection therewith to acquire, construct, convert, rehabilitate, or install permanent or temporary public works, including land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment, in the total amount of $15,000,000: *Provided*, That the Secretary of the Army, or his designee, shall notify the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives, immediately upon reaching a final decision to implement, of the cost of construction of any public work undertaken under this section, including those real estate actions pertaining thereto. This authorization will expire as of September 30, 1962, except for those public works projects concerning which the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives have been notified pursuant to this section prior to that date.

SEC. 104. (a) Public Law 85–685, as amended, is amended under the heading "INSIDE THE UNITED STATES", in section 101 as follows:

Under the subheading "FIELD FORCES FACILITIES (Sixth Army Area)", with respect to Fort Lewis, Washington, strike out "$1,085,000" and insert in place thereof "$1,257,000".

(b) Public Law 85–685, as amended, is amended by striking out in clause (1) of section 502 the amounts "$110,625,000" and

"$310,535,000" and inserting in place thereof $110,797,000" and "$310,707,000", respectively.

SEC. 105. (a) Public Law 86–149, as amended is amended under the heading "INSIDE THE UNITED STATES", in section 101 as follows:

Under the subheading "TECHNICAL SERVICES FACILITIES (Chemical Corps)", with respect to Dugway Proving Ground, Utah, strike out "$532,000" and insert in place thereof "$600,000".

(b) Public Law 86–149, as amended, is amended by striking out in section 102 the amount "$81,830,000" and inserting in place thereof "$83,876,000".

(c) Public Law 86–149, as amended, is amended by striking out in clause (1) of section 402 the amounts "$73,652,100", "$81,830,000" and "$189,692,100" and inserting in place thereof "$73,720,100", "$83,876,000" and $191,806,100", respectively.

SEC. 106. (a) Public Law 86–500 is amended under the heading "INSIDE THE UNITED STATES" in section 101 as follows:

Under the subheading "FIELD FORCES FACILITIES (Fifth Army Area)", with respect to Fort Leonard Wood, Missouri, strike out "$9,087,000" and insert in place thereof "$11,731,000".

(b) Public Law 86–500 is amended by striking out in clause (1) of section 502 "$76,631,000" and "$143,561,000" and inserting in place thereof "$79,275,000" and "$146,205,000", respectively.

TITLE II

SEC. 201. The Secretary of the Navy may establish or develop military installations and facilities by acquiring, constructing, converting, rehabilitating, or installing permanent or temporary public works, including site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment for the following projects:

INSIDE THE UNITED STATES

Shipyard facilities

Naval Shipyard, Charleston, South Carolina: Operational facilities, and supply facilities, $700,000.

Naval Facility, Fort Miles, Lewes, Delaware: Family housing, and utilities, $495,000.

Naval Submarine Base, New London, Connecticut: Family housing, utilities, and real estate, $3,300,000.

Naval Shipyard, Norfolk, Virginia: Maintenance facilities, $211,000.

Naval Shipyard, Portsmouth, New Hampshire: Maintenance facilities, administrative facilities, and utilities, $1,774,000.

Naval Shipyard, Mare Island, Vallejo, California: Operational facilities, $417,000.

Fleet base facilities

Naval Base, Charleston, South Carolina: Family housing, and utilities, $3,300,000.

Naval Station, Charleston, South Carolina: Medical facilities, troop housing, and utilities and ground improvements, $5,951,000.

Naval Station, Long Beach, California: Operational facilities and utilities, $720,000.

Naval Station, Mayport, Florida: Family housing, medical facilities, utilities, and real estate, $2,880,000.

Naval weapons facilities

(Training Stations)

Naval Air Station, Glynco, Georgia: Training facilities, $639,000.

Naval Air Station, Memphis, Tennessee: Community facilities, $94,000.

(Field Support Stations)

Naval Air Station, Alameda, California: Supply facilities, $309,000.

Naval Air Station, Brunswick, Maine: Training facilities, $211,000.

Naval Air Station, Cecil Field, Florida: Operational facilities, $68,000.

Naval Auxiliary Air Station, Fallon, Nevada: Utilities, $772,000.

Naval Air Station, Lemoore, California: Supply facilities, family housing, utilities, and ground improvements, $3,579,000.

Naval Air Station, Miramar, California: Operational ities, family housing, utilities, and ground improvements, $3,579,000.

Naval Air Station, Norfolk, Virginia: Maintenance facilities, $435,000.

Naval Air Station, North Island, San Diego, California: Operational facilities, $1,480,000.

Naval Air Station, Oceana, Virginia: Maintenance facilities, $161,000.

(Marine Corps Air Stations)

Marine Corps Air Station, Beaufort, South Carolina: Operational facilities, $190,000.

Marine Corps Air Station, Cherry Point, North Carolina: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, administrative facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, $4,703,000.

Marine Corps Air Station, El Toro, California: Operational facilities, $463,000.

Marine Corps Air Facility, New River, North Carolina: Training facilities, maintenance facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, $2,731,000.

(Fleet Readiness Stations)

Naval Ammunition Depot, Concord, California: Research, development and test facilities, $345,000.

Naval Propellant Plant, Indian Head, Maryland: Supply facilities, $460,000.

(Research, Development, Test and Evaluation Stations)

Naval Ordnance Test Station, China Lake, California: Utilities, $1,086,000.

Naval Air Station, Lakehurst, New Jersey: Operational facilities, $1,628,000.

Pacific Missile Range, Point Mugu, California: Utilities, at Point Arguello, supply facilities, medical facilities, and utilities and ground improvements; and, on San Nicolas Island, operational facilities, research, development and test facilities, and utilities, $2,791,000.

Naval Ordnance Laboratory, White Oak, Maryland: Research, development and test facilities, $240,000.

Supply facilities

Military Industrial Supply Agency, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania: Administrative facilities, $825,000.

Marine Corps facilities

Marine Corps Base, Camp Pendleton, California: Operational and training facilities, supply facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing and community facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, $6,101,000.

Marine Corps Schools, Quantico, Virginia: Administrative facilities, $118,000.

Marine, Corps Base, Twentynine Palms, California: Hospital facilities, $1,100,000.

Service school facilities

Naval Academy, Annapolis, Maryland: Troop housing, $7,730,000.

Naval Training Center, Great Lakes, Illinois: Medical facilities, and troop housing, $4,952,000.

Naval Schools, Mare Island, Vallejo, California: Training facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing, and utilities, $2,213,000.

Naval Post Graduate School, Monterey, California: Training facilities, $2,463,000.

Atlantic Fleet Anti-Submarine Warfare Tactical School, Norfolk, Virginia: Training facilities, $868,000.

Medical facilities

Naval Hospital, Portsmouth, New Hampshire: Hospital facilities, $60,000.

Communication facilities

Naval Radio Station, Annapolis, Maryland: Operational facilities, $900,000.

Naval Security Group Detachment, Charleston, South Carolina: Supply facilities, $240,000.

Naval Radio Station, Cheltenham, Maryland: Operational facilities, $151,000.

Naval Radio Station, Dixon, California: Troop housing, $165,000.

Naval Communication Station, Kodiak, Alaska: Operational facilities, $77,000.

Naval Security Group Activity, Winter Harbor, Maine: Family housing, and utilities, $459,000.

Yards and docks facilities

Naval Construction Battalion Center, Port Hueneme, California: Family housing, and utilities, $3,300,000.

OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES

Naval weapons facilities

Naval Magazine, Cartagena, Spain: Utilities, $115,000.

Marine Corps Air Facility, Futema, Okinawa: Operational facilities, and administrative facilities, $1,527,000.

Marine Corps Air Facility, Iwakuni, Japan: Operational facilities, $1,375,000.

Naval Air Facility, Naha, Okinawa: Maintenance facilities, $1,791,000.

Naval Station, Roosevelt Roads, Puerto Rico: Operational facilities, $90,000.

Marine Corps facilities

Camp Smedley D. Butler, Okinawa: Operational facilities, medical facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing and community facilities and utilities and ground improvements, $3,238,000.

SEC. 202. The Secretary of the Navy may establish or develop classified naval installations and facilities by acquiring, constructing, converting, rehabilitating, or installing permament or temporary public works, including land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment, in the total amount of $40,969,000.

SEC. 203. The Secretary of the Navy may establish or develop Navy installations and facilities by proceeding with construction made necessary by changes in Navy missions, new weapons developments, new and unforeseen research and development requirements, or improved production schedules, if the Secretary of Defense determines that deferral of such construction for inclusion in the next military construction authorization Act would be inconsistent with interests of national security, and in connection therewith to acquire, construct, convert, rehabilitate, or install permanent or temporary public works, including land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment, in the total amount of $15,000,000: *Provided*, That the Secretary of the Navy, or his designee, shall notify the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives, immediately upon reaching a final decision to implement, of the cost of construction of any public work undertaken under this section, including those real estate actions pertaining thereto. This authorization will expire as of September 30, 1962, except for those public works projects concerning which the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives have been notified pursuant to this section prior to that date.

SEC. 204. (a) Public Law 85–685, as amended, is amended by striking out in section 202, "$93,101,000", and inserting in place thereof "$129,701,000".

(b) Public Law 85–685, as amended, is amended by striking out in clause (2) of section 502 the amounts "$93,101,000" and "$351,294,000", and inserting respectively in place thereof "$129,701,000", and $387-894,000".

SEC. 205. (a) Public Law 86–500 is amended in section 201 under the heading "INSIDE THE UNITED STATES" and subheading "SHIPYARD FACILITIES", with respect to the Naval Shipyard, Charleston, South Carolina, by striking out the amount "$14,855,000", and inserting in place thereof "$17,955,000".

(b) Public Law 86-500 is amended by striking out in clause (2) of section 502, the amounts "$83,975,000" and $127,566,000", and inserting respectively in place thereof "$87,075,000" and "$130,666,000".

TITLE III

SEC. 301. The Secretary of the Air Force may establish or develop military installations and facilities by acquiring, constructing, converting, rehabilitating, or installing permanent or temporary public works, including site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment, for the following projects:

INSIDE THE UNITED STATES

Air defense command

Grand Forks Air Force Base, Grand Forks, North Dakota: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, and community facilities, $888,000.

K. I. Sawyer Municipal Airport, Marquette, Michigan: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, and troop housing and community facilities, $1,468,000.

Kincheloe Air Force Base, Sault Sainte Marie, Michigan: Maintenance facilities, supply facilities and community facilities, $1,256,000.

McChord Air Force Base, Tacoma, Washington: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, and utilities, $404,000.

Minot Air Force Base, Minot, North Dakota: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, community facilites, and utilities, $2,677,000.

NORAD Headquarters, Colorado Springs, Colorado: Operational facilities, $12,400,000.

Otis Air Force Base, Falmouth, Massachusetts: Operational facilities, $373,000.

Suffolk County Air Force Base, Westhampton Beach, New York: Real estate, $43,000.

Air materiel command

Gentile Air Force Station, Dayton, Ohio: Administrative facilities, $420,000.

Griffiss Air Force Base, Rome, New York: Operational facilities, $160,000.

Hill Air Force Base, Ogden, Utah: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, family housing, and utilities, $6,770,000.

McClellan Air Force Base, Sacramento, California: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities and utilities, $1,280,000.

Olmstead Air Force Base, Middletown, Pennsylvania: Operational facilities, and maintenance facilities, $1,639,000.

Robins Air Force Base, Macon, Georgia: Operational facilities, supply facilities, administrative facilities, community facilities, and utilities, $1,107,000.

Tinker Air Force Base, Oklahoma City, Oklahoma: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, and utilities, $881,000.

Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Dayton, Ohio: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, research, development, and test facilities, supply facilities, and medical facilities, $1,653,000.

Air research and development command

Arnold Engineering Development Center, Tullahoma, Tennessee: Research, development, and test facilities, $18,500,000.

Edwards Air Force Base, Muroc, California: Research, development, and test facilities and utilities, $1,885,000.

Eglin Air Force Base, Valparaiso, Florida: Operational facilities, $345,000.

Laurence G. Hanscom Field, Bedford, Massachusetts: Research, development, and test facilities, community facilities, and utilities, $2,819,000.

Patrick Air Force Base, Cocoa, Florida: Operational facilities and community facilities, $630,000.

Various locations, Atlantic Missile Range: Operational facilities, and research, development, and test facilities, $10,006,000.

Air training command

Brooks Air Force Base, San Antonio, Texas: Community facilities, $296,000.

Chanute Air Force Base, Rantoul, Illinois: Troop housing, $342,000.

James Connally Air Force Base, Waco, Texas: Community facilities and utilities, $427,000.

Keesler Air Force Base, Biloxi, Mississippi: Medical facilities and community facilities, $693,000.

Lackland Air Force Base, San Antonio, Texas: Training facilities, and administrative facilities, $1,040,000.

Lowry Air Force Base, Denver, Colorado: Medical facilities, $371,000.

Mather Air Force Base, Sacramento, California: Training facilities, and maintenance facilities, $1,075,000.

Perrin Air Force Base, Sherman, Texas: Supply facilities, $203,000.

Randolph Air Force Base, San Antonio, Texas: Operational facilities, $1,256,000.

Reese Air Force Base, Lubbock, Texas: Operational facilities, $135,000.

Sheppard Air Force Base, Wichita Falls, Texas: Troop housing and utilities, $553,000.

Air university

Gunter Air Force Base, Montgomery, Alabama: Community facilities, $86,000.

Maxwell Air Force Base, Montgomery, Alabama: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, troop housing, and utilities, $2,413,000.

Alaskan air command

Eielson Air Force Base, Fairbanks, Alaska: Community facilities, $354,000.

Elmendorf Air Force Base, Anchorage, Alaska: Maintenance facilities, and community facilities, $240,000.

King Salmon Airport, Naknek, Alaska: Operational facilities, $684,000.

Various locations, Alaska: Maintenance facilities, supply facilities, and troop housing, $1,837,000.

Headquarters command

Andrews Air Force Base, Camp Springs, Maryland: Maintenance facilities, administrative facilities, and utilities, $2,692,000.

Military air transport service

Dover Air Force Base, Dover, Delaware: Maintenance facilities, $145,000.

McGuire Air Force Base, Wrightstown, New Jersey: Operational facilities, and supply facilities, $125,000.

Travis Air Force Base, Fairfield, California: Maintenance facilities and medical facilities, $441,000.

Pacific air forces

Hickam Air Force Base, Honolulu, Hawaii: Operational facilities, $122,000.

Strategic air command

Barksdale Air Force Base, Shreveport, Louisiana: Operational facilities and medical facilities, $1,217,000.

Beale Air Force Base, Marysville, California: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, and utilities, $373,000.

Bergstrom Air Force Base, Austin, Texas: Operational facilities, $74,000.

Blytheville Air Force Base, Blytheville, Arkansas: Operational facilities and community facilities, $475,000.

Bunker Hill Air Force Base, Peru, Indiana: Operational facilities and maintenance facilities, $411,000.

Carswell Air Force Base, Fort Worth, Texas: Maintenance facilities and utilities, $236,000.

Castle Air Force Base, Merced, California: Operational facilities, $72,000.

Clinton-Sherman Air Force Base, Clinton, Oklahoma: Maintenance facilities, $193,000.

Columbus Air Force Base, Columbus, Mississippi: Community facilities, $197,000.

Dow Air Force Base, Bangor, Maine: Operational facilities, and troop housing, $828,000.

Dyess Air Force Base, Abilene, Texas: Maintenance facilities, and troop housing, $568,000.

Ellsworth Air Force Base, Rapid City, South Dakota: Operational facilities, community facilities and utilities, $762,000.

Francis E. Warren Air Force Base, Cheyenne, Wyoming: Hospital facilities, $2,050,000.

Glasgow Air Force Base, Glasgow, Montana: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, administrative facilities, and community facilities, $2,716,000.

Homestead Air Force Base, Homestead, Florida: Operational facilities and troop housing, $509,000.

Larson Air Force Base, Moses Lake, Washington: Supply facilities and medical facilities, $360,000.

Lincoln Air Force Base, Lincoln, Nebraska: Operational facilities and medical facilities, $934,000.

Little Rock Air Force Base, Little Rock, Arkansas: Hospital facilities, $1,900,000.

Lockbourne Air Force Base, Columbus, Ohio: Operational facilities, $67,000.

Loring Air Force Base, Limestone, Maine: Maintenance facilities, $72,000.

March Air Force Base, Riverside, California: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, hospital facilities, and utilities, $6,280,000.

McConnell Air Force Base, Wichita, Kansas: Operational facilities, $66,000.

McCoy Air Force Base, Orlando, Florida: Operational facilities and maintenance facilities, $163,000.

Offutt Air Force Base, Omaha, Nebraska: Hospital facilities, utilities and ground improvements, and real estate, $4,854,000.

Pease Air Force Base, Portsmouth, New Hampshire: Operational facilities, $172,000.

Plattsburgh Air Force Base, Plattsburgh, New York: Operational facilities, $415,000.

Schilling Air Force Base, Salina, Kansas: Operational and training facilities and supply facilities, $490,000.

Tampa Fuel Annex, Tampa, Florida: Utilities, $48,000.

Turner Air Force Base, Albany, Georgia: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, and troop housing and community facilities, $3,481,000.

Vandenberg Air Force Base, Lompoc, California: Operational facilities, community facilities, and utilities, $466,000.

Walker Air Force Base, Roswell, New Mexico: Utilities, $100,000.

Westover Air Force Base, Chicopee Falls, Massachusetts: Operational facilities, supply facilities, and real estate, $8,677,000.

Whiteman Air Force Base, Knobnoster, Missouri: Community facilities and utilities, $458,000.

Wurtsmith Air Force Base, Oscoda, Michigan: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities and community facilities, $2,240,000.

Tactical air command

Cannon Air Force Base, Clovis, New Mexico: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, and community facilities, $1,544,000.

Luke Air Force Base, Phoenix, Arizona: Maintenance facilities and supply facilities, $1,441,000.

Myrtle Beach Air Force Base, Myrtle Beach, South Carolina: Operational facilities, $98,000.

Nellis Air Force Base, Las Vegas, Nevada: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, hospital facilities, and community facilities, $4,663,000.

Seymour-Johnson Air Force Base, Goldsboro, North Carolina: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, and utilities, $512,000.

Aircraft control and warning system

Various locations: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, troop housing and community facilities, and utilities, $16,129,000.

Special facilities

Various locations: Operational facilities, $142,000.

Transportable family housing

Various locations: Family housing, $3,584,000.

OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES

Caribbean air command

Howard Air Force Base, Canal Zone: Operational facilities, $117,000.

Military air transport service

Various locations: Operational facilities, supply facilities, and troop housing, $977,000.

Pacific air forces

Various locations: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, troop housing and community facilities, and utilities and ground improvements, $9,468,000.

Strategic air command

Andersen Air Force Base, Guam: Operational facilities, $181,000.

Ramey Air Force Base, Puerto Rico: Operational facilities, $80,000.

Various locations: Operational facilities, $1,988,000.

United States air forces in Europe

Various locations: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing and community facilities, and utilities, $10,508,000.

United States air force security service

Various locations: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, administrative facilities, troop housing, community facilities, and utilities, $6,059,000.

Aircraft control and warning system

Various locations: Operational facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities, and utilities, $2,768,000.

Special facilities

Various locations: Operational facilities, $651,000.

SEC. 302. The Secretary of the Air Force may establish or develop classified military installations and facilities for ballistic missiles by acquiring, constructing, converting, rehabilitating, or installing permanent or temporary public works, including land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment in the total amount of $285,300,000.

SEC. 303. The Secretary of the Air Force may establish or develop Air Force installations and facilities by proceeding with construction made necessary by changes in Air Force missions, new weapons developments, new and unforeseen research and development requirements, or improved production schedules, if the Secretary of Defense determines that deferral of such construction for inclusion in the next military construction authorization Act would be inconsistent with interests of national security, and in connection therewith to acquire, construct, convert, rehabilitate, or install permanent or temporary public works, including land acquisition, site preparation, appurtenances, utilities, and equipment, in the total amount of $15,000,000: *Provided*, That the Secretary of the Air Force, or his designee, shall notify the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives immediately upon reaching a final decision to implement, of the cost of construction of any public work undertaken under this section, including those real estate actions pertaining thereto. This authorization will expire as of September 30, 1962, except for those public works projects concerning which the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives have been notified pursuant to this section prior to that date.

SEC. 304. Section 9 of the Air Force Academy Act, as amended (68 Stat. 49), is further amended by striking out in the first sentence the figure "$139,797,000" and inserting in place thereof the figure "$141,797,000".

SEC. 305. (a) Public Law 86–149, as amended, is amended in section 301 under the heading "INSIDE THE UNITED STATES" an subheading "STRATEGIC AIR COMMAND", with respect to Barksdale Air Force Base, Shreveport, Louisiana, by striking out "$110,000" and inserting in place thereof "$169,000".

(b) Public Law 86–149, as amended, is amended by striking out in clause (3) of section 402 the amounts of "$299,576,800" and "$850,175,800" and inserting in place thereof "$299,635,800" and "$850,234,800", respectively.

SEC. 306. (a) Public Law 86–500 is amended in section 301 under the heading "INSIDE THE UNITED STATES" and subheading "AIR RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT COMMAND", with respect to Arnold Engineering Development Center, Tullahoma, Tennessee, by striking out "$10,500,000" and inserting in place thereof "$11,800,000".

(b) Public Law 86–500 is amended by striking out in clause (3) of section 502 the amounts of "$204,735,000" and "$727,305,000" and inserting in place thereof "$206,035,000" and "$728,605,000", respectively.

TITLE IV

SEC. 401. In addition to the family housing units authorized by titles I, II, and III of this Act, the Secretaries of the Army, Navy, and Air Force are authorized to construct not more than 500 family housing units with necessary utilities at locations and in numbers specified by the Secretary of Defense, or his designee.

SEC. 402. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated not to exceed $8,250,000 to carry out the purposes of this title.

TITLE V—GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 501. The Secretary of each military department may proceed to establish or develop installations and facilities under this Act without regard to sections 3648 and 3734 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U.S.C. 529; 40 U.S.C. 259, 267), and sections 4774(d) and 9774(d) of title 10, United States Code. The authority to place permanent or temporary improvements on land includes authority for surveys, administration, overhead, planning, and supervision incident to construction. That authority may be exercised before title to the land is approved under section 355 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (40 U.S.C. 255), and even though the land is held temporarily. The authority to acquire real estate or land includes authority to make surveys and to acquire land, and interests in land (including temporary use), by gift, purchase, exchange of Government-owned land, or otherwise.

SEC. 502. There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary for the purposes of this Act, but appropriations for public works projects authorized by titles I, II, III, and IV shall not exceed—

(1) for title I: Inside the United States, $71,301,000; outside the United States $37,243,000; section 102, $6,245,000; section 103, $15,000,000; or a total of $129,789,000.

(2) for title II: Inside the United States, $76,482,000; outside the United States, $8,136,000; section 202, $40,969,000; section 203, $15,000,000; or a total of $140,587,000.

(3) for title III: Inside the United States, $153,171,000; outside the United States, $32,797,000; section 302, $285,300,000; section 303, $15,000,000; or a total of $486,268,000.

(4) for title IV: $8,250,000.

SEC. 503. Any of the amounts named in titles I, II, and III of this Act, may, in the discretion of the Secretary concerned, be increased by 5 per centum for projects inside the United States (other than Alaska) and by 10 per centum for projects outside the United States or in Alaska, if he determines in the case of any particular project that such increase (1) is required for the sole purpose of meeting unusual variations in cost arising in connection with that project, and (2) could not have been reasonably anticipated at the time such project was submitted to the Congress. However, the total costs of all projects in each such title may not be more than the total amount authorized to be appropriated for projects in that title.

SEC. 504. Whenever—

(1) the President determines that compliance with section 2313(b) of title 10, United States Code, for contracts made under this Act for the establishment or development of military installations and facilities in foreign countries would interfere with the carrying out of this Act; and

(2) the Secretary of Defense and the Comptroller General have agreed upon alternative methods of adequately auditing those contracts;

the President may exempt those contracts from the requirements of that section.

SEC. 505. Contracts for construction made by the United States for performance within the United States and its possessions, under this Act shall be executed under the jurisdiction and supervision of the Corps of Engineers, Department of the Army, or the Bureau of Yards and Docks, Department of the Navy, unless the Secretary of Defense determines that because such jurisdiction and supervision is wholly impracticable such contracts should be executed under the jurisdiction and supervision of another department or Government agency, and shall be awarded, insofar as practicable, on a competitive basis to the lowest responsible bidder, if the national security will not be impaired and the award is consistent with chapter 137 of title 10, United States Code. The Secretaries of the military departments shall report semiannually to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives with respect to all contracts awarded on other than a competitive basis to the lowest responsible bidder.

SEC. 506. As of July 1, 1962, all authorizations for military public works to be accomplished by the Secretary of a military department in connection with the establishment or development of military installations and facilities, and all authorizations for appropriations therefor, that are contained in Acts approved before August 11, 1959, and not superseded or otherwise modified by a later authorization are repealed, except—

(1) authorizations for public works and for appropriations therefor that are set forth in those Acts in the titles that contain the general provisions;

(2) the authorization for public works projects as to which appropriated funds have been obligated for construction contracts or land acquisitions in whole or in part before July 1, 1962, and authorizations for appropriations therefor;

(3) the authorization for the rental guarantee for family housing in the amount of $100,000,000 that is contained in section 302 of the Act of July 14, 1952 (66 Stat. 606, 622);

(4) notwithstanding the provisions of section 506 of the Act of June 8, 1960 (74 Stat. 166, 184), the authorization for—

(a) administrative facilities in the amount of $5,666,000 at Detroit Arsenal, Michigan, that is contained in title I, section 101, under the heading "INSIDE THE UNITED STATES" and subheading "TECHNICAL SERVICES FACILITIES (Ordnance Corps)" of the Act of August 20, 1958 (72 Stat. 636);

(b) troop housing and utilities in the amount of $3,749,000 at Fort Dix, New Jersey, that is contained in title I, section 101, under the heading "INSIDE THE UNITED STATES" and subheading "FIELD FORCES FACILITIES (First Army Area)" of the Act of August 20, 1958 (72 Stat. 636, 637);

(c) troop housing in the amount of $584,000 at For Benning, Georgia, that is contained in title I, section 101, under the heading "INSIDE THE UNITED STATES" and subheading "FIELD FORCES FACILITIES (Third Army Area)" of the Act of August 20, 1958 (72 Stat. 636, 637);

(d) administrative facilities and troop housing in the amount of $2,839,000 at Fort Hood, Texas, that is contained in title I, section 101, under the heading "INSIDE THE UNITED STATES" and subheading "FIELD FORCES FACILITIES (Fourth Army Area)" of the Act of August 20, 1958 (72 Stat. 636, 637);

(e) troop housing in the amount of $713,000 at Fort Leavenworth, Kansas, that is contained in title I, section 101, under the heading "INSIDE THE UNITED STATES" and subheading "FIELD FORCES FACILITIES (Fifth Army Area)" of the Act of August 20, 1958 (72 Stat. 636, 637);

(f) medical facilities in the amount of $4,136,000 for Selfridge Air Force Base, Mount Clemens, Michigan, under the heading "CONTINENTAL UNITED STATES" and the subheading "AIR DEFENSE COMMAND" that is contained in title III, section 301, of the Act of July 15, 1955 (69 Stat. 324, 338), as amended;

(g) operational facilities, and real estate in the amount of $4,352,000 for Marine Corps Auxiliary Air Station, Beaufort, South Carolina, under the heading "INSIDE THE UNITED STATES" and subheading "AVIATION FACILITIES (MARINE CORPS AIR STATION)" of the Act of August 30, 1958 (72 Stat. 643).

SEC. 507. Section 515 of the Act of July 15, 1955 (69 Stat. 324, 352), as amended, is further amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 515. During fiscal years 1959 through and including 1964, the Secretaries of the Army, Navy, and Air Force, respectively, are authorized to lease housing facilities at or near tactical military installations for assignment as public quarters to military personnel and their dependents, if any, without rental charge upon a determination by the Secretary of Defense, or his designee, that there is a lack of adequate housing facilities at or near such military installations. Such housing facilities shall be leased on a family or individual unit basis and not more than seven thousand five hundred of such units may be so leased at any one time. Expenditures for the rental of such housing facilities may be made out of appropriations available for maintenance and operation but may not exceed $150 a month for any such unit."

SEC. 508. No family housing unit may be rehabilitated at a cost in excess of that established by section 109 of Public Law 86-630 as a limitation on the cost of construction of family housing units, except where the Secretary of Defense, or his designee, has notified the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives prior to such rehabilitation: *Provided*, That no family housing unit may be rehabilitated at a cost in excess of $20,000.

SEC. 509. Section 407 of the Act of August 30, 1957 (71 Stat. 531, 556), as amended, is amended (1) by striking out the words "July 1, 1961" in subsection (e) and inserting "July 1, 1962" in lieu thereof; and (2) by striking out the words "July 1, 1962" from subsection (g) and inserting "July 1, 1965" in lieu thereof.

SEC. 510. Section 409 of the Act of August 3, 1956 (70 Stat. 991, 1016), is repealed.

SEC. 511. None of the authority contained in title I, II, and III of this Act shall be deemed to authorize any building construction project inside the United States (other than Alaska) at a unit cost in excess of—

(1) $32 per square foot for cold-storage warehousing;

(2) $8 per square foot for regular warehousing;

(3) $1,850 per man for permanent barracks;

(4) $8,500 per man for bachelor officer quarters; unless the Secretary of Defense determines that, because of special circumstances, application to such project of the limitations on unit costs contained in this section is impracticable.

SEC. 512. Titles I, II, III, IV, and V of this Act may be cited as the "Military Construction Act of 1961."

TITLE VI—RESERVE FORCES FACILITIES

SEC. 601. Subject to chapter 133 of title 10, United States Code, the Secretary of Defense may establish or develop the following facilities for Reserve Forces:

(1) For Department of the Army:

ARMY NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES (ARMORY)

Aberdeen, South Dakota: Training facilities, $158,000.

Altavista, Virginia: Training facilities, $134,000.

Altus, Oklahoma: Training facilities, $152,000.

Anacortes, Washington: Training facilities, $150,000.

Atchison, Kansas: Training facilities, $93,000.

Austin, Minnesota: Training facilities, $210,000.

Baltimore, Maryland: Training facilities, $300,000.

Baraboo, Wisconsin: Training facilities, $171,000.

Batavia, New York: Training facilities, $234,000.

Baxley, Georgia: Training facilities, $90,000.

Bay Springs, Mississippi: Training facilities, $72,000.

Beaufort, South Carolina: Training facilities, $96,000.

Beaver, Utah: Training facilities, $111,000.

Bedford, Indiana: Training facilities conversion, $52,000.

Bluefield, West Virginia: Training facilities, $225,000.

Bonham, Texas: Training facilities, $87,000.

Boone, Iowa: Training facilities, $225,000.

Boston (West Roxbury), Massachusetts: Training facilities, $249,000.

Brantley, Alabama: Training facilities, $72,000.

Bridgeport, Alabama: Training facilities, $72,000.

Brooklyn, New York: Training facilities conversion, $50,000.

Caldwell, Idaho: Training facilities, $125,000.

Campbellsville, Kentucky: Training facilities, $124,000.

Chadron, Nebraska: Training facilities, $43,250.

Charleston, South Carolina: Training facilities, $128,000.

Charleston, South Carolina: Training facilities, $96,000.

Clackamas, Oregon: Training facilities expansion, $150,000.

Columbia, South Carolina: Training facilities, $400,000.

Columbus, Ohio: Training facilities, $540,000.

Dallas (number 2), Texas: Training facilities, $74,000.

Decatur, Mississippi: Training facilities, $72,000.

Deer Lodge, Montana: Training facilities, $69,000.

Dermott, Arkansas: Training facilities, $45,000.

Devils Lake, North Dakota: Training facilities, $135,000.

East Providence, Rhode Island: Training facilities, $266,000.

Eau Claire, Wisconsin: Training facilities, $240,000.

Edgeley, North Dakota: Training facilities, $150,000.

Elizabethtown, North Carolina: Training facilities, $105,000.

Enfield-Thompsonville, Connecticut: Training facilities, $169,000.

Fairmont, West Virginia: Training facilities, $210,000.

Fallon, Nevada: Training facilities, $101,000.

Fort Atkinson, Wisconsin: Training facilities, $171,000.

Geneseo, New York: Training facilities, $233,000.

Glasgow, Kentucky: Training facilities, $136,000.

Glasgow, Montana: Training facilities, $69,000.

Glennville, Georgia: Training facilities, $90,000.

Great Bend, Kansas: Training facilities, $93,000.

Green Bay, Wisconsin: Training facilities, $205,000.

Hamlet, North Carolina: Training facilities, $99,000.

Hinesville, Georgia: Training facilities, $90,000.

Holly Springs, Mississippi: Training facilities, $81,000.

Honolulu, Hawaii: Training facilities, $282,000.

Hopkinsville, Kentucky: Training facilities, $134,000.

Huntington, West Virginia: Training facilities, $250,000.

Jesup, Georgia: Training facilities, $90,000.

Kerens, Texas: Training facilities, $74,000.

Kingwood, West Virginia: Training facilities, $170,000.

Lake Village, Arkansas: Training facilities, $54,000.

Lincoln, Arkansas: Training facilities, $45,000.

Lock Haven, Pennsylvania: Training facilities expansion and rehabilitation, $156,000.

Marion, Kentucky: Training facilities, $124,000.

Mexia, Texas: Training facilities, $74,000.

Monroe, Louisiana: Training facilities, $191,000.

Monticello, Indiana: Training facilities, $152,000.

Monticello, Kentucky: Training facilities, $124,000.

Morehead City, North Carolina: Training facilities, $101,250.

Morgantown, West Virginia: Training facilities, $198,000.

Moultrie, Georgia: Training facilities, $90,000.

Mount Holly, New Jersey: Training facilities, $169,000.

Myrtle Beach, South Carolina: Training facilities, $87,000.

Newark, New Jersey: Training facilities rehabilitation, $234,000.

Newton, Mississippi: Training facilities, $81,000.

Newport, Vermont: Training facilities, $136,000.

Nogales, Arizona: Training facilities, $83,000.

North Vernon, Indiana: Training facilities, $152,000.

Oak Ridge, Tennessee: Training facilities, $117,000.

O'Neil, Nebraska: Training facilities, $43,250.

Palmetto, Florida: Training facilities, $120,000.

Panama City, Florida: Training facilities, $120,000.

Parsons, Tennessee: Training facilities, $102,000.

Philadelphia, Mississippi: Training facilities, $81,000.

Phillipsburg, Kansas: Training facilities, $92,000.

Phoenixville, Pennsylvania: Training facilities expansion and rehabilitation, $125,000.

Portage, Wisconsin: Training facilities, $150,000.

Port Gibson, Mississippi: Training facilities, $81,000.

Pueblo, Colorado: Training facilities, $135,000.

Punxsutawney, Pennsylvania: Training facilities expansion and rehabilitation, $102,000.

Raleigh, North Carolina: Training facilities, $431,000.

Raleigh-Durham Airport, North Carolina: Training facilities, $158,000.

Richmond, Virginia: Training facilities, $700,000.

Roseville, California: Training facilities, $150,000.

Rupert, Idaho: Training facilities, $75,000.

Saint Albans, West Virginia: Training facilities, $190,000.

Saint George, South Carolina: Training facilities, $99,000.

Saint Louis or Saint Louis County, Missouri: Training facilities, $122,000.

Seguin, Texas: Training facilities, $74,000.

Sparta, Georgia: Training facilities, $90,000.

Spartanburg, South Carolina: Training facilities, $186,000.

Spindale-Forest City, North Carolina: Training facilities, $113,000.

Starkville, Mississippi: Training facilities, $120,000.

Stockton, California: Training facilities, $254,000.

Tamaqua, Pennsylvania: Training facilities, $210,000.

Tifton, Georgia: Training facilities, $90,000.

Truth or Consequences, New Mexico: Training facilities, $67,000.

Turlock, California: Training facilities, $115,000.

Van Nuys, California: Training facilities, $202,000.

Wagner, South Dakota: Training facilities, $165,000.

Warrenton, Missouri: Training facilities, $150,000.

Waterville, Maine: Training facilities, $257,000.

Wayne, Nebraska: Training facilities, $116,000.

West Orange, New Jersey: Training facilities rehabilitation, $243,000.

Wheatland, Wyoming: Training facilities, $109,000.

Winston-Salem, North Carolina: Training facilities, $135,000.

Woonsocket, South Dakota: Training facilities, $128,000.

Worcester, Massachusetts: Training facilities, $328,000.

Various locations: Training facilities, minor conversions and additions, $150,000.

ARMY NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES (NON-ARMORY)

Camp Blanding, Florida: Supply facilities, $177,000.

Camp Grafton, North Dakota: Troop housing, $263,000.

Camp Grayling, Michigan: Troop housing, $900,000.

Camp Ripley, Minnesota: Troop housing, $300,000.

Camp Roberts, California: Maintenance facilities, $52,000.

Camp Shelby, Mississippi: Troop housing, $800,000.

Fort Stewart, Georgia: Troop housing, $800,000.

Fort William H. Harrison, Montana: Troop housing, $258,000.

Montgomery, Alabama: Maintenance facilities, administrative facilities and supply facilities, $582,000.

Point Pleasant, West Virginia: Maintenance facilities, $340,000.

Santa Fe, New Mexico: Maintenance facilities, administrative facilities and supply facilities, $546,000.

Various locations: Minor projects, $110,000.

ARMY RESERVE

Brownsville, Pennsylvania: Training facilities, $190,000.

Burlington, Vermont: Acquisition and rehabilitation of training facilities, $79,000.

Butte, Montana: Training facilities, $185,000.

Chicago (number 4), Illinois: Training facilities, $778,000.

Cincinnati (number 2), Ohio: Training facilities, $601,000.

Durham, North Carolina: Training facilities addition, $58,000.

Erie, Pennsylvania: Training facilities, $323,000.

Fall River, Massachusetts: Training facilities, $386,000.

Fargo, North Dakota: Training facilities, $393,000.

Fort Lauderdale, Florida: Training facilities, $321,000.

Gulfport, Mississippi: Training facilities, $321,000.

Huntington, West Virginia: Training facilities addition, $64,000.

Jamaica, Long Island, New York: Training facilities expansion, $237,000.

Johnson City, Tennessee: Training facilities, $465,000.

Kalamazoo, Michigan: Training facilities, $389,000.

Kansas City, Kansas: Training facilities, $572,000.

Lafayette, Louisiana: Training facilities expansion, $202,000.

Little Rock (Adams Field), Arkansas: Training facilities addition, $48,000.

Lynchburg, Virginia: Training facilities, $218,000.

Martinsburg, West Virginia: Training facilities, $181,000.

McAllen, Texas: Training facilities expansion, $197,000.

Morgantown, West Virginia: Training facilities, $181,000.

New Martinsville, West Virginia: Training facilities, $181,000.

Ontario-LaVerne-Rialto Area, California: Training facilities, $372,000.

Paris, Texas: Training facilities, $166,000.

Phoenix, Arizona: Training facilities, $572,000.

Pleasant Grove, Utah: Training facilities, $181,000.

South Charleston, West Virginia: Training facilities addition, $64,000.

Springfield, Massachusetts: Training facilities, expansion, $111,000.

Terminal, Texas: Training facilities, $273,000.

Terre Haute, Indiana: Training facilities addition, $67,000.

Waycross, Georgia: Training facilities, $163,000.

Yakima, Washington: Training facilities, $236,000.

Yauco, Puerto Rico: Training facilities, $226,000.

Various locations: Training facilities, minor additions, and rehabilitation, $3,038,000.

Land acquisition: Training facilities, $466,000.

(2) For Department of the Navy:

NAVAL RESERVE (AVIATION)

Naval Air Station, Dallas, Texas: Operational facilities and maintenance facilities, $1,285,000.

Naval Air Station, Glenview, Illinois: Maintenance facilities, $54,000.

Naval Air Station, Grosse Ile, Michigan: Operational facilities, $575,000.

Naval Air Station, Los Alamitos, California: Operational facilities, $347,000.

Naval Air Station, New York, New York: Operational facilities and maintenance facilities, $200,000.

Naval Air Station, Olathe, Kansas: Utilities, $100,000.

Naval Air Station, South Weymouth, Massachusetts: Operational facilities and maintenance facilities, $392,000.

Naval Air Station, Willow Grove, Pennsylvania: Operational facilities, troop housing, and maintenance facilities, $841,000.

NAVAL RESERVE (SURFACE)

Naval Reserve Electronics Facility, Belleville, Texas: Acquisition and rehabilitation of training facilities, $47,000.

Naval Reserve Training Center, Brooklyn, New York: Training facilities rehabilitation, $50,000.

Naval Reserve Training Center, Erie, Pennsylvania: Training facilities, $622,000.

Naval Reserve Electronics Facility, Galesburg, Illinois: Training facilities, $62,000.

Naval Reserve Electronics Facility, Midland-Odessa, Texas: Training facilities, $55,000.

Naval and Marine Corps Reserve Training Center, Mobile, Alabama: Training facilities, $550,000.

Naval and Marine Corps Reserve Training Center, Omaha, Nebraska: Training facilities, $648,000.

Naval Reserve Training Center, Sioux Falls, South Dakota: Training facilities, $364,000.

Naval Reserve Training Center, Vallejo, California: Training facilities rehabilitation, $151,000.

Naval Reserve Master Control Radio Station and Electronics Facility, Waukegan, Illinois: Operational and training facilities, $96,000.

Naval Reserve Training Center, Whitestone, New York: Training facilities addition, $91,000.

MARINE CORPS RESERVE (GROUND)

Marine Corps Reserve Training Center, Midland-Odessa, Texas: Training facilities and land acquisition, $373,000.

Naval and Marine Corps Reserve Training Center, Mobile, Alabama: Training facilities, $207,000.

Naval and Marine Corps Reserve Training Center, Omaha, Nebraska: Training facilities, $237,000.

Marine Corps Reserve Training Center, San Bruno, California: Training facilities rehabilitation, $107,000.

Marine Corps Reserve Training Center, Tallahassee, Florida: Training facilities addition, $200,000.

Marine Corps Reserve Training Center, Waukegan, Illinois: Training facilities, $140,000.

(3) For Department of the Air Force:

AIR NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES

Baer Field, Fort Wayne, Indiana: Operational facilities, $588,000.

Berry Field, Nashville, Tennessee: Maintenance facilities, $300,000.

Congaree Air Base, Columbia, South Carolina: Operational, training and maintenance facilities, $1,830,000.

Des Moines Municipal Airport, Des Moines, Iowa: Operational facilities, $770,000.

Foss Field, Sioux Falls, South Dakota: Operational facilities rehabilitation, $516,000.

Fresno Airport, Fresno, California: Operational facilities, $794,000.

General Mitchell Field, Milwaukee, Wisconsin: Operational facilities and maintenance facilities, $923,000.

Grenier Field, Manchester Municipal Airport, Manchester, New Hampshire: Operational facilities, $400,000.

Hector Field, Fargo, North Dakota: Operational facilities, $372,000.

Hickam Air Force Base, Honolulu, Hawaii: Supply facilities, $252,000.

Hubbard Field, Reno, Nevada: Operational facilities, $287,000.

Hulman Field, Terre Haute, Indiana: Operational facilities, $888,000.

Imeson Municipal Airport, Jacksonville, Florida: Operational facilities, $1,027,000.

Kulis Air National Guard Base, Anchorage, Alaska: Operational, training and maintenance facilities, $678,000.

Naval Air Station, Dallas, Texas: Utilities, $200,000.

Naval Air Station, Willow Grove, Pennsylvania: Operational and training facilities, maintenance facilities, supply facilities and utilities, $1,965,000.

New Castle County Airport, New Castle, Delaware: Maintenance facilities, $300,000.

O'Hare International Airport, Chicago, Illinois: Operational facilities and supply facilities, $774,000.

Olmsted Air Force Base, Middletown, Pennsylvania: Maintenance facilities, $300,000.

Ontario International Airport, Ontario, California: Operational facilities, $1,426,000.

Rosecrans Field, Saint Joseph, Missouri: Operational facilities rehabilitation, $360,000.

Salt Lake Municipal Airport, Salt Lake City, Utah: Maintenance facilities, $300,000.

Schenectady County Airport, Schenectady, New York: Operational facilities, $620,000.

Toledo Express Airport, Toledo, Ohio: Operational facilities, $654,000.

Travis Field, Savannah, Georgia: Operational facilities, $526,000.

Truax Field, Madison, Wisconsin: Operational facilities, rehabilitation, $300,000.

Tulsa Municipal Airport, Tulsa, Oklahoma: Operational facilities, $360,000.

Volk Field, Camp Williams, Wisconsin: Operational facilities, $536,000.

Will Rogers Field, Oklahoma City, Oklahoma: Operational facilities, $360,000.

AIR FORCE RESERVE

Andrews Air Force Base, Camp Springs, Maryland: Supply facilities, $138,000.

Barksdale Air Force Base, Shreveport, Louisiana: Supply facilities, $185,000.

Carswell Air Force Base, Fort Worth, Texas: Operational and training facilities and supply facilities, $619,000.

Davis Field, Muskogee, Oklahoma: Operational facilities, $992,000.

Ellington Air Force Base, Houston, Texas: Operational facilities, $908,000.

Homestead Air Force Base, Homestead, Florida: Maintenance facilities, $350,000.

March Air Force Base, Riverside, California: Maintenance facilities, $350,000.

Paine Air Force Base, Everett, Washington: Operational facilities, $608,000.

Portland International Airport, Portland, Oregon: Operational facilities, $715,000.

(4) For all reserve components: Facilities made necessary by changes in the assignment of weapons or equipment to reserve forces units, if the Secretary of Defense or his designee determines that deferral of such facilities for inclusion in the next law authorizing appropriations for specific facilities for reserve forces would be inconsistent with the interests of national security and if the Secretary of Defense or his designee notifies the Senate and the House of Representatives immediately upon reaching a final decision to implement, of the nature and estimated cost of any facility to be undertaken under this subsection.

SEC. 602. (a) Public Law 85-685, as amended, is amended under the heading "ARMY NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES (NONARMORY)" in clause (3) of section 601 with respect to Camp Butner, North Carolina, by striking out "Camp Butner" and inserting in place thereof "Camp Butner or Raleigh".

(b) Public Law 86-149, as amended, is amended under the heading "ARMY RESERVE" in clause (1) of section 501 with respect to Chicago Heights, Illinois, by striking out "Chicago Heights" and inserting in place thereof "Harvey", and by striking out "$302,000" and inserting in place thereof "$375,000".

(c) Public Law 86-149, as amended, is amended in clause (2) of section 501 as follows:

(1) Under the heading "NAVAL RESERVE (AVIATION)", with respect to Naval Air Station, South Weymouth, Massachusetts, strike out "$76,000" and insert in place thereof "$170,000".

(2) Under the heading "NAVAL RESERVE (SURFACE)" with respect to Naval Reserve Training Center, Galveston, Texas, strike out "$204,000" and insert in place thereof "$262,000".

(d) Public Law 86-149, as amended, is amended under the heading "AIR FORCE RESERVE" in clause (3) of section 501 with respect to General Mitchell Field, Milwaukee, Wisconsin, by striking out "$43,000" and inserting in place thereof "$72,000".

(e) Public Law 86-149, as amended, is amended by striking out in clause (1)(a) of section 504 "$21,457,000" and inserting in place thereof "$21,530,000", by striking out in clause (2) of section 504 "$8,300,000" an inserting in place thereof "$8,452,000", and by striking out in clause (3)(a) of section 504 "$4,093,000" and inserting in place thereof "$4,122,000".

(f) Public Law 86-500 is amended under the heading "ARMY NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES (ARMORY)" in clause 1 of section 601 as follows:

(1) With respect to Clear Lake, South Dakota, strike out "$63,000" and insert in place thereof "$72,000".

(2) With respect to Riverdale, New Jersey, strike out "$171,000" and insert in place thereof "$190,000".

(3) Strike out the following:

"Carmichael, California: Training facilities, $115,000".

"Spartanburg, South Carolina: Training facilities, $134,000".

(g) Public Law 86-500 is amended under the heading "ARMY RESERVE" in clause (1) of section 601 with respect to Pittsburg, California, by striking out "Pittsburg" and inserting in place thereof "Concord".

(h) Public Law 86-500 is amended under the heading "AIR NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES" in clause (3) of section 601 with respect to Foss Field, Sioux Falls, South Dakota, by striking out "$675,000" and inserting in place thereof "$1,038,000".

(i) Public Law 86-500 is amended by striking out in clause 1(a) of section 604 "$18,226,000" and inserting in place thereof "$18,005,000", and by striking out in clause (3)(a) of section 604 "$13,797,000" and inserting in place thereof "$14,160,000".

SEC. 603. The Secretary of Defense may establish or develop installations and facilities under this title without regard to sections 3648 and 3734 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, and sections 4774(d) and 9774(d) of title 10, United States Code. The authority to place permanent or temporary improvements on land includes authority for surveys, administration, overhead, planning, and supervision incident to construction. That authority may be exercised before title to the land is approved under section 355 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, and even though the land is held temporarily. The authority to acquire real estate or land includes authority to make surveys and to acquire land, and interests in land (including temporary use), by gift, purchase, exchange of Government-owned land, or otherwise.

SEC. 604. Appropriations for facilities projects authorized by section 601 for the respective reserve components of the armed forces may not exceed—

(1) for the Department of the Army:

(a) Army National Guard of the United States, $22,386,750.

(b) Army Reserve, $12,505,000.

(2) for Department of the Navy: Naval and Marine Corps Reserves, $7,794,000.

(3) for Department of the Air Force:

(a) Air National Guard of the United States, $18,606,000.

(b) Air Force Reserve, $4,865,000.

SEC. 605. Any of the amounts named in section 601 of this Act may, in the discretion of the Secretary of Defense, be increased by 15 per centum, but the total cost of all projects authorized for the Army National Guard of the United States, the Army Reserve, the Naval and Marine Corps Reserves, the Air National Guard of the United States, and the Air Force Reserve, may not exceed the amounts named in clauses (1)(a), (1)(b), (2), (3)(a) and (3)(b) of section 604 respectively.

SEC. 606. As of July 1, 1962, all authorizations for specific facilities for reserve forces to be accomplished by the Secretary of Defense, and all authorizations for appropriations therefor, that are contained in the Reserve Forces Facilities Act of 1959, and not superseded or otherwise modified by a later authorization, are repealed, except the authorizations for facilities for the reserve forces as to which appropriated funds have been obligated in whole or in part before July 1, 1962, and authorizations for appropriations therefor.

SEC. 607. This title may be cited as the "Reserve Forces Facilities Act of 1961".

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I should like to query the distinguished majority leader about the program for the remainder of the afternoon and also for tomorrow.

Mr. MANSFIELD. In response to the question raised by the distinguished leader, the unfinished business is a bill to authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes.

When the Senate has completed consideration of that bill, it is the intention of the leadership to proceed to consider Calendar No. 172, S. 1215, a bill to amend the Mutual Defense Assistance Control Act of 1951, the so-called Battle Act.

Following consideration of S. 1215, the Senate will consider H.R. 6518, a bill making appropriations for the inter-American social and economic cooperation program, and the Chilean reconstruction and rehabilitation program for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, and for other purposes.

It is hoped that the Senate can finish the military construction authorization bill this afternoon and at least proceed to consider S. 1215, the so-called Battle Act proposed amendment, and make that the pending business for tomorrow.

At the conclusion of the consideration by the Senate of the proposed Battle Act legislation, it is the intention to call up the proposed $600 million appropriation for Latin America, $100 million of which is for Chilean earthquake relief.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the distinguished majority leader yield further?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I wonder if the majority leader has in mind at least some tentative program for later in the week.

Mr. MANSFIELD. If the Senate concludes consideration of all the measures referred to, it is the intention to go over

from Tuesday until Thursday. If that program is followed, on Thursday the Senate will consider proposed legislation from the Committee on Commerce and whatever nominations may be before the Senate, and then, tentatively, it is expected that the Senate will go over from then until Monday.

It is the hope of the leadership to bring up the aid-to-education bill next Tuesday or thereabouts and shortly thereafter follow that measure with the housing bill.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I thank the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. RUSSELL obtained the floor.

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

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield to the Senator from North Carolina.

STUDY OF WIRETAPPING BY THE SENATE JUDICIARY SUBCOMMITTEE ON CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD as a part of my remarks a statement and memorandum concerning the activities and studies of the Senate Judiciary Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights relating to wiretapping.

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR ERVIN

As chairman of the Senate Judiciary Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights, I wish to announce forthcoming hearings on the subject of wiretapping and eavesdropping. The hearings are scheduled for 10:00 a.m. on May 9 and 10, in room 357 of the Senate Office Building, and May 11 and 12 in room 2228 of the New Senate Office Building.

The Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights is continuing its long-term study of wiretapping and eavesdropping and how these practices and similar invasions of privacy affect our constitutional rights.

In the course of its investigation, begun in 1958 and continued in 1959, the subcommittee received the views of technical experts, law professors, a private investigator, and several law enforcement officers, including the attorney general of Pennsylvania and the present attorney general of Missouri.

In addition to the public hearings held, appendix materials have examined the constitutional issues, judicial interpretations, and statutory provisions dealing with wiretapping and eavesdropping. State legislative commission reports, law review articles, and foreign law also comprise the six-volume study.

To complete this record, the subcommittee now plans to hold additional hearings on May 9, 10, 11, and 12 to examine three pending bills, S. 1086, S. 1221, and S. 1495. The subcommittee will seek to ascertain to what extent additional Federal legislation on these subjects may be desirable or practical in keeping with the rights of the individual as guaranteed by the Constitution.

S. 1086 and S. 1221 were introduced by my distinguished colleague, the junior Senator from New York, KENNETH B. KEATING, member of the subcommittee. S. 1086 would permit State law enforcement officials to wiretap under court orders if State legislation authorizes it. S. 1221 deals with wiretapping and other eavesdropping devices.

S. 1495 introduced by my distinguished colleague, the junior Senator from Connecticut, THOMAS J. DODD, would permit wiretapping by both State and Federal officers under court orders in certain cases.

During the 4 days of hearings, approximately 25 witnesses are scheduled to appear, among them the Attorney General of the United States, representatives of law enforcement agencies, a representative of the American Telephone & Telegraph Co., members of the legal profession, and other witnesses from interested organizations.

The problems posed by wiretapping have been examined by the U.S. Supreme Court on several occasions over the last 30 years. In 1928, the Supreme Court by a narrow margin of 5 to 4 in *Olmstead* v. *United States* (277 U.S. 438 (1928)) held that introduction of wiretapping evidence against the defendant, a bootlegger, neither violated his rights against unlawful search and seizure under the fourth amendment nor his rights against self-incrimination under the fifth amendment. Chief Justice Taft, speaking for the majority, said:

"The fourth amendment itself shows that the search is to be of material things—the person, the house, his papers, or his effects. The description of the warrant necessary to make the proceeding lawful, is that it must specify the place to be searched and the person or things to be seized.

"Neither the cases we have cited nor any of the many Federal decisions brought to our attention hold the fourth amendment to have been violated as against a defendant unless there has been an official search and seizure of his person, or such a seizure of his papers or his tangible material effects, or an actual physical invasion of his house 'or curtilage' for the purpose of making a seizure.

"We think, therefore, that the wiretapping here disclosed did not amount to a search or seizure within the meaning of the fourth amendment."

Three of the dissenters, Justices Brandeis, Butler, and Stone, urged that wiretapping was a violation of the fourth amendment. The other dissenter, Justice Holmes, saw another objection to the use of evidence:

"Therefore we must consider the two objects of desire, both of which we cannot have, and make up our minds which to choose. It is desirable that criminals should be detected, and to that end that all available evidence should be used. It also is desirable that the Government should not itself foster and pay for other crimes, when they are the means by which the evidence is to be obtained * * *. We have to choose, and for my part I think it is a less evil that some criminals should escape than that the Government should play an ignoble part."

In 1934, 6 years after the Olmstead case, Congress enacted the Federal Communications Act. The pertinent portion, regarding "unauthorized publication or use of communications," is section 605, which provides in part:

"No person not being authorized by the sender shall intercept any communication and divulge or publish the existence, contents, substance, purport, effect, or meaning of such intercepted communication to any person."

Section 605 had its first test before the Supreme Court in *Nardone* v. *United States* (302 U.S. 379 (1937)). The question raised was whether evidence procured by a Federal officer's tapping the telephone wires and intercepting messages was admissible in a criminal trial in a U.S. district court. The lower court had admitted the evidence and affirmed the judgment of the conviction.

Mr. Justice Roberts delivered the opinion of the Court:

"Taken at face value, the phrase 'no person' comprehends Federal agents, and the ban on communication to 'any person' bars testimony to the content of an intercepted message. Such an application of the section is supported by comparison of the clause concerning intercepted messages with that relating to those known to employees of the carrier. The former may not be divulged to any person, the latter may be divulged in answer to a lawful subpena.

"The Government contends that Congress did not intend to prohibit tapping wires to procure evidence.

"We nevertheless face the fact that the plain words of section 605 forbid anyone, unless authorized by the sender, to intercept a telephone message, and direct in equally clear language that 'no person' shall divulge or publish the message or its substance to 'any person.' To recite the contents of the message in testimony before a court is to divulge the message. The conclusion that the act forbids such testimony seems to us unshaken by the Government's arguments."

The judgment of the lower court was reversed and the cause remanded to the district court for further proceedings.

After the court had nullified Nardone's first conviction, the defendant was retried and again convicted of the same offense. At the second trial, the defense was denied the right to question prosecution witnesses about the use the police had made of the tapped conversations.

Justice Frankfurter delivered the opinion of the Court in the second *Nardone et al.* v. *United States* (308 U.S. 338 (1939)). He stated:

"The issue thus tendered by the circuit court of appeals is the broad one, whether or no section 605 merely interdicts the introduction into evidence in a Federal trial of intercepted telephone conversations, leaving the prosecution free to make every other use of the proscribed evidence. Plainly, this presents a far-reaching problem in the administration of Federal criminal justice, and we therefore brought the case here for disposition.

"We are here dealing with specific prohibition of particular methods in obtaining evidence. The result of the holding below is to reduce the scope of section 605 to exclusion of the exact words heard through forbidden interceptions, allowing these interceptions every derivative use that they may serve. Such a reading of section 605 would largely stultify the policy which compelled our decision in *Nardone* v. *United States, supra.* That decision was not the product of a merely meticulous reading to technical language. It was the translation into practicality of broad considerations of morality and public well-being. This Court found that the logically relevant proof which Congress had outlawed, it outlawed because it was 'inconsistent with ethical standards and destructive of personal liberty.'"

Thus, in 1939 the second Nardone decision extended section 605 to cover not only wiretap evidence, but also evidence obtained from intercepted leads; and to intrastate as well as interstate telephone conversations.

Another far-reaching and significant decision of the Supreme Court was decided in *Benanti* v. *United States* (355 U.S. 96 (1957)). The question presented by the petitioner was whether wiretapping evidence obtained by State law enforcement officers, without participation by Federal authorities, was admissible in a Federal court.

Chief Justice Warren, delivering the opinion of the Court, stated:

"Petitioner, relying on this Court's supervisory powers over the Federal court system, claims that the admission of the evidence was barred by the Federal Constitution and section 605. We do not reach the constitutional questions as this case can be determined under the statute.

"In *Nardone* v. *United States* (302 U.S. 379, and 308 U.S. 338), this Court held that evidence obtained from wiretapping by Federal agents was inadmissible in Federal court. In *Schwartz* v. *Texas* (344 U.S. 199), the same type of evidence was held admissible in a State court where it had been obtained

by State agents. The case before us, containing elements from these three cases, forces a choice between the different results reached.

"The Nardone decisions laid down the underlying premises upon which is based all subsequent consideration of section 605. The crux of these decisions is that the plain words of the statute created a prohibition against any persons violating the integrity of a system of telephonic communication and that evidence obtained in violation of this prohibition may not be used to secure a Federal conviction. *Nardone* v. *United States* (302 U.S. 379, 382). Moreover, as the second *Nardone* decision asserts, distinctions designed to defeat the plain meaning of the statute will not be countenanced (308 U.S. 338, 340). We hold that the correct application of the above principle dictates that evidence obtained by means forbidden by section 605, whether by State or Federal agents, is inadmissible in Federal courts."

The judgment was reversed and the cause remanded to the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit for further proceedings.

Among the more recent of Supreme Court rulings on this issue was the case of *Pugach* v. *Dollinger* (365 U.S. 458 (1961)), decided February 27, 1961. In this case, a per curiam decision affirmed the judgment of the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit on the authority of *Schwartz* v. *Texas* (344 U.S. 199), and *Stefanelli* v. *Minard* (342 U.S. 117).

In *Schwartz* v. *Texas*, the Supreme Court previously held that evidence of this nature was admissible in the State courts where it had been obtained by State agents, and that its admission was not a ground for reversal of a State court conviction. The rule excluding, in Federal proceedings, evidence obtained and sought to be divulged in violation of section 605 was held to be a rule of evidence only. The Court found that Congress, by forbidding the interception and divulgence of telephone communications, did not intend to impose the Federal exclusionary rule of evidence on the State courts, and that States were free to make and apply their own rules of evidence on this subject matter.

The *Stefanelli* v. *Minard* case, referred to in the Pugach per curiam decision, dealt with a denial by the Federal district court of an injunction against the use in pending State criminal proceedings of the fruits of an unlawful search and seizure by the State police. It was held that the Federal courts should refuse to intervene in State criminal proceedings to suppress the use of evidence even when secured by unlawful search and seizure.

Mr. Justice Frankfurter, writing for the Court, said:

"The consequences of exercising the equitable power here invoked are not the concern of a merely doctrinaire alertness to protect the proper sphere of the States in enforcing their criminal law. If we were to sanction this intervention, we would expose every State criminal prosecution to insupportable disruption. Every question of procedural due process of law—with its farflung and undefined range—would invite a flanking movement against the system of State courts by resort to the Federal forum, with review if need be to this Court, to determine the issue."

Thus, the *Pugach* v. *Dollinger* case, indicates a permissive attitude by the Supreme Court regarding the introduction in State prosecutions of evidence illegally obtained through wiretapping.

Mr. President, the Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights initial hearings on wiretapping and eavesdropping have pointed out a multitude of issues and methods in these fields. The forthcoming hearings, May 9, 10, 11, and 12, will explore further the proposals and problems presented by the pending bills before the subcommittee and seek to determine to what extent Federal legislation may be desirable or practical.

This is a difficult area in which to legislate. I am cognizant of the grave problems facing the national security of our Nation. I am also cognizant of the problems facing prosecution and law enforcement agencies in their efforts to eliminate crime and punish the criminals, particularly the organized criminal syndicate rings. However, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights, I am also concerned with the preservation of individual liberties as guaranteed in the Constitution.

If the Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights ascertains that additional Federal legislation is necessary in this area, I am hopeful Congress will find a middle ground which will adequately balance the rights of the private citizen against the public need.

MEMORANDUM PREPARED BY THE STAFF OF THE SENATE SUBCOMMITTEE ON CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS ON WIRETAPPING-EAVESDROPPING

Subject: Wiretapping and the law today.

I. CONGRESS AND WIRETAPPING

A. Legislation in the 87th Congress

Three bills, S. 1086, S. 1221, and S. 1495, have been introduced in the 87th Congress regarding wiretapping and other electronic devices. These bills have been referred to the Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights of the Senate Judiciary Committee:

S. 1086, introduced by Senator KEATING, of New York, would permit State law enforcement officials to wiretap under court orders if State legislation authorizes it.

S. 1221, introduced by Senator KEATING, of New York, would regulate wiretapping and other eavesdropping devices.

S. 1495, introduced by Senator DODD, of Connecticut, would permit wiretapping by both State and Federal officers under court orders in certain cases.

The following chart was prepared by staff members of the Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights to illustrate the three pending bills:

Comparison of wiretapping and eavesdropping bills, S. 1086, S. 1221, and S. 1495

S. 1221 (by Senator Keating)	S. 1495 (by Senator Dodd)	S. 1086 (by Senator Keating)
Defines: "Eavesdropping": (1) Situation in which a person (not a sender or receiver) willfully and by means of instrument, without consent of sender or receiver overhears or records a telephone or telegraph communication or aids, authorizes, employs, procures, or permits another to do so. (2) When one not present during conversation or discussion overhears or records such conversation or discussion, willfully; by means of instruments; without consent of party to conversation or discussion or aids, authorizes, employs, procures, or permits another to do so. (3) When person not a member of a jury records or listens to deliberations of jury by means of instruments or aids, authorizes, employs, procures, or permits another to do so. "Person": Any individual, partnership, corporation, or association including subscriber to telephone or telegraph service excluding any law enforcement officer acting lawfully in official capacity in investigation, detection, or prosecution of crime. "Instrument": Any device, contrivance, machine, or apparatus, or part thereof, designed or used for acoustical detection, including, but not limited to wiretapping, equipment, microphones, detectaphones, spike mikes, dictaphones, radio transmitters, and recorders.	Defines: "Intercept": Acquisition through use of intercepting device of the contents of wire communication made by another person. "Person": Any individual, including investigative or law enforcement agents of the United States, any Federal agency, or any State, partnership, association, joint-stock company, trust, or corporation. "Intercepting device": Any mechanical, electrical, or electronic device or apparatus other than a telephone or telegraph instrument, an extension telephone, a switchboard, a wire communications line, cable, or system, or other part of the facilities used for the transmission of wire communications. "Wire communication": Any communication made by telephone or telegraph. "Interstate communication": Any communication from 1 State to another, or within District of Columbia or U.S. possession. "Foreign communication": Transmitted between any State or U.S. possession and any foreign country. "Contents": Any information concerning existence contents, substance, purport, or meaning of communication. "Federal agency": Any department, agency, or armed force of United States. "State": Any State of the United States, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, any U.S. possession. "Judge of competent jurisdiction": For court order to intercept— (a) judge of U.S. district courts, or U.S. courts of appeals in re application or order to obtain evidence of, or to prevent commission of any offense in violation of any statute of United States. (b) judge of any State court, authorized by State statute to enter orders granting such leave in re application or order to obtain evidence of, or to prevent commission of any offense in violation of State law.	No definitions; State law applies.

Comparison of wiretapping and eavesdropping bills, S. 1086, S. 1221, and S. 1495—Continued

S. 1221 (by Senator Keating)	S. 1495 (by Senator Dodd)	S. 1086 (by Senator Keating)
Prohibits eavesdropping by a person: 1. In the District of Columbia, any U.S. territory or possession. 2. For purpose of aiding, abetting, perpetrating a Federal offense. 3. Where conversation, discussion, communication overheard is by wire or radio. 4. For purpose of obtaining information re activity under Federal regulation. 5. Where information overheard or recorded is to be transmitted in interstate commerce or outside United States. 6. Where instrument used involves facilities in interstate or foreign commerce. Penalty: $5,000 and/or up to 1 year imprisonment.	Prohibits interception: Makes it unlawful for any person to intercept, procure others to do so, or conspire with any other person to intercept or attempt to intercept. Penalty: $10,000 and/or up to 2 years imprisonment.	State law applies. (No provision.)
Exceptions to prohibited eavesdropping (not specifically set forth): would include law enforcement officers acting "lawfully in official capacity in investigation, detection or prosecution of crime"—by definition of "person" in the bill.	Exceptions to prohibited interception: 1. Sender. 2. Intended recipient. 3. Person authorized by sender or recipient to intercept. 4. Officer, agent, employee of carrier in normal employment. 5. Investigative or law enforcement officer.	
No similar provision.	Prohibits divulgence or disclosure of intercepted communication: Makes it unlawful to divulge or disclose contents of any wire communication with knowledge that such information was obtained through interception. (Fine of $10,000 and/or 2 years imprisonment.)	No provision.
	Exceptions to prohibited divulgence: 1. Sender. 2. Intended recipient. 3. One authorized by sender or recipient to intercept. 4. If information has been divulged previously by such person, or by any individual while giving certain testimony in State or Federal criminal actions, or proceedings of State legislative or congressional committees. 5. Authorized disclosures to law enforcement officers; in State and Federal courts in criminal actions; to Congress and State legislatures.	
Prohibits possession of eavesdropping instruments: Under circumstances showing intent to use or employ or allow them to be used or employed for unlawful eavesdropping. Penalty: $1,000 and/or 6 months' imprisonment.	No similar provision.	
	Judge may enter ex parte order granting leave to intercept on reasonable ground for belief that— (1) the crime has been or is about to be committed, (2) evidence essential to conviction for, or prevention of the crime will be obtained, (3) no other means are readily available. Order to specify: (1) nature and location of facilities, (2) offense involved, (3) identity of officers authorized to intercept, (4) length of time interception is authorized. Applications to contain same information as listed above for Federal interception.	Do.
Permits eavesdropping without court order for 24 hours: By law enforcement officer with reasonable grounds to believe evidence of crime may be obtained; and time doesn't permit application for court order. Application for court order to be made within 24 hours.	No similar provision.	
State eavesdropping permitted: Nothing in the act to prohibit eavesdropping by any law enforcement officer or agency or any State, or any political subdivision thereof.	State interception under court order permitted: Any investigative or law enforcement officer of a State or political subdivision who is authorized by State statute to apply to judge for leave to intercept (1) when required to obtain evidence of, or to prevent, criminal offense punishable under that State's law by death or 1 year imprisonment, involving murder, kidnaping, extortion, bribery, gambling, possession, use or furnishing of narcotic drugs, or attempt or conspiracy to commit such offense.	State interception permitted under State law: Amends title 18 U.S.C. to provide that no law of the United States shall be construed to prohibit interception by State and local enforcement officer or agency in compliance with State statute, and divulgence in State court. (See below.)
Disclosure of eavesdropping evidence: State court: Nothing in act to prohibit use of eavesdropping evidence obtained by law enforcement officer or agency of State or political subdivision, in any court, where authorized by court of such State on reasonable grounds that interception might disclose evidence of crime.	Disclosure of intercepted communication: In State criminal action: Information obtained by authorized interception and received in authorized way. May be disclosed.	Divulgence of intercepted communication: In State courts: No U.S. law to prohibit divulgence, in any proceeding in any court of such State, of the existence, contents, substance, purport, effect, or meaning of any communication so intercepted if such interception was made after determination by a court of such State that reasonable grounds existed for belief that such interception might disclose evidence of commission of a crime.
State evidence under court order permitted in Federal court: Permits introduction in Federal courts of evidence relating to wire or radio communication intercepted by State or local law enforcement officer or agency, on determination of court of such State of reasonable ground that interception might disclose evidence of commission of crime. Federal wiretapping evidence admissible in criminal proceedings: Information obtained previous to this act by Federal law enforcement agents through interception on written approval of Attorney General in the course of any investigation of any Federal offense shall be admissible in evidence in any criminal proceedings.	In Federal criminal action: Information obtained by authorized interception and received in authorized way may be disclosed in U.S. criminal action.	
Authorizes certain interception by Federal agents—Federal: No similar provision.	Authorizes certain interception by Federal agents—Federal: By authority of the Attorney General without court order: The Attorney General may authorize any investigative or law-enforcement officer of the United States or any Federal agency to intercept if the Attorney General determines there is reasonable ground for belief that— 1. A criminal offense punishable by death or 1 year imprisonment under 18 U.S.C., chs. 37 (espionage); 55 (kidnaping); 105 (sabotage); 115 (treason, sedition, and subversive activities); or a conspiracy to commit such offense, is about to be committed. 2. Evidence essential to conviction for, or prevention of, such offense will be obtained. 3. No other means are readily available for obtaining such evidence.	No provision.

Comparison of wiretapping and eavesdropping bills, S. 1086, S. 1221, and S. 1495—Continued

S. 1221 (by Senator Keating)	S. 1495 (by Senator Dodd)	S. 1086 (by Senator Keating)
Authorizes certain interception by Federal agents—Federal—Con. Under court order: Order to be issued by any judge of U.S. district court, U.S. court of appeals, District of Columbia municipal court, District of Columbia municipal court of appeals, or any U.S. commissioner. Record kept: Procedure: Judge to keep copies of orders, papers on which application is based, etc.: 1. An authorized agent of a Federal law enforcement agency to apply for order. 2. On oath or affirmation. 3. On reasonable ground to believe evidence of Federal crime may be obtained. 4. Particularly describing persons involved and purpose, and identifying telephone number or telegraph lines involved.	Under court order after authorization of Attorney General or others: Order to be issued by judge of court of competent jurisdiction. Record kept: Procedure: Judge to send Administrative Office of U.S. Courts copies of orders, extensions, applications, denials: 1. Attorney General, or any officer of the Justice Department, or any U.S. attorney designated by the Attorney General. 2. May authorize any investigative or law enforcement officer of the United States or any Federal agency to apply to judge for leave to intercept. 3. Oath or affirmation. 4. When such action is required to obtain evidence of, or to prevent commission of criminal offense under 18 U.S.C., chs. 37, 55, 105, 115; or under any other statutes involving murder, extortion, bribery, gambling, racketeering, the possession, use or furnishing of narcotic drugs, or attempt or conspiracy to commit such offense. 5. Application to contain: full and complete statement of facts and circumstances including: the purpose, nature, and location of facilities involved, previous application to intercept involving same facilities and for same purpose and action taken by judge.	
Order effective no longer than 2 months. Renewal or extension to be by same judge if in public interest.	Court orders for (State and Federal) interception: Same. Extended not more than 30 days by same judge on reasonable grounds that extension is necessary to obtain evidence or prevent commission of offense. To Congress and State legislature: Information obtained by authorized interception and received in authorized way may be disclosed in any proceeding of a duly authorized committee of Congress or State legislature. Disclosure to other law enforcement officers: Any investigative or law enforcement officer intercepting by authority may divulge or disclose contents of the communication to any officer or employee of the United States, any Federal agency, or any State, if it is required for the proper performance of official duties of the intercepting officer (if interception is authorized, and communication provides, or may lead to discovery of evidence of actual or probable commission of offense).	No provision.
Use of illegal eavesdropping evidence: Evidence obtained in violation of the act or as a result of violation, to be inadmissible in any civil action, proceeding, or hearing: To be admissible in any disciplinary trial, or hearing, or any administrative action, proceeding, or hearing conducted by or on behalf of any governmental agency.	Disclosure of unauthorized interception: Contents of intercepted communication may not be received as evidence in any proceeding or before any court, grand jury, department, officer, agency, or regulatory body or authority of the United States or any State from any witness if disclosure or divulgence by any means other than giving of testimony would be in violation of the act.	Do.
	Reports concerning intercepted wire communications: Judge to send Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts copy of order and extension of it, the application for the orders, and application for extension; copy of application for order or extension which has been denied. Director of Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts to transmit to Congress report concerning application denied, orders entered; nature of offenses involved, etc., and such other information as may be requested by chairmen of the Judiciary Committees, and Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committees.	Do.
	Amends Communication Act: Provides that sec. 605 shall not apply to— (1) contents of any radio communication broadcast, or transmitted by amateurs or others for use of the general public, or relating to ships in distress; or (2) the interception or any wire communication, or divulgence or disclosure of contents not in violation of that act.	
Duty of carriers to report violations: 1. Imposes duty on carriers subject to Federal Communications Act to report to law enforcement agency having jurisdiction any information coming to his attention re violation of act (failure—punishable up to $500). 2. Authorizes carriers to permit authorized eavesdropping.		

B. Previous congressional action on wiretapping legislation

Congress has never authorized wiretapping by anyone, or any agency, under any circumstances.

When Congress has enacted legislation dealing with wiretapping, eavesdropping, and the interception of messages, Congress has always prohibited the interception of telephone, telegraphic or radio communications. Following are all the Federal laws enacted in these categories:

(a) An act to regulate radio communications: Act of August 13, 1912, 37 Stat. 302; Public Law 264 of the 62d Congress.

(b) An act providing for the protection of the users of the telephone and telegraphic service and the properties and funds belonging thereto during Government operation and control: Act of October 29, 1918: 40 Stat. 1017; Public Law 230 of the 65th Congress.

(c) Radio Act of 1927: Act of February 23, 1927; 44 Stat. 1162; Public Law 632 of the 69th Congress (sec. 27).

(d) Amendment forbidding wiretapping in the enforcement of the National Prohibition Act: Act of March 1, 1933; 47 Stat. 1381; Public Law 387 of the 72d Congress. (Amendment to the Appropriations Act for the Departments of State, Justice, Commerce, Labor and the Judiciary, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1934.)

(e) Federal Communications Act of 1934: Act of June 19, 1934; 48 Stat. 1064; Public Law 416 of the 73d Congress (secs. 605 and 501). (For text of sec. 605, see appendix A.)

For the legislative history of bills introduced in Congress during the period 1914 through 1959, to prohibit wiretapping and eavesdropping or to authorize wiretapping and eavesdropping under certain circumstances, see part 4, W–E, pages 781–1031. Bills and legislative action are summarized, followed by texts of bills, committee reports and statutes.

But, at the present time, there is considerable doubt whether any law enforcement officer may wiretap without violating section 605. This doubt persists despite State laws purporting to authorize wiretapping. (For State law citations, see appendix B hereto.)

C. Applications for Federal injunctions against wiretapping or use of information obtained by wiretapping

The Senate Constitutional Rights Subcommittee has no record of any action for damages or suit for equitable relief filed or tried against Federal officers wiretapping or telephone company officials for permitting interference with privacy of communications.

D. States admitting information obtained by wiretapping

Only six States purport to authorize wiretapping, five under court order and one without court order (see appendix B).

II. FEDERAL COURTS AND WIRETAPPING

A. Federal criminal prosecutions

"A single sentence can now tell us what the law concerning wiretapping is: on timely motion by a defendant who was a party to

the call, a Federal court will suppress the contents, and evidence derived therefrom, of any interstate or intrastate telephone communication overheard by any person whether a private citizen or Federal or State agent, if the listening in is without the permission of the other party to the call."

So said Georgetown law professors, Edwin J. Bradley and James E. Hogan, after examining U.S. Supreme Court cases on wiretapping from *Nardone* to *Benanti* and *Rathbun;* part 3, W–E, 589 at 613. This conclusion applies to any attempts to use evidence (obtained by wiretapping) in Federal criminal prosecutions.

In *Olmstead* v. *U.S.* (277 U.S. 438 (1928)), the Supreme Court held, in a closely divided and argued decision of 5 to 4, that wiretapping per se is not unconstitutional under the fourth or fifth amendment. (For text, see pt. 1(a), W–E, 42; plus briefs amici curiae of the telephone companies; pt. 4, W–E, 765.)

Six years later, in 1934, the Federal Communications Act was passed by Congress. Section 605, of the act, provides in part:

"No person not being authorized by the sender shall intercept any communication and divulge or publish the existence, contents, substance, purpose, effect, or meaning of such intercepted communication to any person."

In a letter to the chairman of the Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights, dated September 10, 1959, former Attorney General William P. Rogers wrote, "There is no record of prosecution by the Federal Government, either before or after the Benanti decision, of local law enforcement officers who have intercepted and divulged conversations in the performance of their duties." (For text, see pt. 5, p. 1480.)

III. SUMMARIES OF CONTENTS OF WIRETAPPING AND EAVESDROPPING HEARINGS

Following are summaries of contents of separate volumes (parts) in Senate Constitutional Rights Subcommittee continuing study of wiretapping, eavesdropping, and the Bill of Rights:

Part 1, W–E, hearing, May 20, 1958:
Testimony of— Page
(a) John J. Hanselman, assistant vice president, American Telephone & Telegraph Co.. 2
(b) Prof. Richard Schwartz, Moore School of Electrical Engineering, University of Pennsylvania; coauthor, "The Eavesdroppers" .. 8
(c) Hon. Thomas McBride, then attorney general, Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.. 20
Part 1(a), W–E, Appendix to Hearing of May 20, 1958, background materials:
I. Bill of Rights.. 33
II. Statutes:
A. Sections 605 and 501, Federal Communications Act.. 35
B. Preliminary survey of State laws.. 35
III. Court decisions:
A. Tables of citations.. 40
B. Texts of U.S. Supreme Court opinions, Olmstead to Benanti and Rathburn.. 42
C. Texts of selected search and seizure cases.. 91
IV. Summary of foreign law, by Library of Congress.. 137
V. Bibliography.. 187
Part 2, W–E, hearing, May 22, 1958:
I. Testimony of—
A. Alan F. Westin, assistant professor, department of Government, Cornell University .. 194
(1) Columbia L.R. article, February 1952.. 215
B. Hon. Thomas F. Eagleton, circuit attorney, city of St. Louis, Mo.. 259
Part 2, W–E, hearing, May 22, 1958—Con.
II. Reports of— Page
A. Savarese Committee, New York State, 1956.. 267
B. Savarese Committee, New York State, 1957.. 347
C. British Committee of Privy Councillors, 1957 .. 459
Part 3, W–E, hearing, July 9, 1959:
I. Testimony of—
A. Samuel Dash, Esq., director, Pennsylvania Bar Association, study.. 503
B. Hon. Edward S. Silver, D.A., Kings County, N.Y.. 532
II. Law review articles, statements, letters from law school professors and others.. 566
Part 4, W–E, appendix to part 3:
I. Court decisions:
A. Detailed tables of cases.. 719
B. Texts of decisions since Rathbun and Benanti.. 722
II. Legislative history of congressional bills to prohibit or to authorize wiretapping:
A. Summaries.. 781
B. Text of bills, committee reports, and statutes.. 790
III. Correspondence with Justice Department.. 1033
IV. Savarese Cee., N.Y., report, 1958.. 1041
V. Representative (different points of view) law review articles, texts.. 1163
VI. Bibliography.. 1397
Part 5, W–E, hearings, Dec. 15 and 16, 1959:
I. Testimony of—
A. Harold Lipset, private investigator, San Francisco, Calif.. 1438
B. Edward Bennett Williams, attorney, Washington, D.C.. 1470
C. Paul Williams, attorney, New York City.. 1492
D. Harris Steinoerg, attorney, New York City.. 1506
II. State statutes: supplement to materials in part 1(a), W–E.. 1526
III. Court decisions:
A. Supplement to material in part 1(a), W–E.. 1529
B. Texts of selected lower Federal court decisions.. 1532
C. Texts of selected State appellate court decisions.. 1646
IV. Information on purchase and use of small electronic recording equipment by Federal offices .. 1684
V. Telephone companies' statement, supplementing testimony in part 1, W–E.. 1689
VI. Law review articles and reports of State investigating and bar association commissions.. 1705
VII. Notes on British practices.. 1985
VIII. Notes on Australian practices.. 1997

APPENDIX A

TITLE 47—TELEGRAPHS, TELEPHONES, AND RADIO TELEGRAPHS OF THE U.S. CODE—FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS ACT OF 1934

§ 605. Unauthorized publication or use of communications.

No person receiving or assisting in receiving, or transmitting, or assisting in transmitting, any interstate or foreign communication by wire or radio shall divulge or publish the existence, contents, substance, purport, effect, or meaning thereof, except through authorized channels of transmission or reception, to any person other than the addressee, his agent, or attorney, or to a person employed or authorized to forward such communication to its destination, or to proper accounting or distributing officers of the various communicating centers over which the communication may be passed, or to the master of a ship under whom he is serving, or in response to a subpena issued by a court of competent jurisdiction, or on demand of other lawful authority; and

No person not being authorized by the sender shall intercept any communication and divulge or publish the existence, contents, substance, purport, effect, or meaning of such intercepted communication to any person; and

No person not being entitled thereto shall receive or assist in receiviny any interstate or foreign communication by wire or radio and use the same or any information therein contained for his own benefit or for the benefit of another not entitled thereto; and

No person having received such intercepted communication or having become acquainted with the contents, substance, purport, effect, or meaning of the same or any part thereof, knowing that such information was so obtained, shall divulge or publish the existence, contents, substance, purport, effect, or meaning of the same or any part thereof, or use the same or any information therein contained for his own benefit or for the benefit of another not entitled thereto: *Provided,* That this section shall not apply to the receiving, divulging, publishing, or utilizing the contents of any radio communication broadcast, or transmitted by amateurs or others for the use of the general public, or relating to ships in distress. (June 19, 1934, ch. 652, § 605, 48 Stat. 1103.)

APPENDIX B

STATE STATUTORY PROVISIONS ON WIRETAPPING

EXPLANATION OF STATUTORY DATA

1. Thirty-three States prohibit wiretapping.

2. Six States permit wiretapping by police officers.

A. Five States under court order.

B. One State without court order.

3. Eleven States have no statutes on wiretapping.

1. THIRTY-THREE STATES PROHIBIT WIRETAPPING

1. Alabama: Code 1940, title 14, section 84 (18) (interception prohibited); title 48, section 414–415 Cum. Supp. 1959 (tapping of telegraph or telephone prohibited).

2. Alaska: Comp. Laws Ann. (1949), section 49–5–12 through 49–5–20 (tapping of telegraph or telephone prohibited).

3. Arizona: Rev. Stat. Ann. (1956), section 13–886 (telegraph and telephone 13–887).

4. Arkansas: Stat. Ann. (1957 replacement volume 6B), section 73–1810 (telegraph and telephone).

5. California: Annotated California Code, part 1, title 15, section 640, Annotated California Code, 1960 supplement, sections 619, 653h, and 653.

6. Colorado: Rev. Stat. (1953), section 40–4–17 (telegraph and telephone).

7. Connecticut: Gen. Stat. (1958), section 53–140 (telegraph and telephone).

8. Delaware: Code Ann. (1953), supplement (1958), title 11, section 754–757 (telegraph and telephone).

9. Florida: Stat. Ann. (1944), supplement (1959), section 822.10 (telegraph and telephone).

10. Hawaii: Rev. Laws 1955, section 309A–1 added by laws 1957, page 204, act 176 (prohibits recording telephonic conversations).

11. Idaho: Code Ann. (1948), section 18–6704 (telegraph), 18–6705 (telegraph and telephone).

12. Illinois: Ann. Stat. (Smith-Hurd, 1936), chapter 134, section 15a, 16 (telegraph and telephone) (electronic eavesdropping is defined and prohibited by chapter 38, section 206.1 through 206.5, ibid. (1959 Supp.).

13. Iowa: Code Ann. (West's 1950) section 716.7, 716.8 (telegraph and telephone).

14. Kansas: Gen. Stat. Ann. (Corrick, 1949), section 17–1908 (telegraph and telephone).

15. Kentucky: Rev. Stat. (1953), section 433–430 (telegraph and telephone).
16. Michigan: Stat. Ann. (1954 revised volume 25), section 28–807—28–808.
17. Montana: Rev. Code Ann. (1947), section 94–3203 (telegraph and telephone).
18. Nebraska: Rev. Stat. (1943) (reissue of 1958) section 86–328 (telegraph and telephone).
19. New Jersey: Stat. Ann. (West's 2A N.J.S.A. book 7, revised 1953), section 2A: 146–1 (telegraph and telephone).
20. New Mexico: Stat. Ann. (1953), section 40–37–5 (telegraph and telephone).
21. North Carolina: Gen. Stat. Ann. (1943), section 14–155 (telegraph and telephone).
22. North Dakota: Rev. Code (1943), section 8–1007 (telegraph and telephone).
23. Ohio: Rev. Code Ann. (page 1954), (telegraph and telephone) sections 4931.25–4931.29, 4931.99.
24. Oklahoma: Stat. Ann. (West's 1958), title 21, section 1757 (telegraph and telephone).
25. Pennsylvania: Stat. Ann. (Purdon's 1939), title 15, section 2443 (telegraph and telephone).
26. Rhode Island: Gen. Laws (1956), section 11–35–12 (telegraph and telephone).
27. South Dakota: Code (1939), section 13.4519 (telegraph and telephone).
28. Tennessee: Code Ann. (1955), sections 39–4533, 65–2117, 65–2118 (telegraph and telephone).
29. Utah: Code Ann. (1953), section 76–48–11 (telegraph and telephone).
30. Virginia: Code Ann. (1950), 18–214 (telegraph and telephone) section 18.1–156.
31. Washington: Rev. Code (1951), section 9.61.010(18) (telegraph and telephone).
32. Wisconsin: Stat. Ann. (West's 1957), section 134.39 (applicable only to telegraph).
33. Wyoming: Stat. Ann. (1957), section 37–295 (telegraph and telephone).

2. SIX STATES PERMIT WIRETAPPING BY POLICE OFFICERS

A. Five States under court order:
1. Maryland: Code Ann. (Michie 1957), article 27, section 556(b)(c) (supp. 1959) (electronic devices); article 35, (supp. 1959) (wiretapping), sections 92–99.
2. Massachusetts: Gen. Laws (West's 1959), chapter 272, section 99 (supp. 1959).
3. Nevada: Rev. Stat., sections 200.660 through 200.690.
4. New York: Constitution, article 1, section 12; Penal Law (McKinney's), section 739(1); Code of Criminal Procedure (McKinney's), section 813a, section 813b, sections 738–745 (eavesdropping).
5. Oregon: Rev. Stat. sections 141.720 through 141.740, section 165.540, section 165.535.

B. One State without court order: Louisiana, Rev. Stat. Ann. (West's 1950), section 14:322.

3. ELEVEN STATES HAVE NO STATUTES ON WIRETAPPING

(Title 26, chapter 26, secs. 26–2001–2004)

1. Georgia: Code Ann. (book 10, 1953 revision, supp. 1958), sections 26–3805.
2. Indiana: Stat. Ann. (Burns, 1956 replacement, vol. 4, pt. 2), section 10–4518.
3. Maine: Rev. Stat. Ann. (1954), chapter 131, section 13, section 16.
4. Minnesota: Stat. Ann. (1945), section 621.28(b), section 621.33.
5. Mississippi: Code Ann. (1942), section 2381.
6. Missouri: Stat. Ann. (Vernon 1953), section 560.310.
7. New Hampshire: Rev. Stat. Ann. (1955), section 572.3.
8. South Carolina: Code Ann. (1952), section 58–316.
9. Texas: Penal Code Ann. (Vernon 1953), article 1334.
10. Vermont: Stat. Ann. (1959), title 30, section 2528.
11. West Virginia: Code Ann. (Michie 1955), section 5970.

RED CHINA COULD FALL

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

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, in a dispatch from Hong Kong this morning, Joseph Alsop reports the best political news from Asia in many a month.

Alsop has been a careful, perceptive, and accurate reporter. When he reports that the Red Chinese regime could fall, it deserves careful and thoughtful consideration by responsible Americans. It would seem to add emphasis to the wisdom of refusing to recognize Red China, and of continuing to give assistance to one of the very strongest anti-Communist forces in the free world: the Chinese Nationalists on Taiwan.

For too long the Nationalist Chinese have been subject to automatic criticism and denunciation by otherwise thoughtful citizens who should know better.

After a recent Far Eastern tour of military bases, military officials told me that the Formosan Chinese Army was far and away the best trained and enjoyed the highest morale of any they had visited.

Mr. President, because this article by Joseph Alsop is so pertinent to so many policies in controversy in our country and in the Congress, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

THE GOVERNMENT WAS TOO HARSH

(By Joseph Alsop)

(Some weeks ago, after studying the underground war in South Vietnam, this reporter passed a week in Hong Kong collecting the best available evidence—the evidence of recent refugees—about the mysterious evolution of Communist China. This evidence indicates the clear possibility of an internal explosion which could destroy or radically alter the Chinese Communist government. This is the first in a series.)

HONG KONG.—The articles which begin herewith mainly concern a crime almost past imagining which is perpetrated upon the Chinese masses by their Communist masters. In the simplest moral terms, the Chinese people are now being offered as a blood sacrifice on the altar of the new mammon of our times, industrial power.

But in hard political terms, the chief interest of this crime lies in the enormous political risks which it involves. For the sake of forced industrialization, the Communist masters of China are now gambling their regime's future. Although this view will seem wildly eccentric to the more fashionable analysts, it is quite possible that the Communists will lose their gamble. Oddly enough, the best proof that this view is not eccentric is to be found in the following passages from the official Communist "Outline History of China."

"In the year 209 B.C. a group of 900 conscripts on their way to the frontier for guard duties * * * killed the officer in command and revolted * * * these were the first to raise the cry for the overthrow of the Chin Empire.

"In less than a month their army had grown to more than 1,000 cavalry and several tens of thousands of infantry and owned some 700 war chariots. Inspired by their uprising, peasants all over the country took up arms."

The official history goes on to describe how the power of the Chin Empire effectively collapsed, almost within a matter of weeks, after this sudden, desperate strike in a chain gang of wretched peasant conscripts. As explanation for this astonishing collapse, the official history also approvingly quotes an ancient author, as follows:

"The more powerful the armies of Chin grew, the more its enemies multiplied. The government was too harsh toward the people and punishment was too severe."

The lessons of the past are supposed to be utterly outmoded nowadays. Yet anyone who reflects upon the real meaning of the foregoing quotations will understand why the crime the Chinese Communists are now perpetrating is also a perilous gamble. It is a gamble in their own terms, moreover. The harshness of the Chin government toward the people was as nothing—it was the merest milk and water stuff—compared with the present harshness of the Chinese Communists.

Assuming the harshness as a fact for the moment, what are the other reasons why the foregoing quotations have so much current meaning? The first and simplest reason is the inherent proof that even the most awe-inspiring facade of monolithic authority can be remarkably deceptive.

The Chin government was founded by a ruthlessly totalitarian power originally based in northwestern China. This state of Chin owed its strength to the iron program of the world's first Stalinist, Shang Wei-yang. The Chin Empire was Stalinist in character over two millenia before Stalin.

The Chin conquest of the rest of China, completed only 12 years before Chin's sudden downfall, not merely produced the first phase of the historic, long enduring Chinese empire. It also produced the most powerful single government ever founded in any part of the world, in the whole long period since the first man-ape had first used a rock as an offensive weapon. Such was the state which came to an end because of a strike in a chain gang.

This gigantic police state of the past built the first Great Wall of China to guard against external enemies. But the remedy was probably worse than the disease, because of the internal enemies created by the remorseless conscription of countless labor gangs to build the wall. The enemies who "multiplied" were certainly internal. They were the Chinese people. And Chin really fell because of the first of those sudden, unpredictable, overwhelming general strikes, for which the Chinese people have a curious knack, as their later history also proves.

The key to the success of the rising against Chin is also to be found in the quotations from the official Communist "Outline History." The Chinese peasantry in 209 B.C. could not muster the cavalry and war chariotry mentioned above, any more than the toiling masses in the Communists' peasant communes possess armored cars and tanks today. In fact, the Chin armies, being peasant armies, joined the peasant rising. Without this, the rising would have been quickly crushed. With this, the rising was irresistible, and so will a modern rising be irresistible, if it occurs and rallies the armed forces.

The real question, in sum, is not whether the Chinese Communist government can be brought down by the people. The real question is whether the conditions exist in which the people may be driven to bring down the government.

GROUND WATER DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM

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

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. HICKEY. Mr. President, on Thursday, April 27, Mr. George F. "Pete" Dana, chief of ground water development, Wyoming Natural Resource Board, delivered an address on the ground water development program in Wyoming. The paper was read before the Missouri Basin Interagency Committee, which was held in Casper, Wyo. Mr. Dana's paper illustrates some of the possibilities in connection with the potential development of underground water in the West. It was in line with the general objective of encouraging such development on public lands that we introduced S. 1559, the Underground Water Act of 1961. Mr. Dana's paper gives such an excellent illustration of what might be done with the development of underground water that I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

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

GROUND WATER DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM

(By George F. "Pete" Dana, chief of ground water development, Wyoming Natural Resource Board)

It is indeed a pleasure for me to appear before you today to explain the newly initiated ground water program of the Wyoming Natural Resource Board, a Wyoming State agency created for the purposes of promoting and developing the water, mineral, forest, grazing, industrial and other resources of the State of Wyoming. The board is composed of nine members which are appointed by the Governor on a bipartisan basis. The staff consists of an executive director, J. A. "Buck" Buchanan, a secretary of the board, Charles Sargent, the chief of water development, E. Bruce Jones, and myself.

I would like to acquaint you with the background and goals of the board's new ground water program and explain how we are proceeding in this work.

GROUND WATER POTENTIAL

The natural resource board, realizing the potential of ground water within Wyoming and the increasing need for stock water and supplemental irrigation water, decided to undertake the program of collecting and interpreting of information concerned with ground water development. The program has been originated by the State and is financed solely by the State. On November 1, 1960, I was employed by the board to carry out this program so far as possible. Probably many of you fully realize the need for this program which is the result of near drought and drought conditions that existed in Wyoming during the past year. Even a year of normal moisture will not rectify the losses suffered in the State in 1960 and so far in 1961. In 1960, 11 of Wyoming's 23 counties were designated as drought disaster areas, and present trends indicate that conditions will not be appreciably improved during this year.

Recent figures released by the Soil Conservation Service and the State engineers' office indicate that the present moisture potential from snowpack is from 39 to 80 percent of normal over the State. One area indicates 18 percent of normal as of the April 1st snow survey.

According to predictions given at a recent meeting in Cheyenne, by a consulting meteorologist, the odds are about 10 to 1 that the State's moisture will not climb to normal between now and the commencement of the growing season.

My work is conducted through the water development division of the board and I work directly under Bruce Jones, whom I mentioned, is chief of water development.

In outlining and developing this program, the first step is the collection of any and all available data on ground water within the State's boundaries. To date, I have encountered some 28 different sources and with so many possibilities, you can realize that the assembling and evaluation of such data is a major undertaking in itself. The major sources of information are obtained from oil companies who have been very generous in their cooperation furnishing information on holes which have been drilled throughout the State in search of oil or gas.

MAJOR AQUIFERS

As a result of present investigations, I will list, so far as possible, the State's major aquifers and their potentials in the ten principal geological basins in Wyoming and also assist in any areas where special underground water problems may arise. An excellent example of such special problems is the Eden Valley area near Farson, Wyo., where the supply of irrigation water has been very short. In order to assist with the investigation in this area, the board has directed a reconnaissance study of the possibilities of developing ground water supplies for supplemental irrigation. There is not a great deal known about the ground water conditions in this area and nothing has ever been published concerning its potential.

There are a few deep wells in the area, and one of these, the El Paso Natural Gas Co., No. 1 Simpson Gulch Well, located in sec. 29, T. 25 N., R. 103 W., had an artesian waterflow from a tertiary sandstone bed from about 1,000 feet deep. Because of the apparently good pressure and volume, further study of the development of a water supply from this zone appears to be indicated in the surrounding area.

Due to the volumetric demands placed on water by irrigation we do not feel that, with the exception of isolated cases, a ground water supply can be effectively developed as the sole source of water for an irrigation project in Wyoming. This conclusion is based upon the economics of the situation. However, there is one demand for water in the State which we feel can definitely be fulfilled from ground water and that is the supplying of stock water. In some cases, this could be a supply that would also be supplemental to surface water supplies for irrigation. Water for industrial use is also of interest to us because we realize that there are very few large-scale industries which do not require considerable quantities of water in their processes of manufacturing. As a result of this overall study, we hope to be able to locate and predict areas where suitable quantities and qualities of ground water are available.

Another aspect of this program, which many of you have possibly thought of, is the location and development of water for secondary recovery programs as conducted by oil companies.

Several companies are initiating these waterflood, secondary recovery programs this spring and as new oil discoveries diminish in number in the future, more and more secondary methods will be used to recover the millions of barrels of oil which cannot be obtained by primary methods.

DEEP FLOWS

In the pursuit of any data that could be used in the location of ground water supplies, we have compiled a critical area map. On this map the green colors are basins, and these are the areas where we are concentrating our work. The red areas indicate igneous outcrops where we naturally do not expect to develop any ground water. The counties designated by red crosses through them are the 11 drought disaster counties, 1960, and several of which have been carried over to 1961. The areas outlined in blue are areas which are discussed in various papers prepared by the USGS ground water branch. In order to avoid duplication of work we will concentrate our work on the areas that have not previously been covered by the USGS papers. This program is not meant to replace work accomplished by the USGS but to actually supplement the cooperative program with them. We are interested in wells which are considerably deeper than those which are generally evaluated in USGS ground water papers. Some of the deeper wells in the State have artesian waters available from them which flow from formations as deep as 8,000 to 10,000 feet. The median depth for flowing waters in the majority of artesian wells is from 3,500 to 5,000 feet. A prime example of such quantities of water is the well located right here in Casper at the country club. The depth to an excellent aquifer is 5,000 feet and the quality of water is good.

It is necessary to pump this well but the volumes are sufficient for irrigation of the golf course. No complete cost of the operation will probably ever be compiled because so much of the work and materials was donated. This example was brought forward to emphasize that good qualities and quantities of water can be developed at considerable depths.

At present, all Wyoming basins are considered as areas of critical water supply. Some basins face a much more severe water shortage than others and also the water shortage within any given basin may vary from place to place within the basin and from year to year. If the present trend continues, this State is facing a severe water shortage during the coming growing season.

WATER OCCURRENCE RECORD

In order to make use of future information on water flows which occur in wells that are being drilled and those that will be drilled in the future by the various oil companies, we have drafted a data sheet, called the Underground Water Occurrence Record, which will be given out to all oil and drilling companies which operate in Wyoming. We are asking for the voluntary support of the companies to see that these forms are placed at the well site so that they may be filled out by a responsible person anytime and at any depth when water flows are encountered. Of special interest are shallow water wells which are drilled for water supplies for drilling operations and these forms also apply to them. This form would then be mailed to the Wyoming Natural Resource Board. We believe that we have made the form simple enough so that it will facilitate a quick and easy filling out on the part of the oil companies; however, we are always open to suggestions from them. We hope that this method will prove to be a simple and inexpensive way of gaining water information. We emphasize that this program is strictly voluntary on their part. We do not wish to infer in any way, that the forms are mandatory because they are not, they are a request for information. If at the end of the program you wish to have some of these forms, please help yourselves. They can be obtained at the back of the room.

Our program has been met with a great deal of enthusiasm and all of the people contacted to date have pledged their support. Several companies have offered information on their seismic holes as to location, depth, lithology, and water content. Some seismic holes have found artesian water and of course such information is extremely valuable to us. A number of companies have offered the use of a geologist to go back

through their reports and histories of the wells in which their company has either full or part interest and which have had water flows and report those to us. Quite often this method will reveal information which has long since been forgotten, because such water flows are normally controlled either by casing or by increase in the weight of the drilling mud.

The gathering of information as mentioned above, and by personal calls, are the only ways in which we will get a collection of the details which we can interpret. Another way in which the companies could aid our program is by sending us copies of electric logs and micrologs on wells in which water has been found in any quantities. This again is a voluntary gesture on the part of the companies and one which will be greatly appreciated by the board.

OIL COMPANY COOPERATION

The oil companies which operate in the State have never been approached for this type of information and without their cooperation, the results of the program would be sketchy and incomplete. The job of contacting all of the oil and drilling companies who operate within the State's boundaries is about 75 percent completed and after that is finished, we will begin on uranium companies, small private contractors, and anyone else who would have occasion to drill a hole anywhere in the State.

I have listed the various sources of water data which could be available from oil companies. We realize that any one company may not have all of the various answers, but they might have some information which would be of value to us in their files. These are:

(a) Well histories, daily drilling reports, tour reports.

(b) Drill stem tests.

(c) Mud records.

(d) Seismic hole information.

(e) Shallow wells drilled for water supply source.

(f) Hydrodynamic studies.

(g) Secondary recovery programs (source of water).

(h) Water sample analysis.

(i) Surface or near-surface lithologic studies.

GOALS

At this point you may wonder exactly what we hope to do with all this information. Actually, there are several goals of our program. The first of these would be the successful conversion of dry holes to water wells. To accomplish this we must be aware of beginning drilling operations so that we may approach a company who is drilling in what we consider a critical area and also in an area which may yield considerable water and put forth a proposal, in conjunction with the landowner that, if the well is a dry hole and has a sufficient quantity and quality of water, the natural resource board would be willing to act as a liaison between the company and the landowner or group of individuals who would be interested in putting the water to beneficial use. The natural resource board would enter into arrangements only if requested to do so. It is not the role of the Wyoming Natural Resource Board to promote any specific project, but merely to give assistance when requested.

In some cases the board may be able to be of assistance by loaning money to the potential water users in order to get the well completed. If this can be accomplished while the original rig is on location, the total cost of the completion can be substantially reduced. This loan money is available from the State through the Wyoming Farm Loan Board with the advice of the natural resource board.

Our second goal is the cataloging of all of the State's aquifers and the areas where they may be expected to be water producers, and when possible to predict their potential volumes and qualities.

Another goal is the furnishing of information to those interested in updating the State's existing underground water law.

COMPLETION COSTS

As a result of our work thus far, other associated investigations and problems have arisen and are listed below: (a) The correct procedure and necessary steps for assuming responsibility for completions of a hole as a water well which has no productive capacity as an oil well. The exact procedures for this transfer of responsibility to the landowner have not yet been fully established. We have been discussing this matter with the various agencies involved and also with Rocky Mountain Oil & Gas Association. As you can well realize, nobody wants to put money into a well that they cannot be assured of owning; (b) costs of completion of dry oil wells as either artesian or pumping water wells are always of principal consideration in our program. An example of such a completion is the No. 2 Arminto Unit well, about 40 miles west of Casper. The total cost to the surface tenant, was $4,700.45 and is itemized as follows:

1. Casing (1,400 feet of 7 inch): $3,000.
2. Perforation: $909.20.
3. Installation: $100.
4. Valve (used) and tank: $475.
5. Other, attorney fee ($50), filing fee ($2), supplies ($164.25): total $216.25.

Since the well was artesian, no pumping unit was necessary. It is capable of producing 2,800 barrels of water per day. Other costs of completion would be dependent upon several variable factors including depth, porosity, etc. We realize that each completion is an individual problem and must be discussed upon its own merits and requirements and a decision reached as to its financial feasibility as the situations arise. However, cost estimates in these matters would be of great benefit to us, and such costs will be the subject of a report which I am presently assembling.

Because there has been comparatively little development of this ground-water resource in the State, as compared to some of the other Western States, we in Wyoming are relative newcomers to this field. We are quite interested in the approach taken by other States with their problems so that we may learn from their experiences.

By the May 10 Wyoming Natural Resource Board meeting, I will have the second progress report ready and any of you who wish a copy of it may write to our office in the supreme court building in Cheyenne. You will also find copies of the board's 1960 annual report at the back of the room. Here again, these copies are free and you are welcome to them. You can see by reading the board's annual report that there is a great variety of interests in which the board is concerned.

Our ground-water program is in its infancy, and we wish to add to the work that has been done by the USGS ground-water branch, which has been of considerable value to the State of Wyoming. We hope that through contacting the oil companies, which have never previously been contacted in any degree for this type of information, that we can be of service to them and to the State of Wyoming. All of this information which we are accumulating will be placed on file in the natural resource board's office in Cheyenne. If at any time some of you would like to see our operation in Cheyenne, we invite you to drop up and visit with the staff in room 215, supreme court building. We would be most happy to confer with you concerning this or on any other matters affecting the natural resources of Wyoming.

In closing, I wish to emphasize that our program is just underway as a State responsibility, but its developmental processes are already clear and its goals established. We will locate and develop intelligently, this heretofore practically untouched resource of Wyoming.

Thank you again for the opportunity to appear before you today and inform you of the work that is being done by the State of Wyoming in regard to our ground-water program.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATION, 1962

The Senate resumed the consideration of H.R. 5000, a bill to authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, before beginning my statement on H.R. 5000, I should like to call attention to a printer's error relating to the naval air station, Miramar, Calif., which appears on page 69, line 21, of the bill before us. Lines 22 and 23 should read as follows: "facilities, maintenance facilities, and utilities, $2,591,000." It is clear that instead of this proper language the printer merely repeated lines 19 and 20, which related to another installation. I ask unanimous consent that this correction be made.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the correction will be made.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I have a statement with respect to the bill which I wish to make. It is not long, and when I have concluded I shall be glad to yield for any questions.

Mr. President, the bill before the Senate provides construction and other related authority for the military departments within and outside the United States, including authority for the construction of facilities for the Reserve components. The total sum of the new authorization contained in the bill is $831,050,750. In addition thereto, approval is granted for an increase of $48,634,000 in prior years' authority for a total authorization of $879,684,750.

The Army would be authorized $134.7 million; the Navy, $180.3 million; the Air Force, $489.6 million; the Department of Defense, $8.3 million; and a total of $66.8 million for the various Reserve components.

I want to call attention to the fact that the bill as originally submitted to Congress, and upon which the House took action, called for a total authorization of $870,884,000. From this, the House deleted some $66.3 million, primarily for projects which were not included in the funding program for the coming fiscal year. After the House had acted, the Department of Defense requested several revisions, primarily based upon a reappraisal of the defense programs as announced by the President on March 28, 1961. Such changes resulted in a revised authorization request of the Senate of $942,059,000, which is $71,175,000 above the amount contained in the original bill and, of course, the amount considered by the House. The authorization granted is $62,374,250 below the amount requested.

The authorization approved by the committee does not provide for any new bases. Rather, the projects requested are for the modernization and implementation of existing facilities. There

is nothing contained in the bill for any of the bases that the Department of Defense recently announced will be closed; and the committee has the assurance of the Secretary of Defense that the possibility of any bases for which items are included in this bill being closed in the near future is extremely remote. In any event, should such conditions materialize, the authorized construction would not be undertaken and the committee would be so advised.

The basic policy of the Defense Department planning continues to have as principal elements: First, possession of a powerful retaliatory ability which is considered mandatory as a war deterrent; second, the responsibility to maintain a capacity to apply military force promptly in various local-conflict areas of the free world; and, third, continue a strong Continental Air Defense and maintenance of open sealanes. The items contained in this bill support these policies.

The committee during its examination of the projects took particular care to verify that all the items were needed to support the long-term, future military plans, eliminating all items for which a compelling military necessity did not appear to exist. The closest scrutiny was given to the items deleted by the House, the appeals from the military departments for restoration of House deletions, and to the revised requests that were submitted to the committee during the process of the hearings.

For the most part, the committee agreed with the House deletions and restored only those projects of the highest priority in which there appeared to be some likelihood of their being funded out of savings that might accrue to the Military Establishment during the coming year. Other items denied consisted of those which appeared to duplicate facilities or functions under the control of the military or other Federal agencies and, in some instances, where ambitious programs were planned that were not essential to the immediate needs of the military department concerned. The committee was convinced in each instance that the deferral of the projects would not hamper planned programs and that existing facilities are sufficient for the present.

Mr. President, I should like to deal more specifically with certain areas of concern to the committee in considering the bill.

As mentioned earlier, the principal revisions to the bill resulted from a reappraisal of the defense programs by the new administration, resulting in a request for increased authorizations in certain areas. This affected both the Navy and the Air Force programs.

In this regard, some $10,250,000 in additional authorization was added to the Navy program for nine classified projects in support of the acceleration of the Polaris and antisubmarine warfare programs; $2 million of this will be applied to technical facilities for the Polaris submarine. The balance, we were told, is necessary to accelerate the activation of the security services facilities which support the antisubmarine warfare program through the augmentation of certain communication facilities.

The net increase requested for the Air Force amounts to $59,400,000. The recent reexamination of the Titan and Minuteman programs indicated to the Department of Defense that it is more desirable to accelerate the Minuteman program at this time than to activate additional Titan squadrons. Accordingly, the committee was asked to approve additional authorization totaling $120 million for three additional Minuteman squadrons, and to provide price increases for six squadrons contained in the original bill. This brings the total squadrons requested in the bill to nine. At the same time, however, two Titan II squadrons requested in the original bill were canceled for a net reduction of $74.6 million. This reexamination of the Air Force program also revealed a need for improved weapons control capability and the provision of fallout protection at selected radar sites at an estimated cost of $14 million. The overall result of this change in the Air Force program, as I mentioned earlier, calls for an increase in the authorization of $59.4 million.

After due consideration of these added requests, the committee felt that it had no alternative, because of the importance placed upon them and stressed to the committee, but to grant approval.

Again this year, the committee was faced with the ever-growing problem of providing support facilities for the multitude of military personnel in the Metropolitan Washington area. For a number of years now the committee has emphasized the need for removing military flying from the Anacostia and Bolling Airfields in the metropolitan area. Considerable funds have been provided for this purpose and it is soon to become an accomplished fact. In last year's bill, the Navy requested over $14 million to provide for the first increment of a complex of new facilities on a portion of the Anacostia site. This request was denied and the Navy was told to make a survey to see if some of the functions proposed for this site could not be provided for elsewhere, and that a further study be made of the needs of all three military services with a view toward providing for the needs for all at one central location. However, again this year, the Navy has requested some $6 million for the Anacostia site and the Army, $2.1 million for barracks and support facilities, in addition to 525 units of Capehart housing, for the Fort Myer military reservation—all for the purpose of providing for military personnel in the Washington area. Unquestionably, the Air Force has similar plans for the Bolling Air Force Base. So it goes, each military department endeavoring to provide for its individual needs at separate locations. There are some compelling reasons why some facilities should and must be provided for each of the services in this area. It is most difficult to understand, however, why a combined complex of personnel support facilities for the Washington military contingent cannot be located in one place irrespective of the service to which they belong. Both the Anacostia and Fort Myer requests were denied by the committee, and it is hoped that the Defense Department will make one last real effort to provide a consolidated facility for all three services at a single location, and come in next year with a truly workable plan that can be approved.

Another problem of deep and continuing concern to the committee is that of family housing. During the past several years, the Congress and the executive branch have tried several approaches to meet the family housing requirements of the military services. None of these in the final analysis has proved adequate from the standpoint of economy.

Both the Wherry and the Capehart programs have been costly, although admittedly they have served a purpose. The committee was of the firm opinion that the time has arrived when serious consideration must be given to abandoning the present approach and steps taken to meet this requirement through the regular annual authorization and appropriation process. The committee is convinced that this method of providing necessary housing will be more economical and satisfactory and, in the long run, will save substantial sums.

Therefore, this year in lieu of authorizing the so-called Capehart housing units requested in the bill, we have approved 2,000 units of appropriated fund housing at an average cost of $16,500 per unit. The location of 1,500 of these units was selected by the Defense Department and are identical in number and location to the Capehart units proposed in the original bill, with the exception of those for Fort Myer, Va., which I mentioned earlier. In order to provide for emergency situations that might arise, the Secretary of Defense is granted authority to select the location of the additional 500 units. The committee strongly feels that this will provide an orderly transition of the housing program and will take care of the current urgent requirements of the services.

In addition to the above, authority has been granted to the Air Force for 256 units of transportable housing for use at remote locations such as A.C. & W. sites. These units will average about $14,000 each, which will include the cost of the unit, transportation from the factory to the site, site work, utilities, and so forth. The advantage of relocatable housing is that should the requirement at one location terminate, the housing components can be readily moved to a new location where it is needed. Although this item was deleted from the House-passed bill because it was not included in the funding program for the coming year, the committee urges its approval and hopes that the Air Force might find it possible to fund some of this transportable housing in the coming year. The committee believes that, in part, this is an answer to some of the military housing problems, particularly when it is known that as a result of the recent adjustment in air defense plans, several A.C. & W. sites where permanent housing is now located are to be inactivated and closed.

To complete the housing picture, I want to call attention to section 508 of title V of the bill which places a limitation of $20,000 on the amount that may be spent for rehabilitating existing

quarters. During the past year, the committee's attention has been directed to the fact that the military in some instances have spent exorbitant amounts of maintenance and operations funds for the purpose of rehabilitating family quarters far in excess of that permitted under the law for the construction of new quarters.

As in previous years, very careful consideration was given to proposed new hospital facilities. Nine such facilities were requested in the bill this year. It is believed that the admonitions of Congress over the past several years concerning excessive hospital costs have been given consideration by the Defense Department, since the costs of the proposed facilities this year are in line with those supported by the committee in past years. Of the nine hospitals requested, the committee has approved six. Two were eliminated because it appeared that the requirements for which they were proposed could be provided for in other nearby facilities.

In other words, hospitals for the Army were closely adjacent to where hospitals were requested for the Navy, and the committee thought the existing hospitals might be utilized.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I prefer to complete my statement.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, does the Senator wish to complete his statement before he answers any questions?

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes, if the Senator would be so gracious as to permit me to do so.

The committee concurred in one of those deleted by the House because it was not included in the Air Force funding program. One hospital was added to the bill for the Offutt Air Force Base, Omaha, Nebr. This hospital had been given No. 2 priority by the Air Force of the seven they hoped to obtain this year. The Bureau of the Budget denied this facility while approving others of lower priority. Testimony indicated that there is a valid need for this hospital and that local institutions, on which the Bureau of the Budget relied, do not have the capacity to provide for the needs of the military and their dependents in this area.

Contained in the bill were requests by the Army and the Air Force totaling $20.6 million in authorization to provide for unforeseen construction that might arise in connection with the Nike-Zeus and the ICBM programs. These requests which the departments hoped to fund were in addition to the emergency authorization provisions contained in the bill for each department annually. The committee denied this unscheduled authorization but increased the emergency authorization for each service to $15 million, which is $5 million above the amount approved by the House. It is believed that this amount of emergency authorization should be sufficient to provide for any unforeseen construction arising during the coming year.

Finally, I should like to address myself briefly to the Reserve forces facilities provided in title VI. Refreshing and enthusiastic testimony was heard regarding the high state of readiness of our Reserve forces, and should events again require their active service, there is every reason to believe that, as in the past, they will perform in an outstanding manner. During recent years, testimony has indicated that there is a definite need for more flexibility in the Reserve programs, particularly as it relates to the National Guard, than is now afforded under the procedure of authorizing construction by line item. The committee has been urged each year to incorporate additional projects to provide a total authority more in keeping with the amount of matching funds on hand and held by the States for these programs. This also permits substitution of line items on the basis of unforeseen contingencies. With this in mind, and to provide for urgent projects arising subsequent to submission of the bill to Congress, and to accelerate other important programs, the committee increased the total authorization for Reserve facilities approximately $13.6 million above the amount allowed by the House. The committee has concluded that the line item method of authorizing for Reserve facilities has proved unsatisfactory. Beginning with fiscal year 1963, it is proposed to return to the method followed prior to fiscal year 1959 prescribed by the National Defense Facilities Act of 1950. This act provides for a specific authorization to the Secretary of Defense for use of the Reserve components after consultation with the Armed Services Committees.

Mr. President, I have attempted to summarize the highlights of the military construction authorization bill for fiscal year 1962, and I shall be pleased to answer any questions Senators may have relating thereto.

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

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. First, I commend the distinguished Senator from Georgia for his usually careful and excellent summary of this very complicated subject matter. I know the committee has given grave and careful attention to the various items; and the chairman has, as usual, performed outstanding service.

However, I express my deep disappointment at one action of the committee, namely, the striking of the authorization of $4 million for maintenance facilities at the naval shipyard at Philadelphia, Pa. That item was in the bill as it passed the House. I note that it has been stricken from the Senate committee amendment. There must be some good reason for thus discriminating against Philadelphia, which seems to be the only location in this particular part of the bill provision for which has been stricken. Can the Senater from Georgia give us some explanation for this unfortunate result?

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, in order to save the Senator from Georgia from making the same explanation twice, will the Senator yield to me in connection with the inquiry already posed by my senior colleague?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. SCOTT. It is indeed a disappointment that the committee found itself unable to include in the bill an authorization of $4 million for the Philadelphia Naval Shipyard. As the Senator will recall, I testified on this subject before the Senator's committee, and the Senator raised the question that perhaps the amount needed would not be as high as $4 million, but that perhaps the actual construction work, as separated from the equipment—the item for equipment not being before the Senator's committee—might be finished for about $1,500,000. We had indeed hoped that the Senator's committee might include that amount in the bill, in order that this item might have a better chance for favorable action in conference.

I am quite well aware that the kind of careful work done by this committee and the very high respect in which the Senator from Georgia is held by all of us makes it most likely that if I were to offer an amendment to add this amount it would be the sense of the Senate at present not to accept such an amendment. That is why I do not offer it, although I still cherish the hope that the item may be included in conference in an amount somewhat reduced, I recognize, from $4 million.

Would the distinguished Senator from Georgia consider the inclusion of any amount—perhaps $1,500,000—as an amendment to the bill?

Mr. RUSSELL. I can understand the deep concern of the distinguished Senators from Pennsylvania with respect to this item. However, I am constrained to point out, in the first place, that there is no Bureau of the Budget clearance for this item. In the second place, representatives of the Department of the Navy, when they appeared before the committee, stated clearly, definitely, and specifically that they were not requesting at this time any additional authorization for the Philadelphia Naval Shipyard.

The committee was also confronted with other difficulties. A number of other naval shipyards throughout the country are located in States which are very ably represented by members of the Committee on Armed Services. Those Senators expressed great interest in these items. They said that if there was to be any new construction at Navy yards, the yards in their respective States should be considered.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia further yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. I did not mean to interrupt the Senator, if he had not concluded.

Mr. RUSSELL. My mind is not closed to the question; neither are the minds of the prospective conferees. But with the evidence adduced before the committee, we had no alternative but to strike the item from the bill. Of course, this item will be in conference, as Senators have stated.

Mr. CLARK. It is my strong feeling that for the past several years—and I think I speak for my colleague [Mr. SCOTT] as well as for myself; he will do so, if I do not—there has been real discrimination against the Philadelphia

Naval Shipyard in terms of the maintenance force employed there, compared with other Navy yards up and down the Atlantic seaboard, without any very real explanation to us of any tactical or strategic reason for that apparent discrimination.

We feel that we have a very highly skilled force of workers there, a force which is quite competent to participate in the development of the submarine and antisubmarine warfare components of the Navy.

We had hoped that this item, which was secured in the bill in the House by the assiduous efforts of Representative BYRNE, who is a member of the House Committee on Armed Services, would enable the Philadelphia Naval Shipyard to participate in the development of submarines and thus enhance employment in Philadelphia. The unemployment situation in Philadelphia is very serious at the moment because of economic conditions.

However, although the authorization for Philadelphia has been stricken, I understand $3,300,000 has been included for a facility at New London, Conn., instead. Can the Senator from Georgia enlighten me as to why the authorization for Philadelphia was eliminated and the authorization for Connecticut was inserted?

Mr. RUSSELL. I fear that I could not answer the Senator's question.

All I know is that the Navy Department stated that it did not desire any construction authority whatever at Philadelphia this year, whereas New London, Conn., is the site of the training of the crews of the Polaris submarines, which are being stressed so vigorously at the present time. The Senator well knows that the Polaris submarine requires two crews, and that is a very expensive operation. The crews are very highly skilled, highly trained, and highly compensated; they rank among the highest in the Navy Department. The evidence shows that at New London there is a very great need for housing. As I recall, the principal item needed at New London is housing for the personnel being trained for the Polaris submarine crews.

Mr. CLARK. I note that the item for New London includes family housing, utilities, and real estate.

Our people at Philadelphia have been very much concerned about rumors—whether they have any foundation in fact, I am not in a position to say—that it was contemplated that the Philadelphia Navy Yard might be closed in the reasonably near future. Can the Senator from Georgia give us any information on that point?

Mr. RUSSELL. Such rumors have not come to me; I have no knowledge of them. I know there is a continuing study by the Department of Defense in regard to the utilization of facilities. But I have not heard that closing of that yard was contemplated.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. SCOTT. I am of the impression that such studies have been made, as the Senator says, and that if some of them are acted upon in line with the recommendations, such action will be disadvantageous to the Philadelphia Navy Yard.

I certainly hope the committee will not receive favorably any such recommendation. Aside from the work performed at that yard for the national defense and the national security, there is of course to be considered the constant increase of certain technical skills which are invaluable, and consideration must also be given to the great danger which would result from the dispersal of those skills. I know that is what a member, Representative JAMES VAN ZANDT, of the House Armed Services Committee who submitted the amendment had in mind, and I know it is what Representative BYRNE had in mind in supporting that amendment.

I believe it would be most helpful to the Philadelphia Naval Shipyard employees if we could nail down, once and for all, that rumor, and could make clear that the rumor is based on perhaps only one of several studies made for the Department of Defense, and that the one which is believed to be for closing that naval shipyard is not within the contemplation of the Senate Armed Services Committee.

Mr. RUSSELL. We asked the Navy Department about its plans for this Navy yard, and also for the one at Boston. Although I cannot place my hands on it at the moment, we received from the Navy Department a statement that the present plans do not contemplate the closing of these yards. I cannot guarantee how long their present plans will obtain. But at least such a rumor is certainly ahead of any concrete planning in the Department of Defense.

The Philadelphia Navy Yard has a very long and historic record. It has served this country well since the very beginning of the Republic; and I have not heard that it is planned to close that yard. Of course, the work there has fallen off, as is true of all the yards.

Mr. SCOTT. Will the Senator permit me to request the printing at this point in the RECORD of my testimony at the committee hearings, as it appears on pages 317 to 319?

Mr. RUSSELL. Certainly.

Mr. SCOTT. I so request, Mr. President.

There being no objection, the excerpt from the hearing of March 9, 1961, was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF HON. HUGH SCOTT, U.S. SENATOR FROM THE STATE OF PENNSYLVANIA

Senator SCOTT. Mr. Chairman, thank you very much for your courtesy in giving me the opportunity to testify this morning. As I realize the heavy demands on your time, I will make my remarks as brief as possible.

Before you for consideration is H.R. 5000 which provides for certain construction at military installations.

I would like immediately to refer to that item in the bill which would authorize construction of facilities in the amount of $4 million at the Naval Shipyard, Philadelphia, Pa., to provide a capability for the yard to overhaul and repair nuclear-powered submarines (p. 12, line 3).

Mr. Chairman, we all realize in this age of atomic power and missilery, the submarine is a powerful and versatile weapon.

For this Nation to maintain its position as leader of the free world, we must not only be able to control the air above and the surface of the sea, but also the waters beneath.

The Congress has recognized this and gradually the nuclear submarine will replace the more conventional type.

It is estimated at the end of this year that we will have in our arsenal 16 nuclear-type submarines and 87 of the conventional type, for a total of 103 of the attack type, less than 20 years old.

By 1963, we will have 27 nuclear submarines but our conventional type will only be 84 in number for an overall total of 111.

The increase in the nuclear submarines is as it should be. With the retirement of the conventional submarine because of age—for example, hull deterioration, cost of repair prohibitively expensive, and so forth—and limited space because of demand for more electronic devices, the total number decreases to 55 in the year 1966. Included in this total are only 19 of the conventional type.

As you know, Mr. Chairman, the nuclear attack submarine will continue to increase as the conventional type in our fleet will decrease by retirement.

With the changing times we all accept the increasing demand for more modern equipment in our preparedness force, but we must also consider the effect the change has on the economy of the country.

The national unemployment figure released by Secretary of Labor Goldberg, as recent as last Saturday, March 4, was estimated at 5.5 million. Unfortunately, Pennsylvania adds heavily to that total.

During World War II, the Philadelphia Shipyard employed greater than 40,000 employees, but the complement today is less than 10,000. Action taken by this legislation may well affect the future of the shipyard and, in turn, affect the economy of the whole Philadelphia area and the State of Pennsylvania as well.

The record of work production of the Philadelphia Shipyard is well recognized and I am sure the action you might take in relation to the above mentioned will be justified by continuing high standards.

It is my understanding that it takes approximately 3 years for the conversion of facilities at a shipyard heretofore handling only the conventional-type submarine so that it might handle also the nuclear-powered type. As I pointed out, by 1963 the conventional type will start to phase out while the nuclear submarine will be on the increase.

The funds for conversion authorized at this time will permit the shipyard and its workers to accept this transition without any disruption to the local economy.

Mr. Chairman, it is for these reasons that I strongly urge the committee in its consideration of H.R. 5000 to retain the authorization of $4 million for the Philadelphia shipyard.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to add just this: That the Philadelphia Shipyard and Naval Base is the largest single employer in the entire Philadelphia-southeast Pennsylvania area.

Changes in personnel there have an immediate effect on our employment situation.

The reaction to these changes is more sharp than to that of any other employment personnel alterations in our area.

We have for a long time been concerned at the decreasing amount of work assigned to the shipyard, and particularly concerned because we have been given no opportunity to provide training in nuclear-type work in submarines or otherwise. We are very much afraid that if denied this opportunity, our shipyard will, indeed, decrease much more drastically in personnel.

The matter has been raised a number of times with the former Secretary of Defense

and others, the Secretary of the Navy, and this is a matter in which there is tremendous interest in our area.

As you know, Representative VAN ZANDT had this amendment included on the House side.

We are very much concerned about it, and are very hopeful that it will remain in the bill.

I ought to add, too, I think that Pennsylvania has about 10 percent of the unemployment in the country. We need to maintain as high a proportion of Government facilities in this area as we can, suffering as we are from migration of populations, and, in this case, from the dispersion of irreplaceable skills.

So, Mr. Chairman, I strongly urge the committee's favorable consideration.

Chairman RUSSELL. We are glad to have your views on this, Senator SCOTT. I am sure you are aware that there are very practical difficulties we encounter with respect to an item of this kind. There are a number of Navy yards and naval installations over the country that are very anxious to get in this nuclear work, and I can understand that. It is a developing and growing activity, and the weapon of the future.

Senator SCOTT. We are a protected area from certain forms of attack there, in that we are up the Delaware River considerable mileage. We are not directly on the coast.

But I am no expert on the strategical or tactical considerations involved. But on the personnel, I do assure you that no matter is regarded as more urgent by the civic leaders and those interested in maintaining full employment than this Philadelphia Shipyard situation.

Chairman RUSSELL. We have a number of other installations likewise interested in this; for example, the Boston Shipyard. They ask for consideration with respect to nuclear subs.

I am sure you are aware that the Navy Department said they did not need this facility at this time.

Senator SCOTT. Yes, sir. They are not as kind to me as I am to them. I am always plugging for Polaris. I hope that the quality of mercy will be sufficiently unstrained and the openmindedness which characterizes the Navy will make itself evident ultimately in this matter.

Chairman RUSSELL. The best figures we can get also indicate that if we were to put this installation there, it would not require as much as $4 million.

Senator SCOTT. We would be, of course, happy to have that figure reexamined, but we would like very much to maintain in the bill an adequate amount to permit the conversion.

Chairman RUSSELL. The Navy estimates it will cost a little less than $1.5 million to do the construction. Of course, it requires a good deal for equipment.

Senator SCOTT. Yes.

Chairman RUSSELL. But that is not carried in this item. It is to be provided in another bill.

Senator SCOTT. It would help us greatly if the item, no matter what amount is decided on, is retained in the bill, and I would hope that an adequate amount would be contained, sir.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield further?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. This debate has been most enlightening. I hope that when the Senator goes to conference on this matter he will bear in mind the very real economic distress suffered by the employees of the Philadelphia Navy Yard as a result of a constant reduction in force; and I hope he will also bear in mind the high level of capability of those men to do first-class maintenance work in connection with submarine programs and antisubmarine programs; and I hope that in conference perhaps the Senator from Georgia will look with a little favor at least on a strong position by the House to keep at least some of this appropriation item in the bill.

Mr. RUSSELL. I can only assure the distinguished Senator that I will approach this item, as I do all items in the bill, objectively. If the House conferees make an overwhelming case for it, of course, the Senate conferees will not close their minds.

Mr. CLARK. I thank the Senator.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. All of us realize the great care with which the Senator from Georgia and the other members of the committee have dealt with these problems; and certainly we commend the Senator and his associates for their very thorough and conscientious work.

In connection with the bill, there is a matter which is of great concern to both my colleague [Mr. JAVITS] and myself.

Before asking a question about this item, I should like to inform the Senator from Georgia, if I may do so, a little in regard to the history of the matter.

On March 28, General Kingsley, of the legislative liaison for the Air Force, sent me a letter—and I believe that a similar letter went to my colleague [Mr. JAVITS] and to other Members—in which it was stated that the Air Force planned to continue Rome Air Materiel Area, at Griffiss Air Force Base, pending a complete evaluation of logistics support facilities throughout the country. It was stated then that the evaluation was not to be completed until fall. Yet in the military construction bill I notice that the other bases in the vicinity which do procurement work are getting or are planning huge expansions. For instance, at Olmsted Air Force Base, in Middletown, Pa., there are three projects—an expanded freight terminal, a shop repair depot, and a standards calibration laboratory, and they will cost more than $1,500,000.

For Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, in Dayton, Ohio, nearly $4 million was requested, and more than $1,500,000 was included, for operational facilities, maintenance facilities, research, development, and test facilities, supply facilities, and medical facilities.

At Gentile Air Force Station, in Dayton, Ohio, $420,000 has been requested for air conditioning a converted office building.

Moreover, at the hearings it was revealed, in answer to some questions which were asked by the distinguished Senator from Georgia and by one of the other members of the committee, that the Air Force planned to ask, for the Gentile Air Force Station, $4,300,000, and 250,000 square feet of additional space, in the near future. I have been informed that that is for the expansion of a logistics administration facility.

The distinguished Senator from Georgia indicated, in the course of the testimony, that he expects an increase in personnel there.

At Hanscom Field, Bedford, Mass.—a part of the Air Research and Development Command—there is going to be an expansion of research, development, and test facilities, and also community facilities and utilities, to the extent of nearly $3 million. Although Hanscom Field is not a part of the Air Materiel Command, it is performing work similar to that now done at Griffiss Air Force Base, at Rome, N.Y.

At the same time that these very large increases are occurring, Griffiss Air Force Base will receive only $160,000; and the funds requested for apron-lighting facilities—which, as I understand, are a safety device—were deleted.

I am somewhat puzzled about the contents of the bill when I compare it with the letter from the brigadier general in the Air Force liaison, who told us a complete evaluation was being made in the logistics support facilities throughout the country and would not be completed until early fall. Yet it would appear, from the increases which I have cited, and from the hearings and other testimony I have reviewed on this matter, that the Air Force is moving right along without this further evaluation and is perhaps taking steps to cut out the Rome Air Materiel Area completely.

It has been rumored—and I know the Senator has answered certain other rumors; here is another one—that the difficult decisions on closing these facilities have been postponed until Congress adjourns, so that congressional protests will be rendered ineffective. I hope that is not the case.

I would agree that, in the interest of economy and efficiency, it may be necessary to close some installations in some areas, even in New York State, and I am perfectly willing to take the fair share of such closings; but the point we have continually stresssed, so far as Rome Air Materiel Area is concerned, that the facilities are there, the space is available now, without spending $4 million for new construction, as is contemplated, not in this bill, but later, as was brought out in the hearings, at the Gentile Air Force Station.

It does not lead to greater efficiency, it does not lead to greater national security, to close existing facilities and build new ones elsewhere to do the same work. I am puzzled by the evidence which seems to appear in the bill that these logistics bases are perhaps not being reevaluated, after all, that the Air Force is going ahead, anyway, and merely keeping the bad news quiet until after Congress adjourns.

After that preliminary statement, I ask the Senator from Georgia, with regard to Olmstead, Wright-Patterson, Gentile, and other airfields, does the Senator from Georgia have any information to the effect that the missions to those bases will be increased? Does the Senator have any information of that kind?

Mr. RUSSELL. Of course, the distinguished Senator knows that there are two items requested for this base.

Mr. KEATING. For Rome?

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes, Griffiss Air Force Base; and I think the Senator can take great consolation from that fact, because we pressed the Department of Defense very earnestly not to have us authorize any expenditures for any of the fields that were likely to be closed in this closure program which the Senator has discussed. We did not want to be put in the position of authorizing money for some facilities now, and in November having the Department of Defense, in spite of the fact that Congress had authorized expenditures, notify us that those facilities would be closed.

So I think Griffiss Air Force Base is in a strong position, so far as rumors of closing are concerned.

As for the item that was eliminated, namely, apron lights, let me say this involves a new system of apron lighting. All the stations have systems of apron lighting, but they came in with 18 new ones. It seemed to the committee that was too many at one time, and we asked them to reduce it to about one-half and give us an order of priority which was based on the needs at the stations. That question involves how good their present lighting system is, what will be the load of a new system, the question of overhaul and maintenance. Griffiss was not included in the upper 10 of the 18 that qualified as against any need of a new system of apron lighting.

I feel that the Senator should be able to derive great satisfaction from the fact that they asked for new construction at Griffiss, in light of the fact that none of the stations for which construction funds were asked were in immediate danger of being closed.

Mr. KEATING. I thank the Senator.

Mr. RUSSELL. Understand, I do not guarantee that; but we did try to be exceedingly careful and not to authorize anything for any station that might be closed. Of course, it is known that three-fourths of these matters could be deferred for 1 year without any danger. Perhaps the facilities would be inadequate, but it would not be impossible to do so.

Mr. KEATING. I thank the Senator for his reassurance. I do not misunderstand him to the effect that he could or would give any guarantee with regard to this matter. But his statement is somewhat reassuring.

I wonder whether the Senator could give any explanation, or has heard any explanation, as to why, if the Air Force is completely evaluating the logistics support facilities, as it has assured us that it is, it should at this time ask for so much construction for the Air Materiel Command in these other installations?

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator knows that Wright-Patterson Air Force Base has been the center of the air materiel activity, and it nearly always leads all the others in the requests. There is a great deal of activity there at all times, from research through the entire gamut of military activity. I do not recall the other stations the Senator mentioned.

Mr. KEATING. Gentile was one where they actually asked for $420,000 for air-conditioning of a converted office building.

Mr. RUSSELL. Did the Senator read the testimony about that request?

Mr. KEATING. Yes.

Mr. RUSSELL. There are 1,800 people there. They are working in an old converted warehouse. The testimony was that in the summertime it was practically impossible for the people to keep up with their work. It had not been designed in the first instance as an office building. It was stated they had to have the $420,000 for the installation of an air-conditioning unit. It seemed to me they made a rather good case.

The Senator is referring to the $4,300,000 in futuro?

Mr. KEATING. Yes.

Mr. RUSSELL. I do not have the worksheets for every one of the bases, but I would assume Griffiss may propose $4 million, $6 million, or $8 million in possible plans for the future. We do not ask such questions as to all the bases. We did as to some of them. We can get that sheet and furnish the Senator from New York with that information. The Senator will find there was a substantial amount in reserve for future planning. All of these stations have a substantial amount.

Mr. KEATING. I appreciate that and would like to have the opportunity to see the sheet.

Did the Senator, in his investigation into all of these bases, find evidence from which he could assure us that the evaluation by the Air Force is in fact taking place as to all these installations?

Mr. RUSSELL. Indeed. There is no question about it—not only in the Air Force, but throughout the entire Department of Defense. Every military installation everywhere is being considered, including the Army, Air Force, and Marine Corps.

I can offer a great deal of balm to the Senator and reassure him somewhat by saying the estimated future expenditure at Griffiss Air Force Base is considerably larger than the amount proposed for Gentile.

Mr. KEATING. What I want the Senator to assure us is that when the request comes up for consideration he will treat it favorably.

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

Mr. RUSSELL. I am glad to yield.

Mr. JAVITS. I am very grateful to the Senator. First, I join my colleague [Mr. KEATING] in thanking the Senator for his unfailing courtesy and understanding in regard to these problems. Second, I identify myself with the inquiry which my colleague has made so very ably.

I should like to ask the Senator a specific question. We were in the midst of quite a problem with the Air Force on the Rome Air Materiel Area, which is the part of the Air Materiel Command specifically involved—because this would really be a disaster to the particular section of New York, for it would withdraw nearly the main economic support—when along came the decision on Titan, which resulted in the new attitude with respect to what is called ROAMA, the Rome Air Material Area.

I should like to ask the Senator whether, so far as he knows, as he has surveyed what is being done in regard to the item which we discussed especially, that decisions should not first be taken before negotiations and conversations are held with local people as to the economic or community soundness—and I know the Senator can give no guarantee—any decision has been reached in this particular case or whether the question is still under consideration.

Mr. RUSSELL. I have every confidence that no decision has been taken to close the Griffiss Air Force Base. I do not say that such a decision will not be taken at the conclusion of the examination which is being made now, but, as of today, I am confident no such decision has been taken or recommended.

Mr. JAVITS. Has the distinguished Senator from Georgia at any time articulated any policy with respect to the desirability of consulting the community and the State before such a decision is taken, rather than after it is taken? In order to make the people feel a little happier, perhaps they can be consulted.

Mr. RUSSELL. Very frankly, I say to the Senator from New York, I have not. I am in a position to weep with any Senator whose State has lost a military base. One of the last orders issued by the previous administration closed two airfields in my State where there were flying schools; one at Bainbridge, Ga., and one at Moultrie, Ga. Each was a thriving city of from 12,000 to 18,000 people. Each received some $18 million or $20 million spent yearly in the area as a result of the payroll at the base, the procurement program at the base, and the civilian personnel working at the base. It was a bolt out of the blue when the Secretary of the Air Force called me and said he was going to close those fields.

It is a real ordeal in respect to both ends of the closure. I have never closed one or recommended the closing of one, but I know that the people who are in the Department of Defense are keenly aware of the adverse effect any of these closures has on a civilian community.

I have felt very bad about the fact that the fields in my State were the predecessors in closure of all that came along this year. The two in my State were closed last year.

I do not know that the Air Force or any other department could afford indefinitely to operate an uneconomic base because of impact on a community. We shall have to depend upon the depressed-areas bill of the Senator from New York and the distinguished Senator from Illinois, I suppose, to set those areas back on their feet again.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. I was talking about the desirability of retaining the base in the interests of the economy and the security of the country, because in this particular instance a fine case was made for Griffiss Air Force Base on those grounds alone.

Mr. RUSSELL. Griffiss Air Force Base really is an outstanding base. It is a very efficient and effective base.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank my colleague. I was asking my question in terms of the propriety of consulting the local community and State upon those issues before a decision is arrived at. I think my colleague has answered the question. I thank him very much.

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

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I know it is not necessary to support the worthy and intelligent effort of the Senator from Georgia, but I sat through all the hearings, and we asked the Air Force not once, but two, three, or four times with regard to the various fields, before we authorized the money, if there was any evidence that the Air Force might close the fields. In every instance the witnesses answered categorically that there was no present intention to do so. I support the Senator from Georgia in that regard.

Mr. RUSSELL. Not only did we ask the Air Force that question, but also at the conclusion of the hearings I addressed a letter to the Secretary of Defense, in order that we might put him on record. The Secretary wrote a letter to the committee, a copy of which I have, which says, in part:

I can assure you that no construction included in the fiscal year 1962 bill is planned for the installations already announced for closure.

The Secretary said further:

It is not possible, of course, until after this evaluation is completed to state definitely that none of the construction included in the fiscal year 1962 authorization bill is located on bases which may subsequently be announced for closure. From our studies to date, and in view of the meticulous screening which is given to projects in the military construction program, this possibility is extremely remote.

Mr. KEATING. That is very helpful.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the entire letter printed in the RECORD.

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

THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,
Washington, April 29, 1961.

HON. RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
Chairman, Committee on Armed Services, U.S. Senate.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Reference is made to your letter of April 26, 1961, in which you advise that the committee wishes to receive assurances that none of the construction requested in the fiscal year 1962 military construction authorization bill, now before your committee, is located on bases which will be designated for discontinuance.

I can assure you that no construction included in the fiscal year 1962 bill is planned for the installations already announced for closure in our initial release of March 30, 1961.

As I am sure you will agree, however, it is necessary that we continue our evaluation of the remaining military installations to determine those minimum military requirements to support peacetime and mobilization operations, and to comply with the President's objective of disposing of those installations which are no longer required. Great care is being exercised in this review and its completion is not scheduled before the latter part of the current calendar year.

It is not possible, of course, until after this evaluation is completed to state definitely that none of the construction included in the fiscal year 1962 authorization bill is located on bases which may subsequently be announced for closure. From our studies to date, and in view of the meticulous screening which is given to projects in the military construction program, this possibility is extremely remote. Nevertheless, if this condition should materialize I wish to assure you that the construction concerned will not be undertaken and your committee will be informed at the earliest possible date.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT S. MCNAMARA.

Mr. CARROLL and Mr. KUCHEL addressed the chair.

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield first to the Senator from Colorado, and then I shall be glad to yield to my friend from California.

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. President, it has been brought to my attention that Lowry Air Force Base was previously authorized 200 units of Capehart housing. I think 100 were authorized in 1959 and 100 were authorized in 1960. The design and planning have been completed, and the contracts are ready to be let. As a matter of fact, there is a ground breaking ceremony for the project scheduled for July of this year.

I have been informed that the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate has sort of abandoned the Capehart concept in favor of appropriated fund housing and we are caught in the squeeze with the 200 units previously authorized under the Capehart program.

The able Senator knows that these units are essential to the operation of the Titan missile base at Lowry Air Force Base. This important ICBM missile base will become operational in June.

I have no quarrel at all with the finding of the committee that the Capehart housing program should be abandoned and that appropriated fund housing programs should be adopted as a solution to the military housing problem, especially in the light of recent disclosures, but I wonder if there is not some way we can meet this immediate problem. How shall we obtain housing for Lowry Air Force Base? How shall we move ahead, in view of the planning which has taken place?

Mr. RUSSELL. There are some 5,900 Capehart housing units which have heretofore been authorized, which have been carried over from year to year, and which for some reason have not been let to contract. We are aware of the fact that there are some hardship cases. The whole problem will be in conference when we discuss military housing with the House. If there are any specific areas where the hardship is unendurable, we might authorize construction of enough of the units previously authorized and carried over to eliminate any real hardship.

Mr. CARROLL. I thank the Senator.

Mr. RUSSELL. I assure the Senator that if the condition at Lowry Air Force Base is unusually bad, as he states, we shall give the situation at Lowry consideration in our discussion of the item.

Mr. CARROLL. I thank the Senator from Georgia.

When the 100 units were assigned in 1959 the Air Force housing authorities thought that number would be uneconomical to construct. They really needed and had requested 500 units. It was thought not to be in the interest of economy to construct only 100 units so they waited until they could get 200 units. Now the designing and planning have been completed and the program is ready to move in the month of July.

I appreciate most sincerely the remarks of the able Senator from Georgia.

I believe we have a special case, not because Lowry Field happens to be in my area, but because the circumstances speak for themselves. In view of the fact that the Titan missile base will be operational in June, the need for moving ahead on the 200 units authorized is urgent.

Mr. RUSSELL. Of course, the bill provided for 135 additional units for Lowry, which would have made a total of 335.

Mr. CARROLL. I would be glad to have the conferees agree to include the 135 additional units but the immediate concern is for the 200 units.

Mr. RUSSELL. That subject is one which we shall have to discuss in conference.

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

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield to the Senator from California.

Mr. KUCHEL. If the Senator from Georgia will permit me, I should like to make a brief factual statement and then ask a question with respect to one item in the bill.

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. KUCHEL. I speak in support of the item of $8,763,000 recommended by the executive branch of the Government and by the U.S. Navy for a new naval hospital in Long Beach, Calif.

In 1942, when we were engaged in war, the Federal Government authorized the construction in Long Beach of a great naval hospital. It well served the health needs of the military during the war. At the conclusion of the war, and in 1950, the Secretary of Defense made an order transferring jurisdiction of the naval hospital at Long Beach to the Veterans' Administration. Military installations were being cut back and vessels were being decommissioned and placed in moth balls. Men on active duty were being sent back to civilian life, and it was deemed by the head of our Defense Establishment that the naval hospital there was no longer necessary for military personnel on active duty and their dependents. But the needs of American veterans were, of course, increasing. And thus the hospital and its facilities were transferred to the jurisdiction of the Veterans' Administration. It, too, through the intervening years has served well the veterans of American wars.

In 1954, a need for additional facilities for the paraplegic veterans of World War II and the Korean conflict arose, and together with other Senators, I urged the

Senate Appropriations Committee to consider an amendment providing a $8 million appropriation to enlarge the Long Beach Veterans' Hospital to take care of those who had given their limbs in the service of their country during World War II and in Korea.

In May of 1954 the Senate approved that amendment, and sent it to the House. Subsequently it became law.

The veterans' hospital at Long Beach, which formerly was a naval hospital, then commenced a program of construction. As a result, I think it is fair to say that today the gallant soldiers, sailors, and airmen who are paraplegics have better care available in that city in the State from which I come than otherwise would be the case.

The executive branch of the Government has now recommended that a new naval hospital be authorized for construction at Long Beach, in response to the urgent request of the Navy that such be done.

Long Beach has the third largest concentration of United States naval vessels of any area in the continental United States. There are 112 U.S. naval vessels in commission which call Long Beach their home port. There are 180,000 naval and military personnel and their dependents in that area. Their health needs, under the law, require, as I see it, our approval of the request made by the excutive branch.

I was delighted to see the recommendations of the executive branch receive first the approval of the House Committee on Armed Services and then the approval of the House of Representatives itself.

I share the respect and the high esteem that other Senators have indicated today for the able chairman of the committee, the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] and those on both sides of the aisle who serve under him. That respect is shared by all Senators.

But to my able colleague and friend I must say I believe in this instance an error has been made; I believe the Armed Services Committee was wrong in deleting this item which the House had approved. The words that I use in the floor of the Senate today are spoken to the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services and his colleagues and not to the Senate as a whole, for it is to them, their judgment and their fairness, that I make this appeal.

I most respectfully ask whether or not my friend from Georgia and his colleagues on the forthcoming conference committee will reevaluate and reconsider the recommendation of the Navy Department and of the executive branch of the Government and of the position of the House of Representatives in conference, so that, in that fashion, justice, as I see it, may be done to 180,000 American citizens, most of whom serve our Government in the uniform of the U.S. Navy, together with their dependents.

I most respectfully ask the able Senator if he and his Senate conferees will reexplore in conference the wisdom of the executive branch as concurred in by the House of the recommendation for a new naval hospital at Long Beach.

Mr. RUSSELL. The graciousness of the distinguished Senator from California is enough to soften me and the entire Senate Committee on Armed Services considerably to entertain any request that he might make.

This is the first year a hospital at Long Beach was suggested or that we had any indication one was needed. The subject was presented to us as one of the largest hospitals that have been contemplated for a number of years. There are other facilities in the area.

The young men whom the Senator discusses as being likely patients in such a hospital, most of them members of the U.S. Navy, are probably the healthiest group percentagewise that there is on earth. Some hospital facilities are available on their ships. The Navy has a number of fine doctors. Some vessels have considerable hospital facilities.

We would not knowingly work any hardship on any of the personnel of our armed services or their dependents and, of course, we shall give the subject very careful consideration in conference with the other body. The committee was not adamant that a hospital should not be built at that location. We felt that it was one of the items that might be carried over for another year without causing any great disruption or hardship in our military services.

Mr. KUCHEL. I can understand the thinking of the chairman and the members of the committee. I must say that a question is quite logical: Why did the Government transfer jurisdiction of a naval hospital to the Veterans' Administration? I think with the background of facts, however, the decision to transfer is understandable.

On behalf of my colleague and myself, I repeat that in our judgment there is a justification for a naval hospital at Long Beach for the men who are on active military duty at this time and their dependents.

Mr. RUSSELL. I thank my friend very much.

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

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. ENGLE. The distinguished chairman of the Committee on Armed Services gave very careful and patient consideration to the problem of the Long Beach Hospital. The chairman and other members of the committee have been concerned about the fact that hospitals are scattered around numerous areas and in separate services; and each service insists upon its own hospital and does not use other hospitals.

The question was raised in the Committee on Armed Services as to why the Navy gave away a hospital of 1,000 in 1950 and now wants the Government to build a new one for $9½ million.

I thought the inquiry was pertinent, and I asked the Navy to come up with a pretty good answer as to how circumstances had changed between 1950 and the present time so as to justify the Government in building a hospital costing that amount of money, after the Navy gave away a hospital at that location in 1950. The Navy came up with a piece of paper and a pretty lame explanation. Navy representatives told me confidentially and off the record that they never did concur in the decision, which the Secretary of Defense told them they had to make. I told them whether they liked it or not, the decision made in the Defense Department amounted to a finding that there was not a military requirement for that hospital in 1950.

Of course, they could not say very much about their disagreement with them. However, they were asked to please come up with a statement as to what hospitals are available in the area in other services which could be used for this 500-bed requirement of the Navy; in addition, they were asked to explain why they believe the hospital facilities which they had used since 1950 and up to the present time are not adequate now.

They supplied a memorandum on that subject which I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

REQUIREMENT FOR U.S. NAVAL HOSPITAL, LONG BEACH, CALIF.

During the late 1940's, because of the large reductions in the force levels of the Navy which had taken place over the years following World War II, the Navy had to reduce the number of its operating bases on the west coast. At that time, the decision was made to reduce the level of operations in the Long Beach area. The Naval Air Station at Reeves Field was closed; the shipyard operation was greatly reduced in scope; and the number of ships based at Long Beach was greatly reduced. As a result, the Navy no longer had a valid requirement for a large hospital in the Long Beach area.

Therefore, the naval hospital which had been built during World War II, largely of temporary construction was, by executive decision, turned over to the Veterans' Administration in February 1950, to obviate the need for construction of a new Veterans' Hospital in the area.

In June 1950, the Korean conflict started. During the subsequent buildup of naval forces incident to the Korean war it was necessary to reestablish Long Beach as a major fleet base. Force levels in the Pacific since the war have required continued use of Long Beach as a major fleet base.

However, since the former Navy hospital had been turned over to the Veterans' Administration, required material support to fleet personnel is not now available.

The Navy has a responsibility for medical care in the Long Beach area for approximately 102,500 active and retired military personnel and their dependents, as follows:

Active	36,000
Active dependents	22,900
Retired	21,800
Retired dependents	21,800

Additionally, 3,400 Army and 5,900 Air Force service personnel are stationed in the area and require medical support. The only military medical facilities at Long Beach are the U.S.S. *Haven* and the naval station dispensary. The Army facility at Fort MacArthur is 12 miles away.

Inpatient care is provided for 36,000 active naval personnel in the U.S.S. *Haven*, a hospital ship with 421-bed capacity, designed for combat fleet use, totally inadequate for

peacetime use as a substitute hospital, and scheduled for inactivation in 1964, due to obsolescence. Patients requiring extended treatment are transferred by ambulance to the naval hospital at Camp Pendleton or at San Diego.

Although the primary concern of the Navy is and must be for its active duty personnel, a secondary and vital concern relates to its retired personnel. Outpatient care is provided to active duty and retired personnel and their dependents in the naval station dispensary. Such care at civilian institutions is not authorized under medicare. Fort MacArthur provides 14 beds for inpatient care of dependents. Dependents of active-duty personnel only are eligible for inpatient care under medicare. The 21,800 dependents of retired personnel are not eligible for medicare, but receive inpatient care at a military hospital. The nearest military hospitals of adequate size are naval hospitals at Camp Pendleton, 74 miles away, and at San Diego, 102 miles away.

Construction of the proposed 500-bed hospital will also permit the closing of the Fort MacArthur Hospital, and will provide for care of Air Force patients formerly referred to March Air Force Base, 65 miles from Long Beach. Obstetrical care for dependents is not included and medicare will continue to provide this service.

ADDITIONAL JUSTIFICATION FOR U.S. NAVAL HOSPITAL, LONG BEACH, CALIF.

In response to your request of April 26, 1961 the following additional information in support of the Navy's requirement for a naval hospital at Long Beach, Calif., is provided:

1. A summary of all military medical support facilities and their workloads in the Long Beach area indicating conditions as of April 1961 is appended as enclosure (1).

2. A summary of all civilian medical support facilities and their workloads in the immediate Long Beach area indicating conditions as of August 1960 is appended as enclosure (2).

3. The U.S.S. *Haven* is a most unfortunate solution to an important problem and, at best, can be considered as only a temporary expedient for the present lack of anything better. The ship was originally laid down as a tanker but was converted to a hospital ship to meet pressing wartime demands. By providing four-tier bunks, the ship could evacuate in excess of 700 battle casualties from the combat zone, administer to the wounded while en route to continental United States, and upon arrival, transfer the casualties to a shore-based hospital for advanced treatment. *Haven*, however, is patently unsuited to serve as a peacetime hospital. The ship essentially remains as an evacuation ship, notwithstanding the fact that four-tier bunks have been temporarily reduced to two. The arrangement of spaces peculiar to ship construction and stability criteria impose severe limitations on the operation of the ship as a hospital, a purpose for which it was never designed. In the sense that a hospital ship is a seagoing ambulance, it is not properly equipped, arranged, nor designed to render the kind and degree of medical support which is best provided by a shore-based facility.

The material condition of U.S.S. *Haven* (AH–12) is such that the ship should not be continued in service beyond 1964 as an interim hospital without an extensive overhaul. Such an overhaul would require inactivation of the hospital for at least three months, and when completed, would have served only to return the ship to a satisfactory material condition. The basic character of the ship and its limitations as a medical facility would remain unchanged.

Minimal overhaul and repairs costing about $128,000 were completed 2 years ago. Remaining repairs estimated to cost $508,000 were not done due to lack of funds. Repairs proved to be a slow, tedious process because, in lieu of a normal overhaul, the alterations were done piecemeal, compartment by compartment, in order that the hospital might continue to function. These alterations corrected many leaks in fire mains, ventilating ducts, and other piping in *Haven*. Minor alterations including cutting doors to improve access have been done with some sacrifice in the watertight integrity of the ship which was initially a tanker hull. The fire and flushing system is seriously fouled with marine growth. The fresh water system is badly deteriorated and requires continuous and excessive maintenance to keep the system in operation. Vent ducts lack adequate access openings for cleaning and have no provision for filters, even in the surgical operating spaces. Considerable active corrosion is in evidence in various compartments, particularly the angle irons near decks adjacent to the hull. This corrosion has been accelerated by the high humidity in many spaces due to improper ventilation for 2 years. Corrosion was also noted behind the lagging on ventilating ducts which are harbingers of serious and extensive alterations for the future. In view of the active corrosion in various parts of the shell and the fact that a great part of the ship machinery spaces is still inactivated, the commanding officer was asked to install flooding alarms in all bilges to prevent accidental flooding of *Haven* with possible sinking at its present berthing. The *Haven* must remain at one of the active fleet berths in order that it can receive logistics support from the pier as it is completely dependent upon the firefighting facilities of the shipyard and immediate adjacent ships.

The Navy has received criticism for having "given" its former hospital to the Veterans' Administration after the Navy's need for it declined in the years following World War II. The Navy would like to point out that we did not give the Long Beach hospital to the Veterans' Administration. By Executive decision, this facility was turned over to the VA in February 1950 to obviate the need for construction of a new VA hospital in the area.

This hospital was originally built largely of temporary construction. It is understood that approximately 2 years ago the VA replaced 561 beds and installed a new surgical suite and physical therapy spaces at a cost of $8 million; is asking for an additional $1 million in fiscal year 1962; and plans to request another $8 million in fiscal year 1965 to complete the replacement and renewal program.

Military medical support of all services around Long Beach, April 1961

	Normal bed capacity	Current operating beds	Average patient load, calendar year 1960	Distance from Long Beach
Hospital ship: U.S.S. *Haven*	421	300	229	0
Hospitals:				
Army hospital, Fort MacArthur	85	60	33	12
Navy hospital, Camp Pendleton (temporary)	1,004	600	489	74
Navy hospital, San Diego	1,891	1,750	1,390	102
March Air Force Base	176	95	79	65
Norton Air Force Base	125	80	51	73
George Air Force Base	110	50	28	105
Edwards Air Force Base	63	45	34	156
Station hospitals:				
Marine Corps Supply Center, Barstow	30	20	13	114
Station hospitals—Continued				
Marine Corps Air Station, El Toro	29	30	26	38
Naval Ordnance Test Station, China Lake	60	10	9	206
Naval Construction Battalion Center, Port Hueneme (temporary)	172	25	21	93
Dispensary with beds:				
Naval Air Station, Los Alamitos	44	5	3	11
Dispensary without beds:				
Naval Stations, Long Beach	0	0	0	0
Ammunition and Net Depot, Seal Beach	0	0	0	9

Civilian hospitals, Long Beach area: Civilian hospitals located within 15 miles or 30 minutes' driving time, whichever is greater, from the proposed facility, August 1960

	Normal bed capacity	Average daily census	Type of service
Long Beach:			
Bixby Knolls General	41	25	General.
Harriman Jones Clinic and Hospital	48	33	Do.
Long Beach Community	194	131	Do.
Long Beach General	414	357	Tuberculosis.
Long Beach Hospital (corporation) (not accredited).	41	25	General.
St. Mary's, Long Beach	272	236	Do.
Seaside Memorial [1]	316	258	Do.
Veterans' Administration	1,500	1,354	Do.
Adjacent areas:			
San Pedro (9 miles), San Pedro community	105	75	General.
Compton (9 miles), Compton Sanitarium	115	83	Psychiatric.
Torrance (10 miles):			
Jared Sidney Torrance Memorial	96	67	General.
Los Angeles County Harbor General	715	502	Do.
Lynwood (10 miles), St. Francis	387	332	Do.

[1] Replacement under construction.

Mr. ENGLE. The import of the explanation is that on the first point, what is available—there are about 576 beds available in other military hospitals; and I have made the chart a part of the RECORD. Some of them are at some distance from Long Beach. There are also a number of beds in civilian hospitals, which are also available. I am not able to determine how much of a cushion these hospitals require under normal operation, or to what extent a distance of 102 miles in one instance or 105 miles in another instance would make the use of a military hospital infeasible.

In line with the statement made by my colleague, the senior Senator from California, I should like respectfully to suggest a very careful consideration by the Senate conferees of this subject matter, and to request that they take a good hard look at the figures to see whether or not these people have come up with an adequate justification to show that there are not bed facilities now available in other service hospitals close enough to take care of the military needs of the Navy.

On the second point, with respect to the U.S.S. *Haven*——

Mr. RUSSELL. I overlooked that. They have a hospital ship that is being used, and that will be available until 1965. That is another thing the committee took into consideration.

Mr. ENGLE. That is true. The exact date they gave in the memorandum is that it should not be continued in service beyond 1964 as an interim hospital without extensive overhaul. Their memorandum says that if something is not done it will either sink or roll over. I assume it will last until 1964. In any case, they go on to point out that this naval ship is not a very good place for a hospital because it is small and crowded and not adequate.

As I see the situation, it all boils down to the fact that the time is coming when the vessel will either roll over or sink. As a consequence, eventually we will have to come up with some new hospital facilities for the Navy. I leave that to the very able consideration and the very considerate judgment of our conferees, because in their consideration of this matter they have, as the chairman has indicated, not been adamant, but merely wanted to know why the facilities were required at this time.

Mr. RUSSELL. I am glad the Senator has put his material in the RECORD, because we want to go into this matter with the utmost care. We will see what can be done. Of course, I do not understand how the Navy is able to be so sure in picking the very year when a vessel will roll over or sink. We have had an old Spanish cruiser, which was captured in the Spanish-American War, tied up at the Naval Academy at Annapolis for 60 years. It has not rolled over or sunk. It is being used as quarters for enlisted personnel at the Naval Academy, and has been used for that whole period of time.

We will go thoroughly into the subject in conference. I do not think there is any question that there will be a need for additional naval hospital facilities in this area at some time in the future. There is some question as to the need for this larger hospital in the light of other hospital facilities being available.

Mr. KUCHEL. I should like to have the Chairman's permission and the permission of the Senate to place in the RECORD several communications which I have received on this subject. I urge the very able Senator from Georgia once again to study the figures, because I believe the limit of availability and the limit of capacity of the U.S.S. *Haven* does not make it a competent facility for the personnel who need to use it. The record apparently indicates that in 1964 the *Haven* will require extensive overhaul, which will be expensive. Its use by dependents of military personnel is restricted. I urge the Senator once again to give this item the fair consideration for which he is noted.

Mr. RUSSELL. We will be glad to give it careful scrutiny.

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

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

LONG BEACH, CALIF.

Hon. THOMAS KUCHEL,
Senator from California,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Flabbergasted by Senate Armed Services Committee action deleting Long Beach Naval Hospital funds. Would appreciate your correction of reported erroneous impressions and underscoring totally inadequate facilities of *Haven*.

KENNETH W. MCLAREN,
President, Long Beach Council,
Navy League of the United States.

FLEET RESERVE ASSOCIATION,
Washington, D.C., April 29, 1961.

Hon. THOMAS H. KUCHEL,
Senator from California,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: The discouraging and disheartening news item appearing in yesterday's Los Angeles Times stating "The Senate Armed Services Committee Thursday rejected the Navy's request for authorization of a new 500-bed hospital in Long Beach, Calif." It is hard to understand why a majority of this committee was not convinced of the need for a naval hospital in this area since it is obvious the Navy would not request it if it was not urgently needed. This article implies that particularly the committee acted as it did since a 1,000-bed naval hospital in Long Beach was turned over to the Veterans' Administration because it was not needed. This was not the reason this hospital was turned over to the Veterans' Administration in Long Beach.

As the national authorized representative of the Fleet Reserve Association in the northern section of the 11th Naval District (Garden Grove north to and including Santa Barbara) I spent 3½ months on doing research trying to find out the real reason why this hospital was transferred to the Veterans' Administration. I received many different stories, one blaming Congressman DOYLE. The story that rang true however, was the VA had requested a hospital in California in addition to the many they had. They wanted this hospital north of Los Angeles, they did not want the Naval Hospital on Seventh Street, Long Beach. However, on a compromise they agreed to accept the Naval Hospital, and the career naval personnel lost out. Subsequently they also lost the naval hospital at Corona, Calif.

There are thousands of naval career veterans and their dependents living in this area who were promised in shipping articles they signed, drawn up in contractual form, when they first entered the naval service, "That if they served honorably for a period of 30 years they would be entitled to retired pay and in addition receive medical and hospital care for yourself and dependents as long as you live.

There are only two real naval hospitals in California, one in Oak Knoll, Calif., 420 miles north and one in San Diego 130 miles south of Los Angeles. Neither of these hospitals are of much benefit to the veterans in the area mentioned above. These veterans have been pleading and fighting for this hospital for over 5 years. Many that I know personnally have suffered very much because they have no hospital to go to.

Will you please do everything possible you can to get this hospital started? These naval career veterans have been waiting patiently for a long time for a hospital near enough to their homes so that they could receive proper treatment if they needed it. There is no other single thing they will tell you they desire more.

Respectfully yours,

PHILIP G. CRONAN,
National Treasurer Emeritus.

FLEET RESERVE ASSOCIATION,
Washington, D.C., May 5, 1961.

Hon. THOMAS H. KUCHEL,
U.S. Senate,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR KUCHEL: I have just learned that the Senate in their report, Senate Report No. 200, page 6, dated May 3, 1961, deleted, among other items, the funds requested by the Navy Department for a 500-bed hospital in the Long Beach-San Pedro area.

There is an urgent need for more adequate hospital facilities for Navy and Marine Corps personnel and their dependents in this area. I hope we may count on your support in insuring that this worthy item is again inserted in this appropriation bill when the Senate and House conferees meet.

Respectfully,

FRED J. SCANLAN.

LONG BEACH, CALIF., *April 30, 1961.*

MY DEAR SENATOR: I hope you will do your utmost to see that appropriations are restored for a naval hospital for this city. Over 10,000 naval families need the services of this hospital and the reasons given for removing it from the list by the Senate Appropriations Committee are ridiculous.

We need the services of the hospital very much.

Yours sincerely,

M. W. GRAYBILL.

INDEPENDENT BUSINESS
MEN'S ASSOCIATION
OF GREATER LONG BEACH, INC.,
Long Beach, Calif., May 1, 1961.

Hon. THOMAS H. KUCHEL,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR KUCHEL: We urgently request your attention to the naval hospital proposed for Long Beach, Calif. A recent newspaper item leads us to believe that this facility might be abandoned and we are greatly disturbed.

As you know there was a Navy hospital in Long Beach, but at no time did the Navy approve release of that institution. It is now operated by the Veterans' Administration which is doing a splendid job with every bed occupied and a waiting list. This change was due to an administration order to cut back.

Now there is even a greater need for a Navy hospital in Long Beach because of the increased Navy personnel homeported in

Long Beach. As a matter of fact the need for care in a hospital is easily five times that of 10 years ago and it will increase rapidly as the Navy population grows in Long Beach.

Will you please direct your effort to the end that there shall be a Navy hospital built and operated in Long Beach.

Respectfully,

PAUL R. RIOTH,
President.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I wish to call the Senator's attention to an item on page 4 of the bill which was deleted by the Senate committee. It deals with the Redstone Arsenal, Ala.; for research, development, and test facilities, $5,038,000.

I may say that my colleague from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], who is now on an important mission overseas, and I are very much interested in this item. As the Senator knows, this project is to provide the capability for the Army Ballistic Missile Agency to effectively perform its essential military mission, which involves the planning, directing, guiding, and evaluation of contractors' development of ballistic missile systems needed by the Army. At present, the principal development effort is being concentrated in the Pershing, Sergeant, and Little John missile systems and several future weapons, with continuing development and support effort being expended in the Jupiter, Redstone, Honest John, and Corporal missile systems now in the hands of troops.

To provide the needed space for ABMA, serious consideration was given to displacing certain Ordnance Guided Missile School functions located at Redstone Arsenal to another location. This is impractical because it would involve a multi-million-dollar requirement including duplication of certain training equipment and possible degradation of essential ordnance military training. Such a move would also deprive the staff and faculty of the school of the benefits of intimate contact with development personnel.

Second. The critical facilities shortage, which this project seeks to alleviate, was generated directly by the transfer to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration on July 1, 1960, of all modern missile laboratory facilities, used by ABMA. These total approximately 1.5 million square feet. To replace this loss, this project provides ABMA only 187,300 square feet of laboratory space for the execution of its continuing and essential mission in development of military missile weapon systems.

Third. This work is now being done as far as practicable in World War II barracks, quonset huts, warehouses, and obsolete ammunition loading lines which are basically unsuitable for scientific and technical development work.

Fourth. In addition to the loss of morale of the scientific and technical personnel displaced from the modern laboratories transferred to NASA, the lack of an efficient consolidated laboratory will result in continuous inefficiency in existing buildings used on a "make do" basis. Further crowding, dispersal of activities, loss in operational effectiveness of ABMA and increased costs will result. This must ultimately be reflected in a delay in missile progress and in a degradation in quality of weaponry.

Fifth. This facility will enable ABMA to perform its essential mission of planning, technically guiding, administering, and evaluating missile system development by R. & D. contractors. No capacity is planned or provided for Government manufacture of missiles. Technical laboratories are required for three main purposes:

(a) To accomplish such advanced studies of feasibility and applicability of scientific principles and techniques to specific weapons projects as are essential to define and direct the developments contractors activity.

(b) To test and evaluate components, assemblies, and systems at appropriate stages of development and furnish advanced technical guidance to contractors in their missile development efforts.

(c) To maintain as an element of the foregoing activities, laboratory experience and competency of essential scientific staff in the state of the art to insure capable scientific direction and evaluation of development contracts.

I wish to say to my distinguished, longtime friend from Georgia, that I know how able he is and how fair he is and how thorough and how painstaking he is, and that I know that no man could be more devoted to the defense and security of our country than he.

The chairman and the distinguished Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS], have given much time and thought and study to the subject of military construction. The Senator from Mississippi is also very fair, as is my good friend the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], the ranking minority member of the committee, who has been a member of the committee for a long time. In fact, I had the honor of serving with the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts and the distinguished Senator from Georgia. I know how able they are and how thorough they are, and I know how they always desire to do that which is best for the defense and security of our country. I commend this project to their honest, careful, and sympathetic consideration of the item when it comes up for consideration in the conference committee.

Mr. RUSSELL. I appreciate the Senator's compliment. I hope we may deserve it. I should have tied the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] in these halls, but I am afraid that they have already surrendered without discussing it from the standpoint of the Senate.

I have great sympathy for the Redstone Arsenal, particularly for the Army, in the missile field. The Army has not received the credit which its great contribution to missilery demands. The Army did the first research and made the first breakthrough. The Army's basic research has been utilized by the other services, in all the success that followed. My sympathy is for the Army.

However, a great many buildings have been built in recent years at Redstone Arsenal and NASA has moved in and taken over most of the new ones. We at least wanted the dust to settle before we authorized this building, which is a rather expensive one.

This work is now being done in a number of small buildings. Undoubtedly it would be more effective if all the activities were consolidated under one roof, if the cost of consolidation were not prohibitive.

I assure the distinguished Senator from Alabama that I have been informed in detail as to the activities of Redstone Arsenal since the Senate took this action, and that, in conjunction with the other members of the committee, I shall give very careful consideration to the item in the conference with the other body.

Mr. HILL. I thank the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, may I inquire if the distinguished Senator from Georgia has finished his presentation?

Mr. RUSSELL. I have.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I offer an amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment to the amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 62, in the committee amendment, beginning with line 9, it is proposed to strike out all through the period in line 11.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, my amendment is to eliminate an authorization of $3,812,000 for the purpose of transferring the Food and Container Institute, at present located in Chicago, to Natick, Mass.

In the report which the House Committee on Armed Services submitted, the same authorization was contained. There was a debate on the floor of the House, however, and the amendment was defeated by a vote of 267 to 145. In its place, there was substituted section 108, which authorized the expenditure of $10,000 for an impartial study to determine whether the Food and Container Institute should be transferred; and if so, where. The House of Representatives rejection of the committee's proposal was unusual and we can be sure the House took that action only in response to overwhelming evidence.

The amendment which I have offered would strike out the direct authorization for $3,812,000 which the Senate committee has put back in the bill, and would allow the House language to prevail in conference.

I always try to take a national point of view, and not a parochial attitude, on these issues. On occasions when installations in Illinois have been closed, and I have believed it was in the national interest that they should be closed, I have made no objection. In other cases, when it seemed to be in the national interest to transfer an installation or a facility from Illinois to some other State, I have made no objection. It is only because I think this authorization for $3,812,000 is not in the national interest that I oppose it.

The Food and Container Institute, with its predecessors, has been operating in Chicago for almost 40 years. In its present form, it has been operating for 15 years. A very competent staff of approximately 300 persons has been built

up. They are skilled in food research and container research. They have sunk their roots deeply into this region. It is now proposed to break up this organization and transfer the facility to Natick, Mass., with some inevitable loss of personnel, variously estimated at between 35 and 70 percent.

The proposal contains a number of very extraordinary features. First, when plans were made in 1952 for the creation and expansion of the Quartermaster's facility at Natick, Mass., some of us felt that this was a prelude to the transfer of the Food and Container Institute. We made inquiries of the Department of the Army and received assurances from the Secretary of the Army that no such transfer was contemplated.

Last year an attempt of an identical nature was made. Objections were made by Representative YATES and other Members of the House and by me. As a result, no action was taken. The effort of the Army has been renewed again this year. They never give up.

On the very face of things, this is an uneconomic transfer. The Middle West, not Massachusetts or New England, is the center of the food industries of the country. I was born in Massachusetts; I grew up in New England. I have great affection for that region of the country. It is beautiful country, but it has never been noted as a great producer of food commodities. We all like baked beans. We all appreciate codfish. We know that Massachusetts cranberries are excellent. However, I think these items, exhaust the list of food products which Massachusetts and New England have contributed to the diet of the Nation.

The Midwest is the center of the livestock industry. It is the center of wheat, corn, soybeans, and the feed grains. It is the dairy center of the country. Certainly, it is closer to citrus fruits than Massachusetts. In general, the Midwest is the breadbasket of America. Chicago is the center of the Midwest. Until recently we have been the center of the livestock industry. Although Chicago has suffered losses in recent months, much slaughtering is still carried on there. Chicago is also the center of the candy industry. It is, I believe, the center of the container industry. So we have in Chicago the broad industrial base upon which any research institute should be built.

We appreciate the excellence of the educational institutions around the city of Boston. We have no words of disparagement for them. However, there are excellent educational institutions in Chicago, as well. One of those institutions, the Illinois Institute of Technology, which is certainly a very fine research and teaching organization, has made offers to house the present Food and Container Institute on its grounds. It is admitted by all hands that the present location of the Food and Container Institute, in a large five- or six-story building of the southwest side of Chicago, is not an economic location. It is a former warehouse which has been converted to its present purposes. It is probably true that a more efficient location could be found elsewhere. What we say is that there is no evidence to indicate that Natick, Mass., is the most efficient point of location.

The Army in general and the Quartermaster Corps in particular have not given to the Illinois Institute of Technology and to the affected groups in Chicago a fair chance to make alternative bids. Last year the Illinois Institute of Technology asked the Army to make available the specifications for the building which the Army wanted constructed, so that the people at Illinois Tech might make a bid. That information was denied them. From time to time we have asked the Army to furnish these specifications, so the Illinois Institute or any other group, anywhere in the country, might have an opportunity to bid; and we were willing to abide by the results of those bids. But such opportunity has always been denied. In March, the Chicago Association of Commerce made such a request; but no reply was received. Representative YATES has again and again asked for specifications. At an extraordinary hearing which the Army convened in Chicago, on March 31, and I hold in my hand a copy of the transcript made at that hearing which after much effort I finally obtained—Representative Yates again asked that the specifications be made public. Senators who read the transcript made at that meeting will find that it is clear that, once again, that request was denied.

I do not know that there is anything of a secret or high-security character about a food research institute or a container institute.

No great secrets of national security are involved. But the Army refuses, and says it is going to transfer the Institute, and that it will be cheaper if it is transferred to Natick. The Army does not give those in other parts of the country any opportunity whatever to bid. I say that is highhanded and arbitrary, and I regret that such a plan is being carried through. They do their deeds in darkness and shun the light.

I attach no blame whatever to the distinguished chairman of the Armed Services Committee. In the face of a very insistent Army and a very determined Quartermaster Corps, I suppose the committee did what was inevitable. But I think that was a very arbitrary procedure.

Now I shall say something that ordinarily I do not say, but I think it needs to be said in this instance. I do not believe in attacking public officials, and I am not doing so now. But the man who has been most insistent upon making this change is the Assistant Secretary for Research and Development, one Richard S. Morse. Mr. Morse has been quite vehement in his telephone conversations with the Illinois Institute of Technology and with my office; in fact, vehemence is an understatement. On occasion, his language has verged very close to insulting; and he was so vehement and so determined and so condemnatory of our efforts to get at the facts that I felt I should look up Mr. Morse's record.

If Senators will examine the 1960–61 edition of Who's Who in America, on page 2073, they will find the biography of Mr. Richard S. Morse, as submitted by himself.

He was, first, president of the Minute Maid Corp., beginning in 1944; president of the National Research Corporation Equipment Corp.; a director of the Vaculite Corp.; and a director of similar affiliated organizations. If Senators will turn to Moody & Poor's Manual, they will find a very thorough description of those companies. The Minute Maid Corp. is the leading producer of frozen citrus juices, and it produced a number of similar products. The Vaculite Co. produces containers. The National Research Corporation Equipment Corp., a subsidiary of the National Research Corp.—indeed, it is wholly owned by it—produces high-vacuum equipment. It would be very convenient for those organizations to have the Food Research Institute or the Container Institute transferred to Natick, Mass., so it would be close at hand.

The headquarters of those companies are on Memorial Drive, in Cambridge, Mass.; and when Mr. Morse was a civilian, his office was located there.

I am informed that Mr. Morse is to leave the Government on approximately June 1. I do not know what his future plans will be. But it is quite possible that he may return to the companies whence he came.

I have previously stated that to conduct research on food in Massachusetts is equivalent to conducting research on tropical diseases in Alaska, or to developing cures for frostbite in Florida. On the fact of it, this is an uneconomic expenditure of funds.

Even though the Illinois Institute of Technology was deprived of the specifications upon which it could make a detailed bid, and was refused them, it has made a tentative estimate that, on the basis of a similar building, it could construct a building containing 150,000 square feet—which is the approximate amount of space the Army says it wants to develop at Natick—for $3,500,000, or about $23 a square foot, instead of the $3,812,000 authorized by the bill. Therefore, there is no indication that any economy would be effected by the proposed transfer. On the contrary, there is every indication that there would be losses—losses in the building itself; losses from the breakup of a skilled staff, which necessarily will be decimated by the transfer; losses from transferring this work from the area of the country where food is grown extensively and canned, to an area of the country where very little food is grown; in fact, the other area is relatively isolated from the mainstream of activity in this particular branch.

Mr. President, that is all I wish to say. I submit that, on the basis of those facts, we should return to the House language and authorize an expenditure of $10,000 for a nonpartisan study. With the departure of Mr. Morse from Government service, it is quite possible that in the future we may get a more dispassionate study of this matter than has occurred up to date.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will my colleague yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I associate myself with the observations made by my distinguished senior colleague. I have taken note of this question on other occasions, and realize we are confronted with a $3,810,000 appropriation. Far be it for me to reflect on members of the task force or the advisory committee which made the report. In all candor, though the report favored the transfer, I point out that those people are located in Chicago. There has been no reflection on the efficiency of the work done. The scientific talent in Chicago certainly would equal, if not exceed, that at Natick. By transferring the facility, those who have been doing the work would be discommoded. Whether there would be greater efficiency as a result of the transfer is a question.

I certainly concur in what the Senator has said, and will support the amendment of my colleague.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, this is one of the unfortunate questions that arise from a conflict between a State that has a facility of the Department of Defense, and one that will receive it if the recommendations of the Department are adhered to. I, of course, have no technical training that would enable me to weigh all the facts involved in this controversy and arrive at an independent decision. I do wish to say, in passing, that I deplore and condemn any position of the Department of Defense in failing to furnish to any Member of the Congress, of either party, any information with reference to the laboratory.

The two distinguished Senators from Illinois have delayed this transfer for an exceedingly long period of time. This issue arose first back in 1950, 1951, or 1952, when some part of the facility was established at Natick. The issue was discussed on the floor of the Senate. Substantial effort has been made by the Department of Defense on other occasions to commit the removal of these facilities to Natick, Mass. Each time the move has been proposed, it has wound up with a survey. I do not know of any issue in the Department of Defense that has been surveyed with more different task forces or with more regularity than the proposal to remove the Food and Container Research Institute from Chicago to Natick. It has been studied by task forces, and by the Secretary of the Army, and by the Secretary of Defense, in both Republican and Democratic administrations, and in both Republican and Democratic administrations the report to our committee has been that it was in the interest of economy and efficiency to consolidate all the services at Natick, Mass.

With that testimony before us, the committee had no alternative, as a faithful servant of the Senate, than to report that issue to the Senate. All kinds of reports have been made as to vast savings that would accrue. The Army stated it would start by saving $1,100,000 a year. The General Accounting Office was not quite so optimistic, but the General Accounting Office concluded that for the first 7 years it would save $250,000, and after that there would be a saving of $1 million.

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

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. We admit that there would be savings in a new building as compared with the present building. We do not deny that. What we say is that a new building conforming to the specifications, if we could find out what they are, built in Chicago, could save as much, if not more, money.

What we have been trying to do is to get the Army to give us and other regions in the country the specifications and the opportunity to bid. If, for example, Minneapolis should come forward with a cheaper bid, we would be willing to have the facility go to Minneapolis. Or if it should be found that Atlanta, Ga., had a better bid than Chicago, we would be willing to have still another facility, in addition to the large number of facilities already in the State of Georgia, go to that State. Or if Houston, Tex., made a satisfactory bid, we would be willing to have the facility in Texas. All we ask is that the Quartermaster Corps not be permitted to force the proposed transfer to Natick without other sections of the country having a chance to bid. That is all we ask. And if open bids are submitted in accordance with open specifications, we are confident that Chicago would win out. All we ask is fair play and not judgment by a biased kangaroo court.

Mr. RUSSELL. I did not limit the saving to the building. I have a letter from Dr. Herbert F. York, who has been the able and distinguished Director of the Defense Research and Engineering, and I should like to read this paragraph from the letter:

> The relocation of the Institute at Natick will mean that certain important technical facilities, such as the radiation facility, will be readily available for the work of the Institute, while in Chicago these facilities would have to be separately provided. Furthermore, Natick is the site of the main body of Quartermaster research facilities, and the relocation of the Food and Container Institute at Natick will result in considerable administrative economies, eliminating the duplication of plant and facilities as well as eliminating the need for 32 additional support personnel. The proposed relocation will also eliminate a substantial amount of travel between Chicago and Natick, and should expedite considerably the awarding of contracts, thereby shortening leadtime. By reason of such economies, I believe the cost of the additional construction will be amortized in approximately 3 years.

That is the advice of the man who was selected to advise the committee on this technical matter. In the absence of overwhelming evidence to the contrary, I do not see how the committee or the Senate can do other than to follow his advice.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Will the chairman permit me to make an observation?

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes, indeed.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The chairman has quoted the statement that there would be radiation facilities at Natick which would be lacking at Chicago. I remind the Department that the Argonne Laboratories, devoted to the peaceful use of atomic energy, are located just outside Chicago. The Armour Research Institute, which is an integral part of the Illinois Institute of Technology, has nuclear facilities. Pioneer work in the use of atomic energy on meats has been carried out in Chicago.

It may well be that the facility at Natick has a nuclear reactor, but certainly the facilities are no better than—and I would doubt whether they are equal to—the facilities at Chicago, and the distance is as great to travel from Chicago to Natick as it is from Natick to Chicago.

Mr. RUSSELL. I have a memorandum which has been furnished by the Army. I do not know of any reason why the Army should wish to take undue and unfair advantage of one State as against another. It is stated in the memorandum that the technical characteristics of the reactor at the station described by the Senator from Illinois, the Armour Research Institute, are not of the type which can be utilized in the Army food-irradiation program.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that subparagraphs (c) and (d) of the memorandum may be printed in the RECORD.

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

> (c) The technical characteristics of this reactor do not adapt it for the Army's needs in its food-irradiation program. This Armour research reactor was placed in operation in June 1956; has been in operation intermittently since that time with a maximum power level of 10 kilowatts, the originally maximum licensed power. Armour desired to increase the normal operating power level to the designed level of 50 kilowatts, and prepared the report referenced in 2b above for this purpose. Any representation that this reactor could supply the requisite radiation services needed by the Army's revised food-irradiation program would be either a complete distortion of fact or indicate a complete lack of knowledge of the technical requirements.
>
> (d) Armour Research Foundation is a well-qualified research organization for accomplishing research within its available facilities. During the past 8 years of the Army's food-irradiation program, Armour has been given three contracts in connection with the program. One contract, No. DA-49-007-ND-609, "Subacute Toxicity of Irradiated Foods," was for the period of 1955 and was with the Surgeon General. The food used in this study was irradiated at the General Electric Laboratory at Milwaukee, Wis., frozen and returned to the Armour Foundation for the experimental work. Another contract, with the QM, No. DA-19-129-QM-405, "Irradiation of Lipid-Protein Systems," was during 1956. The third contract, with the QM, No. DA-19-129-QM-1387, "Non-Chemical Methods of Enzyme Inactivation," was during 1959-60. The fact, however, that in the course of this program at least 150 other research foundations, universities, and industrial laboratories have participated in the contractual research would seem to indicate that Armour Research Foundation has not played a major role in the Army's program.

Mr. RUSSELL. I have served on the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy since it was created. I get lost in the bog in respect to work done at one of the atomic energy plants which cannot be done at another, but the scientists claim that is the case.

I have a letter from the Secretary of the Army, the Honorable Elvis J. Stahr, Jr., with reference to the House amendment. He says:

On Wednesday, March 22, the House amended the fiscal year 1962 military construction authorization bill (H.R. 5000) to strike out certain construction planned at Natick, Mass., for the Quartermaster Food and Container Institute. The amendment also directs further study of the relocation of that agency from its present quarters in the Chicago Administration Center.

This is an unfortunate development in a very important program which has been carefully thought out and is a positive move toward economy and efficiency in the Army.

The planned move from Chicago to Natick has been the subject of extremely careful review and analysis. Last year the Army proposal was studied by the Department of Defense, the Bureau of the Budget, and extensively by the General Accounting Office. In addition, a special subcommittee of the House Armed Services Committee was established to visit both sites and to determine the desirability of the proposed move. This subcommittee, with due consideration for the technical, managerial, and operational aspects, concluded that the move should be made, even were the costs at Chicago and Natick identical. The subcommittee concluded, in agreement with the Department of Defense, the Bureau of the Budget, and General Accounting Office studies that there would, in fact, be substantial savings. This is in addition to the important scientific advantages that will result from consolidating the Food and Container Institute with its parent organization in one location.

I continue to read the letter from Secretary Stahr:

The possibility of relocating the facility to the campus of Illinois Institute of Technology has been carefully considered as an alternative, in view of intense local interest in the facility. This alternative was not found to be desirable in that it presented none of the advantages which would accrue from relocating the Food and Container Institute to Natick. The Army has determined that even apart from economic considerations, good management demands the choice of Natick, in agreement with the findings of the House subcommittee.

Thus the Army's position in this matter is sound and has been reaffirmed by the most searching review. I hope you will do everything you can to assure final authorization for this construction and passage of the necessary appropriations at this session of Congress.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the letter written for Dr. Herbert F. York, the Director of Defense Research and Engineering, be printed in the RECORD.

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

DIRECTOR OF DEFENSE RESEARCH AND ENGINEERING,
Washington, D.C., April 12, 1961.

Senator RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
Chairman, Committee on Armed Services, U.S. Senate

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I have been advised that the Secretary of the Army has transmitted to you a study dealing with the feasibility and advisability of relocating in new quarters the Quartermaster Food and Container Institute now located in Chicago, Ill. H.R. 5000, the Military Construction Act of 1961, as passed by the House, provided for this study, and deleted the authorization requested by the Department of Defense for the construction of facilities for the Institute at Natick, Mass.

The study confirms the position of the Department of Defense that the Institute should be relocated in Natick, and this position has received the concurrence of the Advisory Board on Quartermaster Research and Development of the National Academy of Sciences-National Research Council, whose views on this question have been incorporated in the study pursuant to section 108 of H.R. 5000. As you are aware, this is only the latest of a number of such studies, and I strongly believe that the time they have consumed, which has already resulted in a longer delay in relocating this facility than was consistent with good management policy, makes it imperative that the relocation be effected as promptly as possible, and that the authorization for construction at Natick be restored in the present bill.

The relocation of the Institute at Natick will mean that certain important technical facilities, such as the radiation facility, will be readily available for the work of the Institute, while in Chicago these facilities would have to be separately provided. Furthermore, Natick is the site of the main body of Quartermaster research facilities, and the relocation of the Food and Container Institute at Natick will result in considerable administrative economies, eliminating the duplication of plant and facilities as well as eliminating the need for 32 additional support personnel. The proposed relocation will also eliminate a substantial amount of travel between Chicago and Natick, and should expedite considerably the awarding of contracts, thereby shortening leadtime. By reason of such economies, I believe the cost of the additional construction will be amortized in approximately 3 years.

Accordingly, I am strongly of the view that the relocation of the Food and Container Institute is urgently required, and I earnestly request that the authorization for construction be restored. If you wish any more detailed views on this subject, I shall of course be happy to provide them.

Sincerely,

JOHN H. RUBEL
(For Herbert F. York).

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

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I wish to make it clear that the Army has never permitted the Illinois Institute of Technology or any other group to know the specifications for the building, and the Illinois Institute of Technology has never been allowed to make a bid. Although the Institute has been completely shut out, it is said the facilities there are inadequate and not as good as those at Natick. How can it be said that is the case, unless there is an opportunity to bid?

We would like to see Detroit, Mich.; Atlanta, Ga.; Providence, R.I.; Houston, Tex.; Montgomery, Ala.; Jackson, Miss.; Oklahoma City, Okla.; or any other city given an opportunity to bid.

I am not saying, "Hold the Institute at Chicago." I am only saying, "Let us have all the facts" instead of providing, "It must go to Natick: the plans are top secret; nobody else will have an opportunity to look at them and nobody else will have an opportunity to bid."

That seems to me to be the height of arbitrary procedure, not on the part of the Senator from Georgia, but on the part of the Quartermaster Corps and on the part of the Secretary of the Army.

The truth of the matter is that those people made up their minds in 1952 that no matter what the evidence showed they were going to consolidate everything at Natick. That is what I feared at the time. At that time the Secretary of the Army and the Quartermaster General said there was no intention to move the Food and Container Institute. The same disclaimer was made in regard to the Clothing Institute. I believe that has been moved. What we see is "empire building" by the Quartermaster Corps.

It may well be that the cultural opportunities, to hear the Boston Symphony and to listen to the lectures at the Lowell Institute, are attractive to the highly cultured officers in the Quartermaster Corps. There are such opportunities at Chicago. Perhaps we should provide a season ticket to the Chicago Symphony, and we might throw in tickets for the ballet, in addition.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I congratulate the Senator from Illinois. He has shown an ability in regard to this facility which surpasses anything I have ever known to be shown by anyone else who was about to lose a facility.

I do not know that it is wise as a matter of fact to undertake to do all the research by letting it out to bid. In some instances we might be able to do that, but I doubt whether we could operate a laboratory with as wide a range as the one under consideration on a bid basis.

I point out again that the House urged that a study be made, and that the National Academy of Sciences-National Research Council be consulted. They have been consulted. They support the General Accounting Office, the subcommittee of the House Committee on Armed Services, and the task group of the Advisory Board on Quartermaster Research and Development, which made the study in consultation. We have that study available. It is the third or fourth study made in pursuance of the activities of the distinguished Senator from Illinois, but still the finding of all the people—who do not live in Illinois or in Massachusetts—is in favor of Massachusetts and against Chicago, Ill.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the distinguished Senator from Georgia yield to me?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield first to the senior Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I hold in my hand the transcript of the alleged hearing held on the 31st of March by the Advisory Board on Quartermaster Research and Development. It is the most absurd transcript I have ever seen in my life. No evidence was considered. There was a direct refusal to allowing specifications to be known.

I had hoped that I would not be compelled to make this a part of the RECORD, but since the Senator from Georgia has referred to this as the profound research of the Advisory Board task group——

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator puts words in my mouth.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I ask unanimous consent that the transcript of the hearing, beginning at 1 p.m., be printed as a part of the RECORD. Out of their own lips the

Advisory Board task force will be condemned.

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

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I merely wish to say that the only profundity I would attribute to anyone on this question would be that of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS]. I stated nothing about this endeavor being a profound task force. I stated that the profundity of the Senator from Illinois had prevented the accomplishment of the proposed transfer for several years.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator gives me too much credit.

Mr. RUSSELL. There has been dilatory action after dilatory action from year to year, even though last year the Senate voted against the proposal and voted finally, after all these years, to approve this transfer. I did refer to the fact that the Board, with the advice of these people, had made a recommendation supporting one theretofore made by the General Accounting Office and by the Department of the Army, and urged by Dr. York. One of the reports that he cites shows "all existing installations of the Quartermaster General were considered in possible sites."

These included installations in Virginia, New York, Texas, Georgia, Pennsylvania, Tennessee, California, Utah, and Massachusetts.

I believe a pretty thorough study has been given to this subject, and I believe it is about time that the Senate terminated it.

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

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. While I have a deep and abiding interest in the entire subject of culture, I am not so interested in culture as I am in keeping the Container Institute in Chicago. I am a little less liberal, I believe, than my distinguished colleague. I feel a little like one of the two sailors who were marooned on an island. Their plight was desperate. Finally, they erected a pole with a shirt on it. One of them got on his knees and began to pray. He said, "Oh, Lord, if Thou wouldst save us, we would give you everything we have. Oh, Lord, if Thou wouldst save us, we will do anything for you."

Just then the other sailor spoke up and said, "Wait a minute. Don't promise too doggone much. I think I see a ship."

I am not going to promise anything. I am not interested in sending the facility to Houston, Detroit, or to any other place.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Nor am I.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I want to keep the facility in Chicago.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Yes, and I am confident that if we have fair competition, it will be in Chicago. Let there be fair competition and let the best city win; and I am confident that if this is done, the Food and Container Institute will be in Chicago and in no other place.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I did not want that extraneous note to creep into the discussion.

Mr. DOUGLAS. We are ready to rest on the truth, the facts, and the comparative advantages.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Notwithstanding the suggestions and recommendations by the distinguished groups—and I am sure that everyone who served on the task force of the Quartermaster Board was distinguished—of course, even distinguished people can make mistakes. Consider the mistakes that are made in the Senate, where all are distinguished. So they could have made mistakes.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, the Army has risen to great heights in this case in retaining its position over the years. Last year they came in and ruled against the distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], who was the leader of the proponents in the Republican administration; this year they have consistently ruled against the distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], who is, of course, one of the great leaders in the Democratic administration.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Such action shows how they can persist in error.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] to the committee amendment.

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

Mr. RUSSELL. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. HART. I was impressed by the demonstration of saving that the distinguished Senator from Georgia suggested as a result of several studies, but I was curious because of an inquiry directed to me from a food processing firm in Michigan as to whether the several studies, all of which suggest economy, that would result from the establishment of this facility in Massachusetts included evaluation as to the overall economic impact of moving that facility from what I am advised is relatively the center of the food processing industry to the east coast, or whether it was limited simply to the payroll and service costs of the Army.

Mr. RUSSELL. I regret that I cannot answer the question with respect to the economic impact. I have received no testimony. I am sure, however, that the distinguished Senator from Illinois can answer the question.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I certainly can answer it. The answer is that no attention was paid by the Army to anything except the alleged narrow effects within the building itself. In Chicago, we can duplicate that building at less cost, with greater efficiency, and without breaking up an organization. And in addition we can serve the great private food and container industries of America far better from a centrally located and long established institution in Chicago than they can possibly be served by an isolated and new institution in the Far Northeast of the country.

Mr. HART. In explanation of my support for the amendment offered, I wish the distinguished chairman of the committee to understand that the point that was made to me this morning by, I believe, one of the largest food processors in America situated in Michigan was that the removal of the facility would have an impact upon his ability to obtain services.

Mr. SMITH of Massachusetts. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a statement prepared by me on the amendment under consideration be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR SMITH OF MASSACHUSETTS

There are six questions that must be raised and answered concerning the proposed transfer of the Quartermaster food and container research. These six are:

1. Why is it necessary?
2. What are the savings for our national defense effort?
3. Why is it advisable from a scientific viewpoint?
4. Why is it advisable from food and container research viewpoint?
5. What research activities would Quartermaster food and container research be combined with?
6. Have proper studies been made of this proposed transfer?

1. What makes it necessary to move the Food and Container Institute from its present quarters in Chicago?

The buildings now occupied by the Food and Container Institute in Chicago are 40-year-old six-story buildings originally constructed for warehouse purposes and have become increasingly inefficient to operate. All interested parties and studies conducted by the Army, Department of Defense and by outside groups agree on the essentiality of the move from present quarters.

There is considerable urgency in obtaining construction authorization this year. The move has been under discussion since 1958. There must be an adverse effect on employee morale and effectiveness resulting from the uncertainty of the relocation plans.

The Army, after very thorough study and restudy, has chosen to request authority to move to Natick. The primary reasons for choosing Natick over any other site in the United States are in the area of administrative economies, integration of research programs with important directly related work now at Natick, and long term economic savings.

2. What will be the annual savings resulting from the Natick location rather than the location elsewhere in the United States?

The Army estimates operating savings of $1,100,000 per year. This includes approximately $300,000 in direct mission costs and about $800,000 in overhead support.

3. What research equipment, if any, is or would be available at Natick which would have to be provided separately at another location?

The following specialized Army-owned equipment now at Natick would provide research capabilities not now available at the Chicago location, except by rental or contract: Van de Graff electron accelerator, solar furnace, large hot and cold climate chambers, mass and infrared spectrographs, vapor phase chromatographs, food extraction plant, electron miscroscope, X-ray diffraction equipment, psychophysiological equipment, biophysical equipment.

4. It has been suggested that the research environment at the Chicago area is better for the kind of work the Food and Container Institute does than is the Boston area. In what extent is this true?

The essential communication between personnel of the FCI and their colleagues in

closely related disciplines could be more easily effected in Natick than Chicago.

In a 6-State area, within a 300-mile radius of Boston; that is, New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Massachusetts, Maryland, and Connecticut, there are 147 laboratories engaged in food research. Within a few miles of Natick are the world famous food technology laboratories of the MIT and the University of Massachusetts. General Foods has erected one of the Nation's most modern food research centers in Cambridge, less than an hour's drive from Natick. The contract program in food research and development is distributed throughout the United States. This program is expected to continue unchanged. Scientific and technical libraries are readily available in the Boston area.

The Army alleges that there will be mutual benefit to the Food and Container Institute and the rest of the QM research program through joining the F. & C.I. scientists and the Natick staff.

5. What related work is now being done at Natick?

The technical program at Natick amounts to approximately $8 million annually. It encompasses many fields of R. & D., virtually all of the QM research other than that done at the Food and Container Institute. These fields include:

(1) Clothing and personal equipment for protecting the soldier from all wartime environments; (2) materials of many kinds including materials for containers and for packaging food and other Quartermaster items; (3) mechanical and special purpose equipment, including field cooking and messing equipment, refrigeration equipment, aerial delivery equipment, materials handling equipment, etc.; (4) environmental research; (5) human research; and (6) pioneering research in chemistry of food flavors and odors, micro-organisms, ionizing radiation effects, and thermal effects.

The movement of the Food and Container Institute to this established research and engineering center, from which it is now administered, will result in greater overall efficiency and effectiveness of the technical program by consolidating the food and packaging work now performed in Chicago with the related research work on taste, odor, materials, and environment now underway at Natick. It will put the food technologists and package and container development people in direct contact with those researchers working on taste, odor, and flavor, and on materials.

6. How can we be sure that all relevant factors have been considered in selecting the Natick site over any other site in the United States?

The Quartermaster General initiated an extensive study in November 1958 to determine how the efficiency of the QM Food and Container Institute research and development mission could be improved. Sites considered to improve the physical plant included the following:

1. First, all existing installations of the QMG were considered as possible sites. This included installations in Virginia, New York, Texas, Georgia, Pennsylvania, Tennessee, California, Utah, and Massachusetts.

2. Next, other governmental facilities in the Chicago area such as Fort Sheridan.

3. Finally, consideration was given to the construction of a new Government installation in the Chicago area such as at the Illinois Institute of Technology. In considering what should be done it became apparent that the greatest increase in efficiency of operations would result from joining food and container work with the balance of the QM Corps research and development now being performed at Natick.

The QM decision has been subjected to extensive review. I understand that the DDR&E conducted an independent review in February of 1960 which resulted in Defense Department support of the fiscal year 1961 budget request. The General Accounting Office conducted a review to determine the validity of the cost advantages inherent in the move to Natick. It concluded that there would be a substantial savings from transfer of the facility to the Natick establishment.

A special subcommittee of the House Armed Services Committee investigated the proposed move and, in its May 1960 report, recommended proceeding with the move to Natick. Significantly, the subcommittee also concluded that there would be substantial savings and that even if there were no savings, the move should be made in the interest of increased efficiency of the research operations.

In January 1961, the Illinois Institute of Technology made a study of the problem of relocating the Food and Container Institute out of its present location in the Chicago administrative center and concluded that the Illinois Institute of Technology campus would be a suitable location. This study further suggested that the problem be reviewed by the National Academy of Sciences; that they study and make recommendations as to programs, facilities, and site for the Institute.

Finally, in April of this year, the Secretary of the Army ordered a special study to review the validity of the Army position. As a part of his study, the Secretary of the Army requested the comments and recommendation of the Advisory Board on QM Research and Development of the National Academy of Science-National Research Council. This was appropriate in view of section 108 of H.R. 5000, the House amendment to this bill. This study reaffirmed the Department of Defense position in concluding that activity should be moved to Natick at the earliest possible opportunity.

Therefore, I urge that the Senate committee's bill be adopted by defeating the proposed amendment to it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was rejected.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, may I have the attention of the distinguished Senator from Georgia?

I wish to offer an amendment on page 68 of the committee amendment, line 10, to strike the figure "$3,300,000" and substitute therefor "$13,200,000."

We have a very serious situation in the New London area and in Groton, where the submarine base is located.

The House bill originally authorized 800 new units of family housing, which was to be the Capehart type of housing. The Senate committee, in considering all the difficulty, to put it mildly, that we have had with Capehart housing, especially in connection with the Hayes deals in California, struck out all of the Capehart housing and substituted some appropriated funds housing therefor.

That action cut the New London submarine base area down from 800 units to 200 units. Due to the Polaris missile system program, the submarine program has been stepped up very rapidly. We already had a shortage of housing at that location before the work was stepped up. Now the work is stepped up and the New London area is the headquarters for training submariners.

We already have a serious situation. Unless we get more housing than the 200 units allowed in the bill, the situation will be untenable. My amendment would provide four times as much housing as would the Senate bill under the appropriation process. It would give us the 800 units of housing proposed in the House bill. So I am only going as far as the House went in asking for enough to construct the proposed 800 units.

In order to show statistically the status of family housing at the submarine base in New London, I ask unanimous consent that at this point in my remarks a memorandum which was prepared for me by the Navy be printed in the RECORD.

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

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY,
OFFICE OF THE CHIEF OF NAVAL OPERATIONS,
Washington, D.C., May 1, 1961.

Memorandum for Senator PRESCOTT BUSH.
Subject: Status of family housing at NSB, New London, Conn.

1. In accordance with your request the following information is provided:

Number of units now available (adequate)	486
Number of units under contract	1,000
Number of units authorized not yet under construction	0
Total	1,486
Estimated additional requirement	3,264

In addition to the above units the House Armed Services Committee approved 800 Capehart units in the fiscal year 1962 MCON bill H.R. 5000. However, these were deleted from the Senate bill and 200 units of appropriated fund housing substituted therefor.

There are 300 units of World War II housing (low cost rental units) which will be disposed of as housing accommodations if the 800 units are approved in the 1962 program.

FRANK L. JOHNSON,
Rear Admiral, U.S. Navy, Director Shore Activities, Development and Control Division.

Mr. BUSH. I ask that another memorandum that was prepared on this same subject for the use of myself and others entitled "The Need for Capehart Housing in New London," also be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

THE NEED FOR CAPEHART HOUSING IN NEW LONDON

The requirements for Capehart housing in the New London area are not new. They have been recognized as valid since 1957. Efforts have continued toward procuring from all sources sufficient units in order to provide adequate and suitable quarters for military families at modest living standards, at reasonable rents or within acceptable commuting distances. The Capehart housing can provide a solution to this New London housing shortage perhaps more economically and rapidly than any other known plan.

Early in 1957 the submarine base housing survey showed an accute shortage of available rentals even including those which could not meet the DOD criteria in regards to suitability, rental pay scale of the military man or within a commuting distance of 15 miles to the submarine base. This situation has not changed. On the strength of the need existing in 1957, the Navy and Congress approved the submarine base request for

1,050 units by location for New London. Because of the DOD limitation on the number of starts during the forthcoming fiscal year, this figure was cut to 500 units. A request was made for the 1959 fiscal year supplemental but was not funded although fully supported by the Navy Inspector General as a justified item. The second increment of 500 units was held in abeyance by DOD and the Navy until the first increment could start construction.

The real setback came when the contractor for the first 500 approved units was unable to get financial backing and this project had to be readvertised. This misfortune caused a full year's delay in starting construction at a time when the FBM program was being accelerated. The contract for the first 500 Capehart units was finally awarded to Blitz Corp. in early 1960. Construction was started in March 1960 and at the present rate of construction will not be completed until October 1961.

When requirements for support of the FBM Squadron 14 were made known, it became apparent that previous estimates of housing requirements would have to be revised upward to accommodate the 1,150 additional families of submarine crewmen of the Polaris submarines. The second increment of 500 Capehart units was reinstated on the 1960 execution list on the strength of the new impact the additional squadron would have on the already critically short housing condition in New London.

The contract for this second increment was awarded in January 1961 but the earliest completion date is October 1962. This entire block of housing is scheduled to be assigned exclusively to families of the Polaris submarines although originally approved to alleviate the previously known housing deficiency before the additional assignment of the Polaris Squadron to New London.

Annual housing surveys are taken each March. Due to the accelerated FBM program the military population in the New London area has increased even more rapidly than predicted. For example, on March 31, 1958, there was a net housing deficit of 1,019 units. On May 1, 1959, there was a net housing deficit computed on the same criteria of 2,679. This figure is broken down as follows:

On waiting list for Dolphin Gardens and Conning Towers, 360. Occupy substandard private housing (within rental allowance but have to share kitchen or bathroom with one or two other families, basement or attic apartments with excessive fuel costs during winter months, or in summer rental units without central heating and available only during September 10 to May 25 period at reasonable rent. Fuel cost often exceeds rent), 422. Living in adequate housing but located in excess of 15 miles from submarine base, 243.

Living in adequate private housing but paying rents at least 15 percent above rental allowance, 1,654.

Net deficit of inadequate housing, 2,679.

This is the deficit before assignment of 1,150 families of the FBM squadron who desire housing. In addition, 800 men have families who reside beyond 100 miles of New London and have elected not to move their families because of the excessive costs to maintain a household there. On the brighter side there are some 2,059 military families who have been able to rent adequate housing from private sources in New London at a fee within 15 percent of the military rental allowance. The Housing Office since August 1960 has rented 460 units of private housing and reports only 76 units available which have been inspected to meet minimal standards and remain in the bracket of military rental allowances. On February 15, 1961, the waiting list was 840.

When Capehart housing was approved for New London, the Navy, by law, had to take over the title VIII housing, Dolphin Gardens, and convert it to public quarters. Best estimates point to rehabilitation of the Dolphin Garden units, 400 in number, being completed about September 1, 1961. Currently 138 units have been completed and occupied. Also the first units of the Capehart first increment will be completed starting in March at the rate of about 10 units per week through September 1961.

The rate of arrival of families of crewman attached to FBM squadrons homeported in New London is as indicated:

Ship	Arrival date	Crew members	Number of families (housing requirements)
George Washington (SSBN598)	1959	220	
Patrick Henry (SSBN599)	1959	220	170
Theodore Roosevelt (SSBN600)	March 1961	220	[1] 142
Ethan Allen (SSBN608):			
Blue	January 1961	100	66
Gold	April 1961	120	66
Robert E. Lee (SSBN601)	March 1961	220	174
Abraham Lincoln (SSBN602)	May 1961	220	122
Thomas A. Edison (SSBN610):			
Blue	July 1961	100	66
Gold	October 1961	120	66
Sam Houston (SSBN609)	April 1962	220	122
John Marshall (SSBN611)	August 1962	220	122
Total			[2] 1,116

[1] 34 after school is out.
[2] 34 about July 1961.

Incident to the population growth in southeastern Connecticut, civilian housing construction has likewise lagged the population input. The local civilian employees of General Dynamics, Chas. W. Pfizer and Dow Chemical Co., have their housing problem to compound the Navy's. The News and Views of the Greater New London Chamber of Commerce (April 4, 1960) states, "A report from the State labor department shows that one out of four persons working in New London is from outside the New London labor market area.

A total of 7,500 outside residents commute to jobs in the New London area from 80 towns in Connecticut and Rhode Island. Three thousand and ten of these come from Norwich area (over 15 miles) and 3,350 from the Westerly, R.I., area (over 20 miles).

Based on the March 1960 survey, the Navy submitted a request to the Department of Defense for 800 Capehart units. This was done after a meeting with the local real estate and civic officials whereby resolutions to support the Navy request were made. The civic group was requested to assist in providing an additional 768 units to fall within the enlisted rental allowance.

The New London area needs the 200 Capehart units to be included in the fiscal year 1961 execution list and the remaining 600 units of the 800 originally programed to be reinstated in the fiscal year 1962 project. Of the 800 originally programed for fiscal year 1962, 300 units are slated as replacement of the 300 low-cost rental units of Conning Towers (a World War II temporary Government housing development still maintained by the Navy). Experience dictates that these 300 units should not be demolished until the need for their use has subsided and the Capehart units are completed.

Military personnel assigned to units in New London area

From DD854 as of April 1960:	
On board:	
Officer	1021
E4 and above enlisted	3724
Below E4 enlisted	3232
Total	7977
One year projected:	
Officer	1077
E4 and above enlisted	4415
Below E4 enlisted	3194
Total	8686
Two years projected:	
Officer	1225
E4 and above enlisted	4978
Below E4 enlisted	3201
Total	9404
Current as of February 15, 1961:	
On board:	
Officer	1102
E4 and above enlisted	4564
Below E4 enlisted	3362
Total	9028
One year projected:	
Officer	1150
E4 and above enlisted	5043
Below E4 enlisted	3580
Total	9773
Two years projected:	
Officer	1235
E4 and above enlisted	5578
Below E4 enlisted	3252
Total	10,065

Mr. BUSH. I ask this because that additional memorandum, while it was prepared for Capehart housing, nevertheless outlines even more clearly than the previous one the crying need for these additional units at New London, Conn.

Without wishing to prolong the debate, and in conclusion, I say that this is a very pressing situation. I have great reluctance in asking to increase the authorization bill by $10 million, because I am in sympathy with the general objective of the committee, of which I am a member, in delaying the Capehart program for a while, until we can see whether we can get it back on the track and cut out some of the nonsense connected with the costly procedures of the kind we experienced in California. I am in general sympathy with that endeavor. I do not like to increase the authorization for an appropriation in the face of a budget which is already in prospective deficit by about $4 billion next fiscal year, on top of a billion dollar deficit this year. Therefore, I say I am doing this with reluctance. I would not do it unless I very greatly feared the effect this cutback will have on the whole submarine program and the training of the men.

After all, the families of these men must have housing on the station. The situation, at the rate the men are coming in and are expected to come in during the years immediately ahead, will be intolerable, unless we get approximately the amount of housing that is contained in the House bill. I beg my great leader and my good friend the Senator from Georgia to accept the

amendment. I throw myself on his mercy.

Mr. RUSSELL. It is not a question of mercy, so much as it is a question of justice. There is a great need in New London for additional housing. There is a great need for additional housing at a number of other stations. In some cases it is just as great as at New London. New London has fared pretty well. Of a total of 1,500 housing units in the bill, New London gets 200. In addition, there are 500 units in the bill which can be allocated at the discretion of the Department of Defense. If the need is greater in New London than anywhere else, the Secretary of Defense can allocate some additional housing units there. I do not believe we would be justified in appropriating $13 million for military housing at New London, Conn., when we weigh those needs against the needs of the rest of the country. I would like to be helpful to my good friend the Senator from Connecticut, who is a very hard working member of the Committee on Armed Services, but I would not be justified in accepting the amendment which he offers. I will have to ask the Senate to vote against the amendment.

Mr. BUSH. I am sorry to get that message from the Senator from Georgia. His experience in these matters, of course, is vast, and we all respect him for it. I have the strong feeling that this is a very unusual situation. I had hoped that the Senator would be willing to take the amendment to conference, where I am sure he would find the Members of the House very sympathetic toward it.

Mr. RUSSELL. The House bill contains 800 units for New London. The subject will be in conference, and I am sure the members of the conference committee will bear in mind what the Senator from Connecticut has said. However, I do not believe that we would be justified in accepting an amendment of this size.

Mr. BUSH. I thank the Senator for those assurances.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Connecticut yield?

Mr. BUSH. I yield.

Mr. MONRONEY. I propose, following the disposition of the Senator's amendment, to submit an amendment to restore the Capehart housing, as provided in the House bill, which will include an 800-unit authorization for the submarine base at New London, Conn. It will restore the pattern of housing which has been in effect since 1935, and which originated under the chairmanship of the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], when he was chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Mr. BUSH. I thank the Senator for that information. It give me no comfort, however, because I feel that the committee has probably acted wisely in deferring the Capehart housing program until we get to the bottom of some of our problems which have developed in connection with it. So I am afraid the Senator only poses a dilemma for me, rather than giving me any comfort.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Connecticut will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 68, line 10, in the committee amendment, it is proposed to strike out "$3,300,000," and insert in lieu thereof "$13,300,000."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Connecticut to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was rejected.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, I rise to ask the distinguished chairman of the Armed Services Committee [Mr. RUSSELL] about the Airmunitions Surveillance Facility at Hill Air Force Range in Utah. Authorization for this facility was included in the bill by the House but taken out by the Senate committee. I hope I am correct in understanding that the Senate committee will be willing to consider again its position when it meets with the House on this matter in conference.

The facilities requested for the Hill Air Force Range will enable the Air Force Logistics Command to continue its airmunitions surveillance program on the larger and newer solid propellant rocket engines. The program includes environmental simulation, radiographic, ultrasonic, pressure leakage, laboratory analysis, and ultimate destruct testing of solid propellants. The proposal does not establish a new test center and does not duplicate existing facilities.

The objectives of the surveillance program are totally at variance with research and development testing procedures. The difference in test objectives dictates the need for different equipment and personnel of different skills. Surveillance testing has long been recognized as a proper Air Force Logistics Command function. It is further recognized that this project is better related to Hill Air Force Base because of personnel, equipment, and function.

The need for this facility is dictated by safety criteria. Engines in excess of 50 pounds can no longer be destruct tested on Hill Air Force Base. Weapon systems affected are Minuteman, Skybolt, Bomarc B, Bull Pup, Hound Dog, Genie, and Falcon.

The economic benefits of the surveillance program over the past 5 years are significant. The program has already saved the taxpayers over 140 million dollars by extending the shelf life of propellant engines. It is expected that even greater savings will accrue on the larger and more costly solid propellant engines. As an example, if the shelf life of the Minuteman can be extended as little as 2 months, the cost of the Hill Air Force Range will be more than paid for.

Immediate approval of this project is required if the Air Force is to continue to assure the performance, reliability, and serviceability of Air Force explosives and solid propellants. Without this facility, the Air Force has no capability to evaluate the products of industry nor a yardstick against which it can measure the status of solid propellant weapon systems on these larger and newer weapon systems.

I ask the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services to consider this subject in conference. I shall not propose an amendment at this time, but merely wish to make this request to the chairman.

Mr. RUSSELL. The distinguished Senator from Utah had discussed the perplexing question the committee had before it, whether we were justified in proceeding to establish this very large research center at Hill Air Force Range in Utah. If it is to be established, that is the proper place for it. It undoubtedly has all the natural advantages one could ask for in connection with research in this type of development work on missiles. The committee decided, in view of such a large anticipated expenditure, because the first appropriation is only a small part of it—it will cost vast sums of money to complete the project once it is inaugurated—that we would like to take another look at it. That feeling was accentuated by the fact that the Department of the Air Force, in the recent reorganization of the Air Material Command and ARDC has shifted these agencies around.

Prior to that time the work at Edwards Air Force Base was under one agency of the Air Force, and that at Hill Air Force Range was under another agency. I believe I am correct, that under the new organizational structure, the work at these two facilities would come under the same command.

That led the committee to indulge the hope, which more often than not proved futile in the end, that a system might be devised to save large sums of money by doing both jobs at Edwards Air Force Base. However, the Air Force says that is not practicable. We shall have to give further consideration to the whole subject in conference, to determine whether it is wise to carry this work over for 1 year.

I assure the Senator from Utah that the conferees appreciate receiving this information and will consider it during the course of our negotiations with the other body.

Mr. MOSS. I thank the distinguished chairman of the committee.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I call up my amendment, which is at the desk. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed without reading.

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

On page 67, between lines 21 and 22 in the committee amendment it is proposed to insert the following:

"SEC. 107. In accordance with the provisions of title IV of the Housing Amendments of 1955 (69 Stat. 646), as amended, the Secretary of the Army is authorized to construct family housing for occupancy as public quarters at the following locations:

"INSIDE THE UNITED STATES

"Fort Belvoir, Virginia, 250 units.
"Fort Benning, Georgia, 500 units.
"Fort Stewart, Georgia, 160 units.
"Fort Sam Houston, Texas, 200 units.
"Camp Irwin, California, 240 units.
"Fort Meyer, Virginia, 525 units.
"Rocky Mountain Arsenal, Colorado, 40 units.
"Picatinny Arsenal, New Jersey, 34 units.
"Sharpe General Depot, California, 50 units.

"OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES

"Canal Zone, Atlantic side, 200 units.
"Canal Zone, Pacific side, 500 units."

On page 75, between lines 18 and 19, insert the following:

"SEC. 206. In accordance with the provisions of title IV of the Housing Amendments of 1955 (69 Stat. 646), as amended, the Secretary of the Navy is authorized to construct family housing for occupancy as public quarters at the following locations:

"Naval Base, Charleston, South Carolina, 500 units.

"Naval Air Station, Lemoore, California, 500 units.

"Naval Facility, Fort Miles, Lewes, Delaware, 30 units.

"Naval Station, Mayport, Florida, 500 units.

"Naval Submarine Base, New London, Connecticut, 800 units.

"Naval Base, Norfolk, Virginia, 600 units.

"Naval Construction Battalion Center, Port Hueneme, California, 400 units.

"Naval Security Group Activity, Winter Harbor, Maine, 30 units."

On page 88, between lines 14 and 15, insert the following:

"SEC. 307. In accordance with the provisions of title IV of the Housing Amendments of 1955 (69 Stat. 646), as amended, the Secretary of the Air Force is authorized to construct family housing for occupancy as public quarters at the following locations:

"Lowry Air Force Base, Colorado, 135 units.

"Andrews Air Force Base, Maryland, 300 units.

"Lawrence G. Hanscom Air Force Base, Massachusetts, 200 units.

"Hill Air Force Base, Utah, 380 units."

On page 88, beginning with line 16, strike out all down through line 24, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"SEC. 401. Section 803 (a) of the National Housing Act, as amended, is amended by striking out the last proviso and inserting in lieu thereof the following: '*And provided further*, That no more mortgages shall be insured under this title after October 1, 1962, except pursuant to a commitment to insure before such date, and not more than thirty-seven thousand family housing units shall be contracted for after June 30, 1959, pursuant to any mortgage insured under section 803 of this title after such date.'"

On page 89, line 22, strike out "III, and IV" and insert in lieu thereof "and III".

On page 90, strike out line 11.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, this amendment would restore the House provisions on Capehart housing. These provisions are summarized in the report of the House Committee on Armed Services, which I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

1. New Capehart housing:

The committee increased the number of authorized new Capehart housing units which could be initiated by the departments from the 2,025 units requested in H.R. 2743 to a total of 7,074 new units.

This change was initiated by the committee after it had learned that the individual service departments had originally requested more than 22,000 additional Capehart units for inclusion in this bill. This figure was then drastically reduced by the Department of Defense to 7,074 units. However, the Bureau of the Budget, for reasons not evident to the committee, required a further reduction to 2,025 units.

Department of Defense and various service witnesses all testified that the 7,074 figure represented the absolute minimum number of new Capehart units that would be required to meet new high-priority housing needs.

Under these circumstances and in view of the great deficiency in military housing assets, the committee unanimously approved the higher authorization for Capehart housing.

2. Ceiling on Capehart units:

The committee increased the ceiling on the total number of Capehart units that could be built by the departments from the present ceiling of 25,000 to a new ceiling of 37,000.

The departments pointed out that under the present ceiling contained in the last proviso of section 803(a) of the act of August 11, 1955 (69 Stat. 635), as amended, the services are prohibited from contracting for more than 25,000 units after June 30, 1959. However, Congress has, to date, authorized the construction of 35,061 units subsequent to June 30, 1959. The net result, therefore, is an inability of the departments to execute the total program actually authorized. To date 5,160 units have been deferred because of this ceiling. Therefore, the committee agreed to raise the ceiling a total of 12,000 units to accommodate the 5,160 deferred units previously authorized and also to accommodate the 7,074 additional new units contained in this bill.

(3) Capehart authority continued:

The committee, extended, as originally requested by the departments, until October 1, 1962, the termination date for the Capehart program as contained in the National Housing Act, as amended. The present termination date is October 1, 1961. The committee supports a continuation of the Capehart program since it has proven to be an excellent mechanism for the development of new housing for military families.

* * * * *

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

TABLE 5.—*Family housing*

	June 30, 1960			June 30, 1961			June 30, 1962		
	Total	United States	Overseas	Total	United States	Overseas	Total	United States	Overseas
Estimated total requirements [1]	930,772	735,748	195,024	920,937	765,965	154,972	871,954	765,965	105,989
Total assets	643,638	519,657	123,981	644,926	522,958	121,968	635,085	520,264	114,821
Military owned or controlled, total	415,420	311,616	103,804	409,950	308,327	101,623	407,320	305,633	101,687
In being or under construction, total	(385,425)	(284,324)	(101,101)	(396,089)	(296,096)	(99,993)	(400,937)	(300,790)	(100,147)
Adequate housing, total	313,864	221,578	92,286	332,458	240,504	91,954	341,824	249,374	92,450
Public quarters [2]	125,576	48,859	72,717	122,536	50,639	71,897	123,095	50,829	72,266
Wherry:									
Military acquired and operated [3]	62,409	61,414	995	69,504	68,272	1,232	72,916	71,684	1,232
Privately operated	19,954	19,643	311	12,437	12,363	74	8,632	8,558	74
Capehart Act	89,266	86,990	2,276	106,018	103,492	2,526	115,091	112,565	2,526
Rental guarantee	5,590		5,590	5,620		5,620	5,620		5,620
Surplus Commodity	9,298		9,298	9,982		9,982	10,109		10,109
Other (leased)	5,771	4,672	1,099	6,361	5,738	623	6,361	5,738	623
Substandard housing, total	71,561	62,746	8,815	63,631	55,592	8,039	59,113	51,416	7,697
Public quarters	15,655	12,443	3,212	14,563	11,401	3,162	13,705	10,685	3,020
Other (Lanham Act, title III, trailers, etc.)	55,906	50,303	5,603	49,068	44,191	4,877	45,408	40,731	4,677
Funded or programed but not under construction, total [4]	(29,995)	(27,292)	(2,703)	(13,861)	(12,231)	(1,630)	(6,383)	(4,843)	(1,540)
Public quarters [5]	2,055	443	1,612	1,439	36	1,403	1,761	221	1,540
Capehart Act [6]	26,033	25,783	250	12,195	12,195		4,622	4,622	
Rental guarantee	30		30						
Surplus Commodity	811		811	227		227			
Other (leased)	1,066	1,066							
Available from community sources (adequate housing)	228,218	208,041	20,177	234,976	214,631	20,345	227,765	214,631	13,134
Estimated net requirements:									
Utilizing substandard housing	287,134	216,091	71,043	276,011	243,007	33,004	236,869	245,701	−8,832
Including replacement of substandard housing	358,695	278,837	79,858	339,642	298,599	41,043	295,982	297,117	−1,135

[1] Requirements for military personnel who receive quarters allowance under permanent legislation (officers and enlisted men in grade E–7, E–6, and E–5; and in E–4 with 7 or more years of service) and key civilians. Does not include attaché, rotational and student personnel, etc. Requirements for 1961 and 1962 reflect reduction due to new oversea "dependents" policy calculated on the basis of all exceptions made by the Secretary of Defense through Jan. 25, 1961.

[2] Substandard quarters in process of rehabilitation under Public Law 85–241, sec. 407, are reported under this category.

[3] Data reflects elimination of units through conversion (for example, consolidation of 2 single bedroom units into a multiple bedroom unit).

[4] Data shown for June 30, 1962, are based upon a preliminary review by OSD of proposed service programs and are subject to change.

[5] Substandard units programed for rehabilitation under Public Law 85–241, sec. 407, are reported under this category.

[6] Includes 4,467 units which may not be built because of the last proviso of sec. 803(a) of the National Housing Act as amended.

NOTE.—United States includes the 50 States and District of Columbia.

MILITARY HOUSING

H.R. 5000 contains authorization for the construction of 7,074 Capehart housing units for military families. The committee on armed services is of the opinion that these additional authorizations for Capehart housing represent only a relatively modest increment of the total of new housing required by the military departments.

The table below reflects the total housing assets of the military departments as contrasted to estimated total requirements beginning June 30, 1960, and ending June 30, 1962. An inspection of these figures reveals that more than 63,000 of the housing units presently occupied by our military families are substandard and do not qualify as "adequate public quarters."

It is apparent to the committee that no significant reduction in the number of "substandard housing units" will be achieved until "adequate public quarters" are made available in sufficient quantity to replace such substandard units. Consequently, the committee accepted the minimum recommendation of representatives of the Department of Defense and authorized the 7,074 units determined by the Department as essential to meet the high priority housing requirements of the individual services.

A REVIEW OF THE SOURCES OF HOUSING PREVIOUSLY MADE AVAILABLE TO THE MILITARY DEPARTMENTS

A. Appropriated funds construction:

There was little construction of family housing of any sort in the period immediately following World War II, partly as a result of the uncertainty of the Nation's long-range military plans, partly because of the existence of large numbers of temporary World War II housing assets. Most of the funds which Congress did appropriate in this period were used to convert these temporary rental units into adequate public quarters. In 1947, for example, Congress appropriated funds for 8,625 units for the Army, but all were either shell type structures or conversions. In 1948 the Army received no housing appropriation at all.

The passage of the Department of Defense housing bill in 1954 marked the beginning of an appropriated fund housing program of major significance. This legislation authorized 11,967 family units in fiscal year 1955, but appropriations were made for only 40 percent of the authorization. In the following year appropriations were granted for most of the unfunded portion of the fiscal year 1955 program as well as for the fiscal year 1956 authorization of 16,582 units, but construction continued to fall short of authorizations while projects were reviewed to see if they could more suitably be developed under the newly authorized title VIII (Capehart) program. In 1956 an additional 3,790 units were authorized in Public Law 84–968, making a total of 32,339 for fiscal years 1955, 1956, and 1957. Of these and subsequent authorizations only about 18,000 units were actually funded and built.

Appropriated fund housing, although less significant quantitatively than the Wherry or Capehart programs, has been important to the Defense Department's comprehensive plan for reducing the military housing deficit. It has proved a flexible source of new construction both in the United States and overseas, wherever any of the other special programs is impracticable. In the United States, for example, it has met the need for small projects (less than 20 units), where it is felt that a new Capehart project would not be feasible. It is useful in a few high-cost areas or in projects for senior officers.

B. The Wherry program:

As noted above, between 1948 and 1954 there was a gap in appropriated funds housing programs, which was largely filled by our first major privately financed program. This was the so-called Wherry program, authorized by Public Law 81–211, enacted August 8, 1949. This act added to the National Housing Act a new title, "Title VIII—Military Housing Insurance," created a "military housing insurance fund," authorized the Commissioner of the Federal Housing Administration to insure mortgages on military family housing projects, and enlarged the then existing authority of the military departments to lease land for such projects and to sell utility services to the project developers.

Wherry projects for the most part were built on Government-owned land located on or near the various installations, and outleased to the developer or sponsor for a period of 50 years (in some early cases 75 years). The sponsor undertook to organize the mortgagor corporation which actually held the lease, and to finance, build, maintain, and operate the completed units, which were made available on a rental basis to tenants designated by the local base commander. Military tenants retained their basic allowance for quarters. Normally, the units were rented unfurnished. Wherry mortgages were generally limited to $8,100 per unit, based on 90 percent of an estimated replacement cost of $9,000 per unit.

Altogether the Wherry program was successful in producing a substantial number of relatively low cost, but reasonably adequate units to meet an acute shortage. A total of 268 projects were built for the three military departments, comprising a total of 83,742 units.

C. The Capehart program:

By 1955 the Wherry construction program came to a halt. This resulted from increased construction costs, and from legislative enactments which made it impossible for prospective Wherry sponsors to mortgage out—that is, to acquire a 10 percent equity interest in projects with little or no cash investment. Since there was some doubt as to the volume of appropriated funds housing which could be actually funded, efforts were made to devise a new privately financed program without certain of the Wherry defects. Specifically, the departments sought a program under which the mortgages would cover all construction costs, and ownership of the completed projects would vest in the military departments.

Title IV of the Housing Amendments of 1955 (Public Law 84–345, approved Aug. 11, 1955) authorized the acquisition of military family housing under an amended title VIII of the National Housing Act, the so-called Capehart program. The statute contemplated that housing projects be constructed on Government-owned property, pursuant to competitive bidding by private contractors, and financed by the proceeds of 100-percent mortgages insured by the Federal Housing Administration.

Under the Capehart program the winning bidder forms a mortgagor corporation which takes the land under a 50-year lease, and is the "owner" of the leasehold and improvements thereon. Upon completion of construction and receipt by the builder of his final payment, the capital stock of the mortgagor corporation is delivered to the sponsoring military department, which thereupon undertakes the maintenance and operation of the housing, and the amortization of the mortgage over a 25-year term. Capehart units are public quarters, occupied on the basis of forfeiture of quarters allowances, which are used to pay the principal and interest on the Capehart mortgages. The mortgages may not exceed an average of $16,500 per unit. Appropriated funds (not to exceed $1,500 per unit) are authorized to be spent for site acquisition, rough site improvements, and offsite utilities.

Of the 98,700 Capehart units completed or under contract on December 31, 1960, the average mortgage was $15,850 and the average appropriated funds expenditure was $850, for a total average unit cost of $16,700. The Defense Department has recognized that the interest charges under the Capehart program were somewhat higher than the cost of long-term direct Treasury borrowing, but as previously noted, it has felt that the size of the housing program, together with competition with priority military items for available funds, has precluded a large-scale use of direct appropriations for military family housing.

* * * * *

CONSTRUCTION DELAYS AT CAPEHART HOUSING PROJECTS

During the latter part of May 1960, work stopped on seven Capehart projects which were being constructed, for practical purposes, by the same organization.

The projects affected were the following:

	Units
Army: Fort Bliss, Tex	410
Navy: Camp Lejeune, N.C	800
Air Force:	
Beale Air Force Base No. 1, Calif	570
Beale Air Force Base No. 2, Calif	400
Ellsworth Air Force Base, S. Dak	220
Grand Forks Air Force Base No. 1, N. Dak	744
Grand Forks Air Force Base No. 2, N. Dak	304
Total (all projects)	3,448

The work stoppage occurred as a consequence of a dispute between the prime contractor and various subcontractors and material suppliers over the amount of claims remaining to be paid.

Unfortunately, because of the nature of the contract documents and procedures, the military departments were not in a position to take direct action to cause a resumption of work on the projects. Consequently, the departments were necessarily required to observe the legal procedures involved in situations in which a builder of a FHA insured project has defaulted on his contract on Government property.

Representatives of all parties in interest have met frequently since the beginning of the work stoppage and it now appears that effective final arrangements have been made to immediately resume work on these projects.

The Department of Defense has advised the Committee on Armed Services that on Friday, February 24, 1961, authority to enter into completion contracts for the seven projects was given to the Secretaries of the Army, Navy, and Air Force.

Title VIII (Capehart) housing program—Summary of program development as of Dec. 31, 1960

	Total, all services		Army		Navy		Air Force	
	Projects	Units	Projects	Units	Projects	Units	Projects	Units
Total authorized	309	116,091	112	36,385	60	19,806	137	59,900
Completed	187	71,233	77	22,819	21	5,873	89	42,541
Under construction	66	27,496	15	7,142	18	7,430	33	12,924
Bidder accepted	10	4,343	3	1,867	6	2,076	1	400
In process	46	13,019	17	4,557	15	4,427	14	4,035

In the meantime, Defense and FHA are continuing their efforts to develop changes in the Capehart procedures which will enable both agencies to act promptly in event of future defaults on Capehart projects. Changes now under consideration would enable FHA to take control much sooner following default so as to arrange for a resumption of work.

The Department of Defense has advised that it is now anticipated that the period of work stoppage, should cases of this type reoccur, can be reduced from 9 months (as in the current cases) to 6 or 8 weeks.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, for purposes of comparison, the action of the Senate Committee on Armed Services is summarized in its report. I ask unanimous consent that the summary be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

FAMILY HOUSING

This year, in lieu of authorizing so-called Capehart housing units requested in the bill, the committee has approved 2,000 units of appropriated fund housing at an average cost of $16,500 per unit. The locations for these units were selected by the Defense Department and are identical in number and location to the Capehart units proposed in the bill as originally submitted to the Congress, with one exception. This exception is the 525 units proposed for Fort Myer, Va., which has been dealt with earlier in this report. These 2,000 units consist of 1,500 at specific locations and 500 at locations to be designated by the Secretary of Defense or his designee. The Secretary of Defense is requested to advise the Committees on the Armed Services of the Senate and House of Representatives within 30 days after such allocations are made as to the service and the location.

During the past several years the Congress and the executive branch have tried several approaches to meet the housing requirements of the military. None of these, in the final analysis, have proved adequate from the standpoint of economy. Both Wherry and Capehart housing have been costly programs, although admittedly they have served a purpose. The committee believed that the time had come when serious consideration had to be given to abandoning the present approach and steps taken to meet this problem through the regular annual authorization and appropriation process. The committee is convinced that this method of providing necessary housing will be more economical and satisfactory and will save the Government substantial sums in the long run. No housing program can be successful, however, unless carefully thought out ground rules are promulgated by the Defense Establishment and realistic appraisals are made of community support before approval is granted for the construction of military housing units.

The units approved by the committee are as follows:

Department	Location	Number of units	Amount
Army	Camp Irwin, Calif	200	$3,300,000
Navy	Naval Base, Charleston, S.C	200	3,300,000
	Naval Air Station, Lemoore, Calif	200	3,300,000
	Naval Facility, Fort Miles, Lewes, Del	30	495,000
	Naval Station, Mayport, Fla	140	2,310,000
	Naval Submarine Base, New London, Conn	200	3,300,000
	Naval Construction Battalion Center, Port Hueneme, Calif	200	3,300,000
	Naval Security Group Activity, Winter Harbor, Maine	30	495,000
Air Force	Hill Air Force Base, Utah	300	4,950,000
Title IV	Army, Navy and Air Force	500	8,250,000
Total		2,000	33,000,000

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, the Senate committee bill will prevent the the construction of houses previously authorized by Congress because it contains a construction ceiling lower than past authorizations. Final plans are prepared and that construction is ready to proceed at several locations. The housing units involved approach 6,000 as follows. Army, 1,734 units, located as follows: Fort Bliss, Tex., 494 units; Fort Lewis, Wash., 500 units; Fort Campbell, Ky., 400 units; Fort Sill, Okla., 350 units. For the Navy, 2,384 units, located as follows: Alameda, Calif., 900 units; Camp Pendleton, Calif., 400 units; Sugar Grove, W. Va., 142 units; Oceana, Va., 40 units; Great Lakes, Ill., 142 units; New Iberia, La., 178 units; Point Mugu, Calif., 100 units; Monterey, Calif., 100 units; Yuma, Ariz., 40 units; Memphis, Tenn., 250 units; Twentynine Palms, Calif., 50 units. For the Air Force, 1,830 units, located as follows: Offutt Air Force Base, Nebr., 500 units; Truax Field, Wis., 280 units; Kincheloe Air Force Base, Mich., 190 units; Vandenberg Air Force Base, Calif., 200 units; Malmstrom Air Force Base, Mont., 260 units; Lowry Air Force Base, Colo., 200 units; Clinton-Sherman Air Force Base, Okla., 100 units; Amarillo Air Force Base, Tex., 100 units. These units were authorized by the Congress in the past 2 years and cannot proceed to construction because of an imposed ceiling and no increased ceiling is provided in this bill, as recommended by the administration and contained in the House bill.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. It is my understanding that the Senator from Oklahoma anticipates, as of the moment, that he will ask for the yeas and nays on this amendment. Not a sufficient number of Senators is present at this time, because of the press of other duties, to have the Senator's request granted. However, it will be my suggestion that the Senate convene tomorrow at 11 o'clock——

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

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Committee on Armed Services has scheduled a meeting at 10:30 o'clock tomorrow morning to mark up the authorization bill for military procurement. If the majority leader could arrange to have the Senate meet at 12 o'clock instead of 11 o'clock, it would be a great convenience to the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. MANSFIELD. That is perfectly agreeable.

Mr. RUSSELL. We are trying to report bills to the Senate. The bill which we are marking up is an important bill. It involves some $12 billion in procurement of missiles, aircraft, and ships which the committee is authorizing this year for the first time in many years.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Twelve o'clock will be perfectly acceptable. I am delighted to reach this agreement with the Senator from Oklahoma, because his amendment will be the pending question.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 12 O'CLOCK NOON TOMORROW

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate adjourns today, it adjourn until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

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

Mr. MANSFIELD. There will be no votes tonight.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATION, 1962

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 5000) to authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Oklahoma wish his amendments to be considered en bloc?

Mr. MONRONEY. Yes.

Mr. President, I thank the majority leader for the consideration which he always shows to Senators.

I also wish to express my appreciation for the fine bill which the Committee on Armed Services has reported. The fact that we disagree on one point, namely, how best to provide military housing, whether through direct appropriations or as Capehart housing, is a question which the Senate should decide in its own right, rather than to leave it to the conference. Otherwise, I think the committee has performed excellent service in reporting this fine bill. Moreover, I appreciate the understanding of the committee in providing for the vital needs of Oklahoma.

Mr. RUSSELL. I thank the Senator for his complimentary words. We will let the Senate pass on this issue.

If the Senate wishes to continue Capehart housing, it will have an opportunity to say so.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, as one who has listened to the hearings on military housing authorizations for several years, I suggest to the Senate that I do not recall any year when I believe more complete hearings have been held than in this year. The 989 pages which constitute the hearings portion of the transcript comprise only a portion of the total record which was taken. Many projects were of a classified nature, and much time was devoted to them.

I make this statement with the intent of paying tribute to the splendid leadership given by the two ranking members of the Committee on Armed Services; namely, the chairman of the committee,

the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], and the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL].

The hearings can, of course, speak for themselves, with the exception of the testimony which was taken concerning classified items. However, it seemed to me that very thorough hearings were conducted in all respects. At least, the hearings were complete so far as any interest was evidenced on any particular project. The chairman and the staff cooperated in the presentation of questions which brought out facts about many projects which ordinarily are not brought into the testimony which is recorded and printed.

I desired to make this statement because of my belief that excellent work was done by the two ranking members of the committee.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I am exceedingly grateful to the distinguished Senator from South Dakota for his complimentary statement. It is not mere mutual back slapping when I say I consider that "praise from Sir Hubert is praise indeed." No member of the Committee on Armed Services is more diligent in following through a line of thought which he believes will enlighten the Senate than the distinguished Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE].

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I join with the Senator from Georgia in expressing my thanks to the Senator from South Dakota, and I also join with the Senator from Georgia in saying that no Senator is more conscientious in making certain that every detail of so comprehensive a bill as this is worked out correctly.

AMENDMENT OF MUTUAL DEFENSE ASSISTANCE CONTROL ACT OF 1951

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, S. 1215 will be brought up for discussion tomorrow. Because I shall be absent from the Senate tomorrow on official business, I should like to discuss Senate bill 1215 tonight.

The bill proposes important and far-reaching amendments to the Mutual Defense Assistance Control Act of 1951, known as the Battle Act.

One amendment grants authority to the President to extend economic and financial aid to certain Communist countries even though these countries export armaments or strategic materials to the U.S.S.R. or to U.S.S.R.-dominated countries. The only remaining Communist countries to which the President still could not extend aid would be in Soviet Union and Communist-held areas of the Far East.

Further, S. 1215 permits the President to furnish assistance to a country which does not effectively cooperate with nor furnish sufficient information to the United States as required by section 203 of existing law so that we may determine whether that nation is cooperating.

Still another change proposed in S. 1215 would allow the Administrator of the act, instead of the President, to continue aid to a recipient country even though that country knowingly permits shipment of items of primary strategic significance to Communist-bloc countries. The only restriction imposed is that the President must first determine that such aid is important to the security of the United States.

All of these Battle Act amendments were requested by President Kennedy, who, while serving in this body, sponsored similar amendments. In 1958, the Senate Foreign Relations Committee adopted the Kennedy amendment; but on a rollcall vote of the entire Senate, the amendment was defeated, 43 to 42.

The following year, 1959, the Senate approved these Battle Act amendments by a vote of 49 yeas to 40 nays. The Senate-passed bill lay before the House for a year, but that body took no action on it.

Now, for the third time, these far-reaching Battle Act amendments are before the Senate.

It is not easy for a comparative newcomer like myself to take a stand contrary to that taken by the President of the United States, and contrary to that taken by the chairman and members of the Foreign Relations Committee, including my colleague, the senior Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], who cosponsored this bill. This is a matter of judgment on which honest men disagree. Past history shows the Senate has been closely divided on this issue.

For my part, I am strongly opposed to this bill, because I believe that any aid given to any Communist country can only advance the Communist drive toward world domination.

By definition, all Communists are the mortal enemies of freemen. Would not it be wiser to confine our aid to our friends and allies who are resisting communism?

Since 1951, Federal law very wisely has placed an embargo on U.S. shipments of armaments and strategic materials to any nation or bloc of nations threatening America's security. On the embargo list are arms, ammunition, and implements of war, atomic energy materials, petroleum, transportation materials, and items of primary strategic significance used in the production of arms, ammunition, and implements of war.

The Battle Act specifically bars U.S. exports of these items to the Soviet Union and all countries under its domination. It also prohibits our Government from giving military, economic, or financial aid to any country which ships to Communist nations any item in the United States embargo list.

There is one loophole, however. The law gives to the President discretion to continue U.S. aid to such a country, provided he makes a finding that cessation of aid would be detrimental to America's security.

At present, two Communist countries receive U.S. economic aid: Yugoslavia and Poland. Because our Government does not regard Communist Yugoslavia as "Soviet-dominated," the Battle Act prohibitions are deemed not to apply to Yugoslavia.

Although Communist Poland exports to the Soviet Union items that would disqualify her by the Battle Act for aid, our Government has extended aid to Poland under a provision of the Mutual Security Act which permits the President to waive the Battle Act. There is, however, a ceiling of $30 million on mutual security funds that may go to Poland under this provision.

Under still another U.S. law, Public Law 480, Poland has been permitted to use Polish currency to buy American surplus farm commodities. Such transactions are regarded as sales, rather than as economic assistance. Therefore, it is held that such transactions do not violate the Battle Act. But the use of these Polish currencies, which have accumulated over the years, is restricted by the Battle Act. Senate bill 1215, as requested by President Kennedy, would permit these Polish funds to be used for projects in Poland—a form of assistance now prohibited by law.

The Battle Act also prevents loans to Poland under the Export-Import Bank Act and other acts which make U.S. aid available to foreign nations. The effect of the Battle Act changes proposed by President Kennedy would be to permit him to use any authority under any U.S. economic or financial aid statute to dispense such aid to Poland, despite shipment of war items to the Soviet Union.

I have been advised that, under the language of S. 1215, U.S. economic and financial aid could legally go to Czechoslovakia—a Communist country now supplying military equipment to Fidel Castro, in Cuba.

In the past, the rationale advanced for aid to Communist Yugoslavia and Communist Poland is that our assistance would encourage so-called national communism in those countries. Admittedly a calculated gamble, assistance has been urged in the hope those governments would assert independence from the U.S.S.R., and thereby crack the solid wall of the Soviet bloc.

Experience has amply demonstrated that the concept of national communism is sheer fiction. As long ago as 1957, both the Communist Party of Poland and Marshal Tito of Yugoslavia publicly proclaimed there is no such thing as national communism. Their subsequent actions bear out their denials.

We have had 4 years of experience with Communist Poland under this theory.

We have had 11 years of experience with Communist Yugoslavia under this theory.

The time has come for honest, realistic appraisal of our policies which permit American tax dollars to go to the Communist governments—which by definition seek to topple all free governments and replace them with Communist regimes.

The theory has been tried—11 years with Yugoslavia and 4 years with Poland—and has been proved fallacious. It has not worked.

Since the Poznan riots of 1956, the United States has furnished more than $360 million in aid to Poland. Yet Mr. Gomulka remains a faithful servant of Premier Khrushchev, and his regime has

steadily retracted most of the concessions wrung from him by the Polish rioters.

Since 1956, Communist Poland has consistently voted with the Soviet bloc in the United Nations. Last November, Poland signed the Communist Party manifesto, after the big conclave in Moscow, reaffirming with Communists of 80 other countries their determination to rule the world. Where is the evidence that Poland is independent of Moscow? I fail to find it.

Only yesterday it was publicly disclosed that Poland has loaned $13 million—without interest—to Cuba, as part of the $245 million in aid extended to Fidel Castro by the Communist bloc.

Mr. President, I hold in my hand a photostatic copy of a news item which appeared yesterday in the Washington Post. The headline of the article is "Red-Bloc Aid to Havana Now Totals $245 Million." From reading the article, we learn that $13 million was loaned by Poland to Cuba.

I ask unanimous consent that the entire article be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

[From the Washington Post, May 7, 1961]

RED-BLOC AID TO HAVANA NOW TOTALS $245 MILLION

(By George Bryant)

HAVANA.—Cuba has received $245 million in loans from Communist lands since Fidel Castro came to power.

That figure was revealed recently by Ernesto (Che) Guevara, Minister of Industrialization and one of the brains of the revolution.

Cuba, he said, could not have survived without that help.

Speaking at an interview with 100 newsmen—mainly from Latin America and the world's leftwing press—he listed some of the contributions: Russia, $100 million; China, $70 million; Czechoslovakia, $40 million; Poland, $13 million; East Germany, $10 million; Hungary, $7 million; and Bulgaria, $5 million.

Other points made by Guevara:

Cuba had been "forced to accept and even ask" help from the Communist lands by the U.S. economic blockade.

The recent invasion was "militarily sound. In any such future action, Cuban troops will take no prisoners."

Guevara, in the first detailed statement of Communist-Cuba relations, said interest on these loans was mainly 2 percent. China's loan was singular in that no interest was charged.

Communist nations, he added, also help in other ways. Among other things, Russia buys sugar and tobacco, sells Cuba oil and is developing nickel and copper production here. China assists with technicians.

Since taking power, he said, the revolutionary government has spent $200 million on agriculture, $195 million on industry and $125 million on the fight against illiteracy.

"That is very good work," he added, "when you consider that when the revolutionary government took power the national bank had reserves of only $20 million and $70 million in dividends. Its debts were greater than that and more than $50 million had been stolen by the brother of a former president."

Industries in this country, he said, are 82 percent nationalized. Banks are 100 percent government-owned and the land 50 percent. The produce of the other 50 percent is bought by the government. The government has a monopoly on imports.

The greatest change taking place now is the mass movement of farmers to cooperatives, he said. There is, however, no thought of nationalizing small shops and businesses until "the future."

Guevara said the counter-revolutionary invasion of 2 weeks ago was militarily sound. Not many people would be needed to take Cuba, he said, if the population of the country supported them. In this instance they did not have that support.

Asked about guerrilla movements in other Latin American countries, the author of a book on hit-and-run fighting said he had no wish to interfere in the affairs of other nations. But, he said, most other Latin American countries had better conditions for guerrilla warfare than Cuba, which is mainly flat, with only three small mountain ranges.

The social conditions in a number of countries, he said, were similar to those in Cuba before the revolution and guerrilla bands might operate. However, he warned, such guerrillas would need patience, and above all the support of the populace before they would have any hope of success. He refused to be drawn into discussions on any particular country.

He said he believed there would be another attack on Cuba but not a direct one by the United States because Cuba had been promised help by Russia. The United States "will have to think twice before attacking."

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, if Poland can lend Communist Cuba $13 million, why should we extend aid to Poland? Does it make sense to help Poland, so that she can help Cuba build herself into a strategic Communist beachhead against us?

Since Marshal Tito's break with Stalin in 1948, the United States has furnished nearly $1½ billion in economic aid and $700 million in military aid to Communist Yugoslavia. Yet Tito openly sides with America's opponents in the United Nations, and has joined in Communist propaganda attacks on U.S. policy. On the rare occasions when Tito parts company with the Soviet bloc, seldom does he join the free world. He merely selects another plan to further Communist goals.

In appraising the results of America's generous aid to Communist Poland and Communist Yugoslavia, what do we find? Are the present Polish and Yugoslav governments on our side regarding the Congo? Are they on our side regarding Laos? Are they on our side regarding Cuba? The answers are clearly, "No."

Regardless of whether Communists are Polish Communists, Czech Communists, Soviet Communists, Chinese Communists, Yugoslav Communists, or Cuban Communists, their goal is identical. Premier Khrushchev has warned those who fancy that the Communists may abandon these goals; he has said, "You may as well wait until the shrimp learns to whistle."

The Communists have already gobbled up Eastern Europe and mainland China, North Korea, Tibet, and Cuba; and now they are on the march in Laos and in South Vietnam. So that they may sustain their secret and open aggressions against other nations, Communist rulers go to any extreme, even to starving their own people. It is futile to cling to the hope that our economic and financial aid would go to help the needy people of lands where the Communists have an iron grip on the people. Our aid would only further entrench the Red rulers.

Despite the hard, harsh facts of actual experience, it is still contended that we should continue aid to Communist Yugoslavia and Communist Poland, and remove Battle Act restrictions on economic aid to Communist countries outside Soviet Russia and the Communist-held areas of the Far East.

The Senate first considered these Battle Act amendments on June 5, 1958. Since I was not at that time a Member of the Senate, I reviewed the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD debate. The then minority leader, Senator Knowland, of California, delivered some very telling arguments against these amendments. These arguments are still valid today, and they merit repetition. Senator Knowland pointed out that as we help to relieve the famine and economic pinch in these Communist countries, here is what happens:

Life becomes more tolerable for the people. They are less rebellious, and the pressures on the local Communist rulers decline.

This in turn means less hardship on Soviet Russia itself to keep her empire intact.

Thanks to American dollars, communism then appears to be a workable system.

As long as satellite states remain economically satisfactory, politically stable, and even remotely tolerable, the chances of open rebellion are slim. The strength of the Communist rulers is correspondingly greater.

Without outside help, the Communist rulers could not meet the minimum needs of their people. More stringent measures would be needed to increase production, including longer hours for workers.

Dissatisfaction among the millions who would work harder and get less would increase. This would build up pressures on the rulers. There would be fear of uprisings. Strong-arm tactics would intensify, and this would further arouse the people.

Restless satellites would force greater hardships on Soviet Russia proper and further weaken the economic base of the entire Russian imperialist system.

Moscow might be forced to part with consumer goods—always scarce in Russia—and this would be unpopular with the Russian people.

It would require more direct Russian intervention in the local affairs of the satellites. This in turn would create more friction and unrest.

The propaganda value to the West of such dissatisfaction within the satellites would be immeasurable in our ideological struggle with uncommitted or neutral nations. With the gross failures and inhuman brutalities of the Communist bosses thus exposed, as it was in Hungary, there would be less orientation toward Russia by the neutral nations.

Senator Knowland pointed out:

What is far more likely to happen if we continue this calculated risk of aid to Communist nations is a powerful commonwealth of Communist nations acting in concert.

Such a prospect poses a greater menace to the United States than restless satellites in a far-flung Russian empire which can only be kept in line by the might of the Russian Army.

By aiding the satellite countries, we play into the hands of the Soviets: We enable her to keep many of her own troops at home, thereby lessening possibilities of disillusionment and defection in the Russian Army itself, something greatly feared by the men

in the Kremlin * * *. We lend credibility to Russian propaganda which claims the Communist satellite governments are not directed from Moscow.

Like Senator Knowland, I am opposed to the United States giving aid to Communist-dominated countries. To give succor and sustenance to governments who publicly proclaim their undying enmity of all that is free is like supplying them with arms to destroy us. To paraphrase it in the vernacular, we are deliberately cutting our own throats.

Mr. President, experience is a great teacher. But, unless we are apt pupils, we will not profit by our experience. The lessons of recent history regarding American aid to Communist Poland and Communist Yugoslavia are to me clear and inescapable: these policies are not weaning them away from the Communist bloc—these policies have not changed in one iota their hatred for us. They still say they will destroy us.

I therefore urge my colleagues to reject Senate bill 1215.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, in accordance with the order previously entered, I move that the Senate stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 13 minutes p.m.), under the previous order, the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, May 9, 1961, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate May 8, 1961:

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

Paul R. Ignatius, of Massachusetts, to be Assistant Secretary of the Army.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

William L. Batt, Jr., of Pennsylvania, to be Area Revelopment Administrator in the Department of Commerce.

U.S. MARSHAL

R. Ben Hosler, of Ohio, to be U.S. marshal for the northern district of Ohio for the term of 4 years, vice Xavier North, deceased.

IN THE AIR FORCE

The following persons for appointment in the Regular Air Force in the grades indicated, under the provisions of section 8284, title 10, United States Code, with a view to designation under the provisions of section 8067, title 10, United States Code, to perform the duties indicated, and with dates of rank to be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force:

To be captain, USAF (Chaplain)

Edwin H. Braly, AO2077018.

To be captains, USAF (Medical)

Charles K. Beyer, AO3077930.
James B. Harris, AO3075197.
Leonard R. Howard, AO3078916.
Norbert J. Weikers, AO3088634.

To be captains, USAF (Dental)

Paul F. Kiecker, AO699074.
Jerome B. Marshall, Jr., AO3043035.

To be captains, USAF (Veterinary)

John W. Cable, AO2248328.
Keith L. Kraner, AO2247722.

To be captains, USAF (Nurse)

Irmina T. Burkhardt, AN2214437.
Otill A. Chaszar, AN2214259.
Lillian T. Howard, AN1912851.
Billye Masten, AN804188.
Johnena K. Moore, AN2241998.
Joan R. Powers, AN2244131.

To be first lieutenants, USAF (Medical)

Dennis D. Barber, AO3090415.
William R. Bullock, Jr., AO3088638.

To be first lieutenants, USAF (Medical Service)

Quentin T. Barrett, AO3047948.
Domenic A. Maio, AO3079311.
Edward F. Schenkel, AO3001499.

To be first lieutenants, USAF (Nurse)

Geraldine M. Bendickson, AN3091758.
Helen A. Boggess, AN3045725.
Norene E. Cowling, AN3089329.
Mary A. Del Moro, AN3091315.
Mary B. Greene, AN2243364.
Ellen M. B. Kernan, AN3091793.
Joy A. Lane, AN3078616.
Maye L. Liebeck, AN3091565.
Nina P. McMichael, AN2243128.
Monna L. Mumper, AN3045700.
Estella J. Nicholson, AN3088717.
Joan A. Sumner, AN3089939.

To be first lieutenant, USAF (medical specialist)

Donna J. Oldenburg, AJ3075491.

The following persons for appointment in the Regular Air Force, in the grades indicated, under the provisions of section 8284, title 10, United States Code, with dates of rank to be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force:

To be major

Douglas S. Christie, Jr., AO682797.

To be captains

Harold B. Burton, AO3026441.
Eleas Casillas, AO3026338.
George A. Dodds, AO3019311.
Thomas R. Hataway, AO3019795.
Donald E. Majors, AO3018727.
Marvin C. Mayfield, AO3025985.
Roland McCabe, AO3025916.
Donald F. Mead, AO3017833.
James R. Mitchell, Jr., AO3025800.
Robert G. Morrison, AO3025860.
Robert F. O'Rourke, AO3025849.
Maurice E. Quirke, AO1859937.
Wayne E. Robinson, AO1855288.
Robert D. Sidwell, AO3019600.
John H. Slevin, AO3019580.
Rolland C. Smiley, AO3016951.
Rudolph J. Stanislav, AO3016049.
Ray B. Sutton, Jr., AO3015222.
Jack B. Titus, AO3019221.
Robert J. Troxell, AO3019938.
Walter J. Turner, AO3019603.
William E. Underwood III, AO3018941.
Rinaldo F. Vachino, AO3014562.
Dawson N. White, AO3016999.
Frank H. Zander, AO3019826.

To be first lieutenants

Gerald L. Allen, AO3073909.
Frederick S. Battey, AO3087770.
Billy M. Bowen, AO3073895.
James M. Boyer, AO3085632.
Arnold W. Brock, AO3072109.
Robert W. Caldwell, Jr., AO3053384.
William A. Carlton, AO3074242.
Thomas A. Childers, AO1908017.
William A. Christians, AO3087814.
Ervin A. Cogdell, AO3085059.
David W. Cox, AO3082550.
Richard D. Daigle, AO3072831.
Howard A. Dean, AO3085064.
Richard T. Dixon, AO3085216.
Ernest C. Dodson, AO3083309.
Robert D. Engel, AO3085208.
John W. Epperson, Jr., AO3084773.
Frederick C. Erickson, AO3051469.
Denton M. Garner, AO3083259.
Stanley A. Garriss, Jr., AO3074154.
John P. Ham, AO3072969.
Raymond E. Hamilton, AO3087918.
Robert P. Harlow, AO3074459.
Douglass R. Hoadley, AO3072253.
William H. Jackson, AO3073993.
Charles W. Jenkins, AO3072151.
Edward E. Johnson, AO3087938.
Montie R. Keller, AO3074390.
Lee R. Kershner, AO3085309.
Duane E. Knutson, AO3074178.
Erich A. Koch, AO3084501.
Bruce R. Kowol, AO3081555.
James H. LaFon, AO3073913.
Herbert E. Langford, AO3072939.
John L. Larrison, AO3083768.
Jack A. Leach, AO3083898.
Clarence W. Lee, AO3074291.
John T. Loftus, AO3074017.
Thomas J. Margle, AO3074468.
Warren K. Marler, AO3083292.
Alfonso Marquez, AO3074141.
Lawrence F. McArdle, AO3084592.
Gary B. McIntire, AO3072141.
Harlan W. Messick, AO3073885.
Bruce M. Miller, AO3054579.
Madeline A. Moore, AL3060537.
James W. Neal, AO3083950.
Harold E. Neller, AO3073894.
George E. Nelson, AO3085240.
Benard M. Novak, AO3072996.
Donald A. O'Nesky, AO3082641.
Robert T. Otto, AO3073874.
Robert H. Parker, AO3074551.
Jose A. Parodi, AO3082984.
Parker C. Peedin, AO3073887.
Barton J. Pfautz, AO3086210.
William N. Pierce, Jr., AO3084625.
James L. Pruitt, AO3074312.
Robert A. Resuali, AO3073859.
David G. Sanborn, AO3085104.
Don E. Sanders, AO3074478.
Galen E. Savage, AO3073868.
Stanley O. Schaetzle, AO3074195.
William L. Schrader, Sr., AO3070512.
Robert M. Schverak, AO3074317.
Phillip W. Shields, AO3085197.
Fred D. Smith, AO3082942.
Howard J. Steen, AO3084573.
Donald E. Straley, AO3074590.
O. L. Taylor, AO3101007.
Ottis F. Teuton, Jr., AO3084067.
Raymond D. Thomas, AO3093022.
John D. Thomson, AO3083569.
Charles H. Weidman, Jr., AO3085637.
Henry H. Woolard, Jr., AO2215732.
Thomas J. Zimmerman, AO3085124.

To be second lieutenants

Distinguished Aviation Cadet Graduates

Richard L. Byerly, AO3116211.
Theodore J. Conrad, AO3116103.
James B. Lawhon, AO3116283.
William L. Nellans, AO3116295.
Alan M. Uliss, AO3104006.
Arnold M. Visnick, AO3116199.

Distinguished Officer Candidate Graduate

Wayne E. Mabrey, AO3115375.

Distinguished Officer Training School Graduates

Samuel J. Cox, AO3115685.
Spencer C. Frost III, AO3115614.
Jerome A. Michel, AO3115723.
Thomas E. Rodgers, AO3115736.
Edward J. Songy, AO3115746.

Subject to medical qualification and subject to designation as distinguished military graduates, the following distinguished military students of the Air Force Reserve Officers' Training Corps for appointment in the Regular Air Force, in the grade of second lieutenant, under section 8284 of title 10, United States Code, with dates of rank to be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force:

John J. Beck, Jr.
Richard B. Curtin
Kenneth A. Gale
George H. Labovitz
Howard R. McClain
Michael J. Morea
Jack D. Morris

IN THE ARMY

The following-named officers for promotion in the Regular Army of the United States, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3284 and 3299.

To be lieutenant colonel

Hancock, William F., O45013.

To be lieutenant colonels, Medical Corps

Audet, Harold H., O85124.
Bradley, John L., O56869.
Chapman, Ralph R., O43217.
Martin, George W., O43210.
Schoepflin, Adolphe J., O43207.

To be lieutenant colonels, Dental Corps

Blanchard, George, O31269.
DiJoseph, Benjamin J., O88657.
Keeton, Melvin, O78077.
Kruszewski, Edward P., O78594.

To be lieutenant colonels, Veterinary Corps

Burns, Kenneth F., O31210.
Davies, Frank J., O40126.
Faust, Herbert R., O52036.
Gochenour, William S., Jr., O31211.
Miller, Everett B., O40132.
Reid, Joseph E., O31237.
Ross, Martin A., O31224.

To be lieutenant colonels, Medical Service Corps

Alexander, Eugene S., O37488.
Allen, James F., O49955.
Arnold, Ralph D., O49947.
Barnett, Herbert C., O56236.
Barney, Leonard C., O37487.
Beaudry, Stephen J., O37503.
Breyfogle, William V., O37534.
Britt, Arthur E., O37551.
Brown, John A., O49963.
Buchanan, Dee C., O37509.
Buckler, Phillip J., O37564.
Butler, Jesse N., O26983.
Caito, Thomas P., O37478.
Clegg, William J., Jr., O37542.
Coleman, Tyler S., O84821.
Collier, George T., O30898.
Conrad, George F., O37473.
Creamer, Raymond J., O37472.
DeGraff, George J., O49935.
Dempsey, Richard W., O37529.
Edwards, Thomas R., O37499.
Egense, Stanley W., Jr., O37475.
Flatter, Findlay F., O49941.
Funston, Howard J., O41136.
Gaines, Sidney, O39344.
Gans, Harry L., O37536.
Gelby, Walter H., O37560.
Gibson, Wilmot L., O37562.
Godwin, Frank D., O37525.
Gray, John T., O37480.
Greer, Richard S., O39343.
Grindell, James D., O37515.
Grow, George L., O37573.
Hallahan, John M., O37479.
Hammaker, Bernard W., O37492.
Handorf, William G., O49954.
Hill, Harold E., O41142.
Holt, John W., O41154.
Hooker, Claude L., O37482.
Howard, Kenneth G., O37550
Huffman, James V., O37507.
Jewell, Dean M., O49924.
Keegan, Hugh L., O49928.
Kowalsky, Matthew J., O37496.
LaManche, Philip L., O37501.
Maher, Dale R., O37559.
Martin, Edward J., O41143.
Mikuluk, John A., O81867.
Nashold, Donald K., O37500.
Newton, Arthur, O83551.
Plemmons, Sam A., O37517.
Powell, Harry C., O39336.
Richards, Ralph J., Jr., O37485.
Rivenbark, R. V., O49956.
Robbins, Walter F., O56929.
Rockstroh, Henry J., O56942.
Saling, James T., O37553.
Sandman, Otto H., Jr., O37476.
Swall, Ross F., O37511.
Thomas, Hughie C., O37462.
Thompson, Jerry V., O37451.
Thompson, Willard E., O37495.
Van Sickle, Floyd E., Jr., O41145.
Watts, Foster L., O37569.

To be majors

Aaron, Jerome, O89901.
Abelson, Albert N., O57434.
Abt, Alan B., O60323.
Accorti, Peter J., O84448.
Achee, Sidney W., O60583.
Acheson, Leonard D., Jr., O84932.
Acker, Ivan B., O60474.
Acuff, Earl C., O60178.
Adams, Howard E., O57244.
Adams, Robert E., O78690.
Adams, Robert F., O78691.
Adcock, Robert L., O60565.
Adkins, Aaron C., O60512.
Adoue, Eugene L., O58805.
Affleck, David W., O58806.
Agee, Charles D., O78692.
Albertson, James J., O62197.
Alfonso, Albert F., O57240.
Alford, Emanuel P., Jr., O85826.
Allard, Henry G., O58808.
Allen, Donald E., O75135.
Allen, Herbert B., O60349.
Allen, Robert L., O92057.
Allen, Warren P., O62825.
Allis, John D., O60616.
Allison, William A., O60176.
Amenson, Raymond C., O80033.
Amity, Richard F., O60407.
Ammerman, Edwin F., O63841.
Anderson, Allen R., O62116.
Anderson, Burton L., O78701.
Anderson, David M., O80538.
Anderson, Philip C., O80034.
Anderson, Reuben L., Jr., O57129.
Anderson, Richard C., O58810.
Anderson, Richard L., O60567.
Anderton, Edward C., O61094.
Andres, Charles, 3d, O58811.
Andrews, James L., O58812.
Anthony, Thomas J., O58813.
Applegate, William H., O65007.
Apt, Robert, O58814.
Arendt, Morton, Jr., O65942.
Armstrong, Nemesio A., O59898.
Armstrong, William H., O87467.
Arnett, Vern R., O60369.
Arnold, Emmett R., O60396.
Arnold, Richard D., O58815.
Arnold, Richard J., O58816.
Arnwine, Henry B., O78705.
Asbury, Harold D., O81950.
Astarita, Edward F., O60821.
Atchison, Frank E., O58817.
Athanason, Frank A., O58818.
Atkinson, Donald E., O65071.
Austin, Henry M., Jr., O80037.
Avery, Albert M., Jr., O59894.
Avery, William H., Jr., O58819.
Axelson, Rudolph A., O59838.
Bale, John J., O85127.
Bailey, Jack S., O62209.
Bailey, James, O78707.
Bailey, John F., O78708.
Bailey, Paul O., O60515.
Baker, James O., O60316.
Baker, John W., O63380.
Baldy, Paul A., O59773.
Balitis, John J., O60414.
Ballard, Donald S., O58821.
Ballinger, Eldon L., O61202.
Balmforth, Edmund E., O80552.
Bang, John D., O63056.
Bangs, Robert R., O78710.
Barber, John W., O65009.
Barbero, Eugene C., O61994.
Barker, Edmund J., O60330.
Barnett, James W., Jr., O57087.
Barnett, Robert B., O58823.
Barr, William H., O59470.
Barrett, George B., Jr., O60601.
Barrick, Thomas M., O60493.
Bartholdt, William E., O60630.
Barton, Deforest A., O80558.
Barwick, William R., Jr., O61089.
Bass, Marshall B., O62204.
Baswell, Carl F., O58826.
Batiste, John O., O58827.
Baxley, James W., O78714.
Beard, Daryl A., O60506.
Beard, Kenneth R., O61095.
Bearden, William A., O60491.
Beasley, Thomas A., O65074.
Becicka, Leonard, O58828.
Beck, William J., O58829.
Beckett, James E., O59839.
Beckman, Paul E., O66135.
Behenna, Douglas L., O65034.
Bein, Robert K., O60379.
Beinke, Walter, Jr., O57357.
Bell, Eugene J., Jr., O63676.
Bellinger, John B., Jr., O57136.
Beninate, Nicholas A., O59464.
Bentley, Robert D., O65044.
Benton, Lucien C., O60549.
Berger, Alvin C., O65948.
Bernard, Robert J., O58830.
Berry, Milton M., O59886.
Berry, Sidney B., Jr., O57233.
Bertholf, Russell W., Jr., O63083.
Bertram, Edward H., Jr., O57327.
Best, Charles E., O58831.
Betz, John J., Jr., O58832.
Biere, Emerson T., O58834.
Big, Bernard, O58835.
Bilharz, Dwight L., O65952.
Birdsong, Eff W., Jr., O80045.
Bithos, Franklin J., O81958.
Blackford, James C., O58836.
Blair, Robert C., O59840.
Blakeslee, James A., O57272.
Bledsoe, James E., O78720.
Blumenthal, Peter J., O81960.
Boehm, William C., O63051.
Boisvert, Joseph R., O65018.
Boland, Richard H., O78723.
Boone, George M., Jr., O60335.
Booth, Dale R., O70078.
Booth, Merritt B., Jr., O65698.
Borcheller, Karl H., O57038.
Boutelle, Guy C., O78728.
Boutelle, Maurice H., O62126.
Bowen, Thomas W., O57090.
Bowen, William C., Jr., O61201.
Bowman, James H., O78730.
Boy, Edmund G., O63073.
Boyd, Donn T., O62181.
Boyle, Peter J., Jr., O58839.
Boylston, William L., O59775.
Bradford, Robert K., O62173.
Brambila, Robert M., Jr., O88584.
Brandewie, Robert A., O60373.
Brannock, Robert C., O64995.
Brannon, Otis E., Jr., O50783.
Brash, William W., O65042.
Bratton, William D., O60190.
Braun, Walter R., O60509.
Breen, Patrick J., O62129.
Brennan, John W., O57124.
Bridges, Wayne W., O78734.
Briggs, John L., O58840.
Brigham, Bruce A., O78736.
Brizius, Charles A., Sr., O58841.
Brockett, Charles K., O60199.
Brooks, Roland St. J., Jr., O60336.
Brouillette, Frederick, O65057.
Brown, Albert J., O60321.
Brown, George K., Jr., O58842.
Brown, Halden D., O62136.
Brown, Hugh M., Jr., O58843.
Brown, Richard F., O59841.
Brown, William A., O60815.
Brown, William D., O60426.
Browne, Mark L., Jr., O58844.
Bruger, Edward J., O60516.
Brummer, James L., O78739.
Brunt, Julian G., O78741.
Bryant, Jackson M., O62151.
Bryant, John T., Jr., O58845.
Buchanan, Everts R., O59842.
Buchanan, Thomas E., O78742.
Buckley, Harry A., Jr., O57335.
Buie, David M., O59777.
Bullard, William P., O58847.
Bullock, Frank E., O60319.
Bundy, Robert E., O60633.
Burch, Charles T., O63060.

Burch, Gerald C., O63283.
Burget, Frank R., O62120.
Burhoe, John M., O90258.
Burke, Martin J., Jr., O61098.
Burns, George T., O78743.
Burns, William C., O57092.
Burpo, Frank W., O65026.
Burrer, John D., O61208.
Burt, Robert E., O63053.
Bush, Francis J., O64997.
Bush, Harry L., O59843.
Bush, Hugh W., Jr., O60626.
Bush, Sydney A., O78746.
Byers, William E., O57200.
Byrd, Billy W., O58848.
Byrne, Daniel K., O58849.
Cadman, Walvin M., O60554.
Cain, Lloyd R., O58850.
Caldwell, Elmer I., O59778.
Caldwell, William B., 3d, O57280.
Call, Raymond L., O60618.
Callagy, Thomas A., O61093.
Callahan, Robert F., O58851.
Callahan, Vincent J., O60325.
Callanan, Edward F., O57215.
Cancelliere, Francis P., 2d, O57287.
Candal, Miguel A., O61096.
Cannon, J. Parry, O58852.
Cantlebary, Leland R., O60350.
Cantor, David L., O60539.
Caponegro, Michael A., O60206.
Capps, Jack L., O57322.
Capuano, Joseph, O58853.
Carpenter, Dalton O., Jr., O62188.
Carper, William C., 3d, O58854.
Carr, William D., O60420.
Carrig, Stephen J., O60378.
Carrigan, Kevin F., O62159.
Carrigo, Edward A., Jr., O58856.
Carroll, James H., Jr., O65000.
Carson, Eugene T., O89434.
Carter, James T., O60358.
Carter, Leslie D., Jr., O57270.
Carter, Sherman F., O60550.
Cartwright, Roscoe C., O63039.
Caruthers, Lawrence W., O67554.
Casey, Herbert T., Jr., O59891.
Casey, Warren C., O63233.
Catlin, Rupert W., O58859.
Cerow, Donald A., O57315.
Chapman, Lorin P., O58860.
Charron, Frederick E., O78756.
Chase, Lawrence R., O81972.
Chelenza, Nicholas J., O78757.
Chesnut, James W., O65046.
Chester, Sigmund R., O58861.
Childress, Herbert J., Jr., O63301.
Ching, Kenneth E. Y., O78758.
Chitty, John H., Jr., O57254.
Christianson, George H., O60500.
Churchill, Lake G., Jr., O57312.
Ciley, Colin D., Jr., O65484.
Citrak, Michael, O30655.
Clare, George F., O80656.
Clark, Alphus R., O63059.
Clark, Harlow G., Jr., O60339.
Clark, Thomas R., O57148.
Clark, William R., O60521.
Clarke, Carter W., Jr., O57314.
Clarkson, Richard L., O60792.
Clausen, Hugh J., O70302.
Clayton, Frank W., O60617.
Clement, William J., Jr., O65039.
Cleveland, John H., O59468.
Cockerham, Samuel G., O57340.
Cody, Henry L., O60443.
Coffey, William D., Jr., O60341.
Coggins, Bruce T., O68335.
Cole, Earl F., O64999.
Cole, Jack H., O60456.
Coleman, Bruce S., O58862.
Coleman, James F., O58863.
Coleman, John D., Jr., O60785.
Coles, Clarence J., O60432.
Collier, William H., O58864.
Collins, Clarence G., Jr., O56988.
Collins, John M., O80060.
Collins, John W., O63332.
Collins, Michael G., O65485.
Condrill, Donald R., O63309.
Connelly, Frank P., Jr., O84600.
Conner, Donald A., O58866.
Connor, George C., O60557.
Conrad, Charles E., O58867.
Conrad, Clifton H., O63071.
Cook, Carroll M., Jr., O60638.
Cook, Dewitt, O60510.
Cook, William B., Jr., O76861.
Coon, John E., O59847.
Cooper, Richmond J., O57155.
Cope, Edward H., O65037.
Cordero, Virgil N., Jr., O60181.
Corey, Jim, O57464.
Corley, Arthur V., O78773.
Cormack, Thomas B., O57125.
Cormier, Robert A., O65970.
Correll, David R., O60440.
Corrington, Roger A., O60621.
Coveny, Robert F., O62167.
Cowan, Kenneth L., O60607.
Craft, Floyd G., O60627.
Crandall, Walter M., Jr., O58869.
Crane, Ray T., O80681.
Crane, William H., O62222.
Crenshaw, Leon, O59457.
Crochet, Harold J., O81982.
Crockett, John J., O59848.
Cronin, Morgan J., O58870.
Cronk, Robert A., O58871.
Crouchet, Jack H., O69893.
Crowder, Thomas H., Jr., O62178.
Crozier, Bruce U., O50885.
Cruikshank, Ralph H., O60803.
Cruz, Alfred J., O90215.
Culbertson, Paul V., O59849.
Culpepper, Vernon M., O66145.
Cummings, Lloyd R., O81983.
Cunningham, John D., O62223.
Cunningham, Robert F., O58873.
Curles, Cecil M., O63298.
Currey, Wallace H., O62212.
Curtis, Walter R., O65005.
Cushing, Robert H., Jr., O57147.
Custis, Harry N., O65027.
Cutler, Cecil L., Jr., O67913.
Dale, Thomas W., O58874.
Dalton, David N., O63289.
Dalzell, Robert C., O60183.
Dambrosio, Eugene J., O78783.
Daniel, George M., O60551.
Darden, Jack M., O60595.
Daugherty, Robert M., O78173.
Daum, William B., O58875.
Davis, David L., O60365.
Davis, Glenn A., O63295.
Davis, Gordon R., Jr., O58876.
Davis, Joseph A., O78786.
Davis, Ralph J., O60619.
Dawson, Albert F., O59850.
Day, Philip S., Jr., O57349.
DeFranco, Theodore J., O60417.
DeMarcus, John B., O59851.
DeSantis, Joseph A., O60362.
DeWeese, Robert E., Jr., O78790.
Decker, Charles DeF., Jr., O58878.
Decker, James W., O78791.
Deehan, Donald E., O57181.
Del Vitto Jon M., O78792.
Dellinger, Lawrence M., O65011.
Denison, Paul S., Jr., O58880.
Denney, Darel D., O60408.
Dent, James R., O78794.
Devall, Sherral C., O78796.
Devan, Vernon C., O62194.
Diaz, George F., O78798.
Dickerson, Gerald T., O84976.
Dickson, Ervin W., Jr., O69479.
Dietrich, Frank L., O78799.
Diggs, Walter F., O80071.
Dileanis Leonard P., O60614.
Dillard, Oliver W., O60564.
Dillard, Robert J., O58881.
Dille, Richard T., O58882.
Dillon, William H., O58883.
Dingeman, James W., O57260.
Dobson, William C., Jr., O65982.
Doerflein, Donald P., O60547.
Dolan, Bernard J., Jr., O63321.
Domenech, John, O60487.
Donahue, Richard E., O60620.
Donnelly, James D., O60205.
Donnelly, Paul E., O59852.
Donovan, Thomas W., O58884.
Doody, John J., O57360.
Doren, Donald M., O78803.
Dorr, Colgate, O80713.
Doty, Mercer M., O57221.
Dougherty, Jack D., O65476.
Dougherty, John E., O60314.
Douglas, Leslie M., O58885.
Dowds, Peter M., O86082.
Doyle, Lee T., O57115.
Dragotta, Harry A., O63336.
Drake, William T., O60429.
Drane, Elbert E., O60449.
Duarte, Stanley J., O78805.
Ducote, Warren S., O60826.
Dufresne, George R., O62812.
Duggins, George J., O58886.
Duke, James O., O60502.
Dukes, Lonzie J., O58887.
Duncan, James R., O62221.
Duncan, Samuel K., O60393.
Dunham, William H., 3d, O60419.
Dunn, Wellington J., O63287.
Durant, Robert N., O63803.
Duruz, Paul B., O58889.
Dyer, Joseph A., O60376.
Eagan, Warren C., O69638.
Earle, Frank H., O60831.
Earles, Carl T., O58890.
Earnest, George C., O78813.
Eaton, Richard J., O62227.
Echols, James E., Jr., O63334.
Eckes, Leroy J., O78815.
Edington, James E., O50734.
Edmunds, Joseph A., O60390.
Edwards, Ralph, O62827.
Edwards, Robert B., O60562.
Egan, Frank J., O58891.
Egbert, John S., O57103.
Egg, Eugene C., O60609.
Eggers, George D., Jr., O60555.
Eggert, Dalton D., O85318.
Eickhoff, Albert P., O59853.
Elam, John K., Jr., O65986.
Ellard, Uell W., Jr., O58892.
Ellis, August V., O58893.
Ellis, Ernest W., Jr., O65596.
Ellis, Walter G., O80738.
Ellis, William R., O62814.
Ellison, Richard W., O78817.
Elmer, Bryce L., O58894.
Ely, Robert L., Jr., O60211.
Embley, William H., O58895.
Emerick, James C., O80742.
Emerson, Duane L., O57106.
Emery, Jean R., O60544.
Emmons, Harris, O59854.
Emrich, Robert F., O78821.
Enderle, Wallace O., O57196.
Endres, Edward P., O60571.
Epps, Jones N., O60328.
Ericsson, Eric A., O88670.
Ertischweiger, Herman, O58896.
Escola, Albert R., O60569.
Etchemendy, William W., O62152.
Etkin, Max, O60793.
Evans, Harry E., O62150.
Eyer, Arvine J., O62824.
Fahs, Robert B., O50824.
Fairfield, Ronald, J., Jr., O62135.
Falkenstein, Richard C., O81993.
Fallon, Rudolph A., O62225.
Farkash, Eugene J., O80750.
Farmer, William K., O60486.
Farrington, Thomas H., O60796.
Farwell, Faris T., O65063.
Farwell, Lester C., O78829.
Fazakerley, Richard G., O58898.
Felix, Russell E., O60475.
Fenstemacher, Edgar R., O59780.
Fiorelli, Michael C., O88677.
Fisher, Bruce C., O60329.
Fitzpatrick, John R., Jr., O50883.
Fix, Joseph, 3d, O60527.
Flake, Glade F., O69921.
Fleet, Robert G., O91983.
Fleming, Eugene C., Jr., O57372.
Fleshman, William H., O80085.
Fletcher, Paul M., O60189.
Flick, John E., O64988.
Flournoy, Robert W., Jr., O78834.

Fogel, William H., O58899.
Fontana, Joseph A., O60439.
Foote, Ashby M., Jr., O57229.
Forbes, William A., O58900.
Ford, Francis J., O84857.
Forner, Herschel W., O84608.
Forrester, Eugene P., O57250.
Fort, Alvin E., O62163.
Foster, James E., O58901.
Francis, Robert, O62122.
Frank, Alva B., O65991.
Franzen, Walter C., O63082.
Freed, Cleo S., O59463.
Freeland, Robert L., O65051.
Freeman, George L., O59781.
Freund, Benedict L., O60631.
Frye, Wayne E., O84056.
Fulsang, Ejner J., Jr., O60452.
Gabardy, Robert L., O58902.
Gaffke, Frank M., O65997.
Gaines, Melvin R., O83598.
Galing, Bernard W., O60574.
Galloway, James V., O59782.
Galloway, Robert M., O62166.
Gambrell, John C., O58904.
Garcia, Orlando, O62138.
Gardner, Richard W., O87521.
Garman, George A., Jr., O78842.
Garner, Milton P., O68187.
Garrett, Edward J., O58905.
Garrett, Felix R., O60436.
Garrett, Franklin T., O59783.
Garwood, Charles E., O60552.
Gatrell, Wallace B., O78844.
Gay, Joseph M., Jr., O62214.
Geiger, Robert A., O58907.
Gellnicht, Donald L., O58908.
Genero, Peter P., O63063.
Gentry, William H. L., O78846.
George, Jack M., O69653.
Gerecke, Henry H., O62160.
Gerlach, Shirl L., O63049.
Gerrity, John F., O58910.
Gettman, Richard P., O80785.
Giesen, Robert J., O78848.
Giggey, Frederick W., O60532.
Gilbert, Robert R., O78849.
Gillert, Gustav J., O80790.
Gillis, John P., O60313.
Girton, Ralph H., O57588.
Glasgow, William M., Jr., O56771.
Glikes, Richard J., O60197.
Glinski, Douglass E., O65020.
Goad, Lewis H., O60450.
Goodell, Roscoe H., O60377.
Gordon, James H., O60784.
Gore, William E., O58911.
Gough, Robert B., Sr., O78854.
Graber, Gordon L., O78855.
Graf, Robert E., O57083.
Gramling, Freddie W., O62115.
Grandelli, Charles M., O80803.
Grandinetti, Dominick J., O85326.
Grant, Robert T., Jr., O60346.
Graver, Herbert A., O78858.
Graves, Harold K., O59855.
Graves, Robert P., O58912.
Gray, Columbus E., Jr., O59460.
Gray, Harvey W., Jr., O60582.
Greene, George V., Jr., O80805.
Greene, Maurice C., O60435.
Gregory, Arthur P., O60788.
Gresham, William A., O59471.
Grezaffi, Joseph, O60613.
Griffin, Leonard F., O61092.
Griffin, Lorayne M., O63084.
Griffin, Robert W., O80810.
Griffith, Stephen M., O57165.
Grimsley, James A., O60632.
Groff, Guy, Jr., O89816.
Grogan, John F., O65040.
Grogan, Owen R., Jr., O63052.
Grout, Gilbert J., O65588.
Grubbs, Alfred T., O82017.
Guinan, Warren A., O82018.
Gunter, Benjamin L., Jr., O62202.
Gutting, Louis J., O62822.
Gutzmann, Leslie E., O89217.
Hagan, James A., O66003.
Hagar, Bailey W., O80823.
Hagerty, James J., Jr., O82020.
Hagman, Charles A., Jr., O63291.
Haines, Albert E., Jr., O65048.
Hale, John D., Jr., O60830.
Hall, Charles E., O60578.
Hall, Harry H., O58913.
Hall, Robert L., O88717.
Hallahan, Robert F., O57251.
Halloran, Joseph E., Jr., O78865.
Hamilton, John D., O57343.
Hamlet, James F., O60412.
Hamlin, Guy A., O63740.
Hammack, Ralph B., O66004.
Hamscher, George M., O62174.
Hanks, William R., O58914.
Hansen, George K., O58916.
Harbort, Walter J., O65478.
Harp, Clifford E., O63800.
Harper, Adam W., O60399.
Harper, Douglas P., O58918.
Harper, Joseph W., Jr., O58919.
Harrelson, Joseph S., Jr., O62119.
Harrington, James R., O66158.
Harrington, Richard H., O65038.
Harris, Carl W., O58920.
Harris, Harry B., O62165.
Harrison, Dennis J., O58921.
Harsh, Keith R., O80099.
Harstad, Leroy O., O60453.
Hart, Edsel F., O60186.
Hart, Robert E., O78633.
Hartman, Carl W., O62171.
Hartnell, George W., O57302.
Haskell, Louis W., Jr., O57283.
Haszard, Sidney S., O60457.
Hatch, Jay A., O57143.
Hathaway, William S., O60588.
Hawkins, William S., O60808.
Hawley, William B., O78870.
Hayden, Oakes M., O60327.
Hayes, Herbert W., Jr., O58922.
Hayler, Rodney G., Jr., O60528.
Hays, Marshall C., O78872.
Heath, Ralph M., O66013.
Heekin, David P., O60888.
Heilman, Daniel P., O60563.
Helms, John L., O60513.
Hendricks, Jess B., Jr., O57168.
Hennes, Donald J., O63297.
Henry, Lee S., Jr., O63337.
Herbert, Bueford G., O64986.
Herigstad, Bert H., O78877.
Herron, Howard M., O59465.
Hertzog, Frank S., O80104.
Hettlinger, Walter, O59857.
Heuston, Harold W., O78878.
Hibbard, Walter, Jr., O59858.
Hickerson, Elzie, O62141.
Hicks, Harold A., O65694.
Hiestand, Harry H., O65012.
Hieta, Clifford W., O78879.
Hill, Alfred G., O58924.
Hill, Herbert R., O65073.
Hill, Lucius G., Jr., O58925.
Hinojosa, Ernest A., Jr., O57585.
Hinton, William S., O78881.
Hitchcock, James M., O60198.
Hodgdon, Raymond F., O60187.
Hodges, Genous S., Jr., O58926.
Hodges, Morris D., O65549.
Hodson, Fremont B., Jr., O60543.
Hoff, Forest E., O63310.
Hoffman, Albert R., O63234.
Hoffman, Hugh F. T., Jr., O57259.
Hoffman, John H., O62140.
Hoffman, Paul M., O78883.
Hoke, Ray R., O50886.
Holliday, Sam C., O57336.
Hollowell, Harry W., Jr., O84454.
Holper, Ambrose C., O78885.
Honour, Charles M., Jr., O65060.
Hooker, James F., Jr., O57138.
Hooker, William P., O78887.
Horn, Charles S., O57205.
Horn, Maurice R., O59472.
Horne, Paul R., Jr., O82027.
Horne, Willard V., O60800.
Horton, Warren H., O74949.
Hoskin, Charles E., 3d, O78890.
Hotaling, Robert P., O62177.
Houtz, James W., O62821.
Houtz, John W., O63326.
Howard, Charles W., O59785.
Howard, G. B., O88269.
Howard, Kenneth A., O67581.
Hoyt, Lawrence V., O57218.
Hubbard, Jack A., O71370.
Hubbard, Wallace H., O57172.
Huck, Frederick R., O60421.
Huetter, John J., O63316.
Huff, Douglas A., O65062.
Huff, John S., O59859.
Hughes, John A., Jr., O61995.
Hughes, John B., Jr., O57160.
Hughes, John C., O58930.
Humberd, Quentin L., O59897.
Hume, Albert G., O58931.
Humphrey, William L., O59786.
Hunter, David H., O63335.
Huray, Frank T., O66025.
Hurd, George R., Jr., O60437.
Hussey, Stanley J., O63323.
Hutchison, James H., O60282.
Hutson, Albert L., Jr., O58932.
Hylander, Walter R., Jr., O76887.
Iaderosa, Alfonso J., O60635.
Ingram, Earl, O78894.
Irby, Chester P., Jr., O60366.
Irick, Edward F., Jr., O60791.
Irvin, I. J., Jr., O62131.
Isaacs, Thomas R., O58934.
Ivie, Carl W., Jr., O59787.
Jamison, Robert W., O60355.
Jarrett, John A., O65016.
Jeffers, Henry A., Jr., O60795.
Jeffers, Heyward G., Jr., O66166.
Jennings, John M., O60587.
Jersey, Donald H., O65699.
Jessup, John E., Jr., O62219.
Johns, Leo D., O78899.
Johnson, Albert C., O66028.
Johnson, Carl A., O58936.
Johnson, Haskell L., O80118.
Johnson, Jasper R., O62170.
Johnson, Marshall D., O58937.
Johnson, Raymond E., O63281.
Johnston, Walter F., O63302.
Johnstonbaugh, Merle A., O60590.
Jones, Gilbert C., O64998.
Jones, James L., O57150.
Jones, Louis R., O57214.
Jones, Rees, O57235.
Jones, Russell B., Jr., O59860.
Jones, Thomas H., O65059.
Jones, Thomas T., O57113.
Jones, William J., O91613.
Joost, Horst K., O60353.
Juskowiak, Joseph L., O88272.
Kachavos, Charles J., O59491.
Kaczmarowski, Jerome H., O60454.
Kampe, Raymond L., O60430.
Kanelis, Tom, O58940.
Kaplan, Edward N., O60180.
Karst, Ralph A., O78908.
Kean, John P., O57345.
Keator, Hervey E., O58941.
Kelley, Eugene, Jr., O63320.
Kelly, George P., O84637.
Kelsey, Jesse T., O57274.
Kennedy, Reid W., Jr., O68366.
Kent, Graham G., O50859.
Kern, Bernard S., O62201.
Kerns, Raymond C., O78911.
Kerr, Richard L., O59458.
Kersey, Irwin J., O78912.
Kershaw, Charles G., 2d, O58942.
Kiernan, Joseph M., Jr., O57075.
Killpack, Paul E., O58944.
Kincy, William P., Jr., O78916.
King, Monroe D., O60322.
King, William P., O58945.
Kinley, Gordon L., O65693.
Kirby, Pierre P., O60624.
Kirchenstein, John, J., O68123.
Kirchman, William W., O62185.
Kirk, Henry C., O60422.
Kirwan, Robert L., O57252.
Kiser, John F., O58946.
Kneisl, Jerry A., O60499.
Kobbe, Eric, O62175.
Koch, Kenneth W., O62190.
Koch, Richard P., O78922.
Koenig, James R., O59475.

Komoto, Yasuro, O78923.
Komp, John S., O58947.
Kone, Kenneth M., O63330.
Kortum, Zane B., O69717.
Kranyak, Louis W., O63296.
Krause, Frederick C., O60702.
Kravitz, Seymour, O59492.
Kryzanowsky, Constantine D., O62162.
Kunkel, Charles E., O58949.
LaLonde, Wilfred G., O62195.
Labadie, George V., Jr., O62118.
Lamison, Kenneth R., O58951.
Landers, Joseph F., O65023.
Lane, Albert G., O65003.
Lange, Arthur G., Jr., O78931.
Lanier, Donald H., O60559.
Lawrence, Clyde K., O78936.
Lawrence, James R., O58952.
Lawson, William F., Jr., O62176.
Lawton, William S., Jr., O60505.
Layton, Victor J., O59862.
LeClair, John H., O58954.
Leahey, William E., O58953.
Lechner, Roy J., O60503.
Leddon, John W., Jr., O83605.
Lee, Donald C., O78940.
Lee, Harold H., O63324.
Leer, James M., Jr., O61204.
Lehman, Robert H., O62168.
Lennon, Daniel A., Jr., O78634.
Leonhauser, Paul C., Jr., O82043.
Lesniak, Walter J., O80967.
Leu, Bernard J., Jr., O62205.
Lewis, Marion A., Jr., O69727.
Liles, Roy L., O58955.
Lindley, Joseph H., O78946.
Lindsay, William B., O61203.
Lineker, George B., O66038.
Lippman, Gordon J., O60536.
Litschgi, Albert W., 3d, O59863.
Liana, Theodore, Jr., O59864.
Lockhart, Leon H., O62117.
Loftin, Joseph R., O60312.
Lomax, Arthur E., O60488.
Long, Carl L., O78949.
Lorch, Robert C., O58957.
Lorentzen, Lloyd E., O59487.
Lorenz, Robert M., O63036.
Louis, Eugene, O78950.
Lovejoy, Norman B., O57118.
Lovett, Frank P., Jr., O60825.
Lowman, Harry F., Jr., O59459.
Lowman, Theodore R., O58958.
Luce, Edward G., O60356.
Luckie, Lorenzo F., Jr., O58959.
Ludy, Garland A., O65049.
Lukens, James R., O63331.
Lundquist, Roy W. C., O63042.
Lutz, Roman J., O58961.
Lycas, John, O62137.
Lynch, Camille L., O78954.
Lynch, James E., Jr., O78955.
Lynes, Donald L., O63080.
Lynn, Otis C., O65066.
Lyons, Joseph W., O59466.
MacGarvey, Paul D., O62132.
MacLane, Robert C., O59865.
MacLean, Angus B., O60530.
MacLeod, William A., O60397.
Macklin, James E., Jr., O57225.
Madden, Everett I., O65070.
Maddox, John H., O59912.
Mahoney, Arthur E., O60523.
Maier, John E., O63058.
Maier, Robert J., Jr., O63075.
Mainer, George W., O60811.
Malone, Michael J., O58963.
Maloney, William L., O60600.
Manning, James A., O64996.
Manning, William E., O60466.
Marciniec, Walter F., O57133.
Marden, Martin, O83607.
Maricle, Louis J., O65055.
Marsh, Robert D., O60387.
Marshall, David S., O63288.
Marshall, James E., Jr., O60794.
Marshall, Robert W., O57284.
Marshall, Tandy G., O66046.
Martin, Hugh G., Jr., O78959.
Martin, James C., O58965.
Martin, James E., O81012.
Martin, Jason H., O58966.
Martin, Merritt P., O62215.
Marx, George H., O58967.
Mathews, Harry T., O60428.
Matteson, James S., O87847.
Matthews, Stanley L., O60315.
Mattingly, Leroy B., O58968.
Mattoon, Hugh M., O78963.
McAllister, Henry J., O60332.
McAmis, James C., Jr., O60372.
McAuliffe, John F., O60354.
McCain, Malcolm L., O64989.
McCann, Samuel E., O61200.
McCarthy, Leo C., O62123.
McCartney, Nevin L., O60508.
McCaslin, James K., O65031.
McClellan, Stan L., O58969.
McClelland, Don S., O57247.
McCormick, William F., Jr., O63076.
McCowen, George A., O65480.
McCoy, Clarence E., O82054.
McCoy, Paul G., O59501.
McCray, James G., O57277.
McCuen, John J., O57185.
McCullar, Francis M., O60174.
McCurley, Henry H., O60802.
McDade, Robert A., O78967.
McElhenny, John F., O76894.
McEnery, John W., O57184.
McFadden, Charles A., O60175.
McFall, Kenneth T., O60586.
McFarland, Richard DeL., O58971.
McGiffert, John R., 2d, O58972.
McKee, James O60427.
McKenty, Samuel H., Jr., O63328.
McMath, Robert P., O60603.
McMillan, Jenis C., O65036.
McNeely, David W., O57364.
McNeese, Frank J., O60577.
McNeil, William E., O81040.
McPherson, Robert B., O65013.
McSpadden, Garland R., O57139.
Meadow, Sam, O62142.
Mearns, George, O78976.
Meers, Boyce R., O78978.
Meinzen, Walter E., O57242.
Meiss, Jack M., O62146.
Mejia-Flores, Francisco, O88289.
Merigold, Frank A., O63050.
Merrell, George D., Jr., O60812.
Metcalf, Edward A., 3d, O72521.
Metosh, Cyril P., O78979.
Metzdorf, Jack R., O62139.
Metzner, Warren H., O62191.
Meyer, David W., O59867.
Meyer, Joseph H., O57153.
Meyer, Walter P., O63314.
Miescher, Walter H., Jr., O65017.
Millard, Alfred J., O60489.
Miller, Allen W., 3d, O78984.
Miller, Darwin C., O60538.
Miller, David I., O78985.
Miller, Jack R., O57296.
Miller, James W., O82061.
Miller, Kurtz J., Jr., O65024.
Miller, Paul H., O63325.
Millett, Lewis L., O78988.
Millican, Henry D., O88154.
Milton, John M., O57341.
Minkel, Edward J., O78989.
Mitman, Henry D., O59911.
Mittelstadt, Jack, O78992.
Moffitt, John P., O58979.
Monroe, Keith L., O62182.
Montgomery, Burton W., O82063.
Montgomery, John J., O59868.
Montgomery, Raymond J., O60391.
Moore, Donald P., O87570.
Moore, Euless B., Jr., O63300.
Moore, Gene D., O63280.
Moore, Russell E., O60615.
Morath, Eugene E., Jr., O58980.
More, Berkeley D., O58981.
Morehead, Thomas G., O59869.
Morehouse, Richard C., O78995.
Morgan, John T., Jr., O60814.
Morgan, Thomas L., O78996.
Morrison, James L., Jr., O50881.
Morrisroe, William J., O62186.
Morse, Herbert E., O60498.
Morton, Paul A., O62127.
Morton, Robert E., O60483.
Moseley, Lonnie L., O78998.
Mulligan, James R., O60191.
Mulvany, Floyd R., O60459.
Mundie, William L., O58984.
Munn, Richard A., Jr., O59461.
Munroe, Roscoe H., O79003.
Murnane, James J., O62144.
Murphey, James A., Jr., O60501.
Murphy, Eugene C., O66059.
Murphy, Francis J., O62156.
Myron, Harold L., O88854.
Nagata, George M., O60799.
Nance, Marvin L., O62161.
Neal, Harold, O79007.
Neff, Orrin D., O62189.
Neitz, Ravellan H., O81087.
Nelson, Shelton R., O65687.
Nemeth, Stephen A., O59870.
Neumann, Edward J., O79009.
Newell, Roscius C., O58985.
Newman, Gilbert H., O59790.
Nichols, Glen L., O58986.
Nichols, William L., O58987.
Nickel, William F., O63293.
Nisbet, Andrew, Jr., O58988.
Noble, Thomas P., O60334.
Nocita, John W., O65045.
Noice, Charles G., Jr., O63303.
Nolde, Hubert E., O60542.
Noll, Robert J., O58989.
Norby, Allen R., O65696.
Noreen, Albert T., Jr., O60438.
Norrie, George, Jr., O65025.
North, Louis J., O62199.
Norwood, Leonard L., Jr., O58990.
Novick, Jehiel, O61993.
Nunn, Clifford C., Jr., O60465.
Obradovich, Francis S., Jr., O63055.
O'Connor, Richard C., O62187.
Ogden, Dorward W., Jr., O58991.
Oldham, Thomas C., O66188.
Oliver, Tillman C., O63299.
Oliver, Wiley E., Jr., O70005.
Olow, John L., 3d., O65067.
Olsen, Raymond M., O81106.
Olson, James C., O60207.
Olson, Kenneth W., O57146.
O'Neill, Brian B., O59896.
Orfalea, George A., O60455.
Osborne, John R., O60537.
O'Shaughnessy, John E., Jr., O63317.
Osiecki, Frank S., O60425.
Osteen, John L., Jr., O57285.
Otto, Charles B., O88169.
Overstreet, Gerald L., O65050.
Overstreet, Lewis D., O79016.
Owen, Tom H., O81116.
Oxford, William B., O65065.
Pabst, Alfred A., O57169.
Packard, Donald F., O57162.
Packett, Wilbern L., O65004.
Padgett, Wade H., Jr., O62145.
Page, Alexander C., O60556.
Paradis, Joseph F., O63305.
Parker, John F., O65015.
Parker, John M., O58992.
Parker, Orville L. R., O66065.
Parker, Robert L., O58993.
Parks, Robert H., O59872.
Passell, David W., O62211.
Patch, William A., O57281.
Patterson, Edwin D., O57110.
Patterson, Robert W., O58994.
Paulmann, Edwin, O65010.
Payne, Charles G., Jr., O60637.
Payne, Thomas A., O80163.
Pecoraro, Anthony, O59873.
Penick, Jack G., O62218.
Percival, Allen C., O80165.
Perkins, Richard A., Jr., O59890.
Perry, Gerald L., Jr., O60184.
Perry, Harrison, O57096.
Petersen, Robert J., O57334.
Petrelli, John, O60413.
Phillips, Milton B., O62210.
Phillips, Robert L., Jr., O58997.
Phillips, William R., Jr., O63304.
Piburn, Edwin W., Jr., O60380.
Piccirilli, Albert A., O60342.
Picou, Lloyd J., O58998.

Pierce, John W., O59874.
Pierce, Leon A., O58999.
Piercy, James E., O59000.
Pineau, George P., O80169.
Pipkin, William P., O84461.
Pitchford, Harold I., Jr., O67738.
Plowman, Harry B., O60324.
Plumb, John F., O59001.
Plummer, Walter W., Jr., O57182.
Policastro, John J., O62226.
Polifka, Donald K., O60522.
Pollard, William F., Jr., O79029.
Pope, George Van W., Jr., O63485.
Porta, James R., O60431.
Post, Alton G., O60317.
Post, Charles M., O59002.
Pottle, Arthur F., Jr., O79031.
Powell, Charles M., Jr., O65475.
Powell, Elbert W., O79032.
Powell, George B., O65043.
Praeger, Herman A., Jr., O81149.
Prawitz, Leeland R., O81151.
Presson, David R., O60195.
Price, James R., O87889.
Price, Wilbur F., O60847.
Pritchard, Charles E., O63041.
Procter, Gilbert, Jr., O62155.
Proctor, Frank D., O61097.
Psaki, Nicholas G., Jr., O62121.
Pulliam, George W., Jr., O62208.
Putnam, William T., O59004.
Quinnelly, James L., O60177.
Radcliff, Edward C., O60533.
Rafferty, John H., Jr., O60804.
Ramundo, Bernard A., O65586.
Randolph, Jacob A., Jr. O63081.
Raney, Thompson L., O63054.
Raum, Mark, O59006.
Rawlins, Claude H., O60594.
Rawn, William A., O60461.
Ray, William B., O60568.
Reade, Robert A., O60514.
Reaugh, Vern W., O65029.
Redman, Albert., Jr., O62157.
Rehm, Walter R., O79044.
Reid, Tom, O63040.
Reid, Wallace G., O60361.
Reidy, James F., O60636.
Reinikka, Arnold J., O82084.
Reisacher, Robert W., O80173.
Renneisen, Daniel J., O62133.
Rettie, Robert G., O79046.
Reynolds, Clifford C., Jr., O63279.
Reynolds, Donald H., O63035.
Reynolds, John W., O60829.
Rhoads, Homer E., O59010.
Rhodes, Richard G., O59876.
Rhodes, Samuel T., O56992.
Rice, Marvin E., O59011.
Rice, Richard L., O65690.
Richards, Barton F., O60471.
Richardson, Walton K., O59013.
Richmond, Melvin E., O60388.
Richwine, Francis K., O66084.
Ride, Walter T., Jr., O63290.
Rider, Vance D., O60518.
Rinaldi, Eugene, O59015.
Ring, Kenneth G., O59016.
Ringel, Eugene J., O59017.
Rios, Edwin T., O63038.
Roach, Andrew J., O56994.
Roark, Carl F., O61996.
Robbins, Oliver L., O62153.
Roberts, Harold B., O65008.
Roberts, William G., O59018.
Robertson, Claron A., Jr., O57107.
Robinson, George R., O65542.
Robinson, Howard F., O63077.
Robinson, Neil, O59019.
Robinson, Norman L., Jr., O57210.
Robinson, William B., O62813.
Robitshek, Irving H., O82087.
Rock, Fairfield, O79053.
Rodenbeck, Eric O., O60375.
Rogan, John F., O62203.
Rogers, Benton M., O59020.
Rogers, Ernest R., Jr., O60374.
Roley, Ronald J., O79057.
Roper, George M., Jr., O60359.
Rose, Charles W., O60400.
Ross, Charles G., O60623.
Ross, John P., O60404.
Ross, Paul E., O84885.
Rountree, Wadie J., O60606.
Rousseau, William J., Jr., O59022.
Rovegno, Eugene S., O88487.
Row, Henry C., Jr., O60433.
Royce, Newton C., O60415.
Rudd, Edwin A., O57211.
Runft, Harold W., O63046.
Rusanowsky, Alexander P., O62823.
Russell, Donald K., O62817.
Russell, George C., Jr., O59877.
Russell, George H., O59499.
Russell, James W., O60424.
Russell, Jay V., Jr., O60634.
Russell, Robert C., O62125.
Ruthe, Hans G., O62164.
Ryan, James W., O63070.
Sachs, William H., Jr., O60464.
Safar, Benjamin B., O60331.
Salvador, Felix., O79066.
Salzman, Charles N., O79067.
Sampson, Samuel F., O59023.
Samson, Jack, O81199.
Sapp, Bernard B., O62143.
Sargeant, Arnold M., Jr., O57313.
Satterfield, Robert A., O60482.
Saum, James B., O59878.
Sawyer, Robert K., O79070.
Schabacker, William, O59792.
Schach, Raphael J., O65056.
Schaner, Louis T., O62200.
Schless, William F., O57278.
Schlotterbeck, Walter B., O57195.
Schmidt, Edwin M., O63677.
Schofield, Frank C., O81207.
Schreiber, Thomas S., O57918.
Schrinel, Paul J., O79076.
Schultz, Robert D., O79077.
Schuster, John P., O69666.
Schwartz, William C., O80183.
Scott, Beverly S., O60580.
Scott, Craig C., O63079.
Scott, Dwain L., O63078.
Scott, Ebbin P., Jr., O60467.
Scott, James I., O63319.
Scott, Willard W., Jr., O57098.
Sears, Robert E., O60311.
Sebastian, Nicholas H., O91686.
Secan, Frank D., O60201.
Seddon, John A., O63057.
Seely, Chesley K., O59025.
Seibert, August G., O59026.
Shaffer, Jarvis K., O59888.
Shaneyfelt, Donald L., O64987.
Sheffield, Merle G., O57173.
Shell, Claude O., Jr., O60798.
Sheppard, Jerome S., O60468.
Sheppe, Frank W., O59803.
Shidler, Robert W., O63329.
Shields, Selvin E., O60382.
Shilling, Harold E., O60473.
Shipman, Kenneth, O60411.
Shirley, Courtney R., O59027.
Shockley, James W., O59028.
Shoemaker, Leo W., O65028.
Shriver, Rowland B., Jr., O60495.
Shuffer, George M., Jr., O59029.
Shuman, Billy J., O66098.
Sikes, Arthur E., O60531.
Simon, James E., O70150.
Simpson, Arthur R., O59030.
Simpson, Paul W., O65706.
Sims, Morton D., O81224.
Sinclair, Edgar M., O59031.
Singleton, Jack, Jr., O79087.
Sites, George E., Jr., O79089.
Sittner, Homer H., O60492.
Skogsberg, Paul L., O62134.
Slade, Arthur R., O63741.
Sleeper, Earl S., O63045.
Sliger, Ira T., Jr., O59032.
Slominski, Martin J., O59892.
Smith, Charles A., O60566.
Smith, Dewitt C., Jr., O80187.
Smith, Eb W., Jr., O64994.
Smith, Harold T., O59795.
Smith, Homer D., Jr., O59805.
Smith, Jack E., O60347.
Smith, John A., Jr., O63843.
Smith, Joseph S., O59033.
Smith, Kingsley J., O59034.
Smith, Paul V., O79096.
Smith, Richard C., O60477.
Smith, Samuel C., O59036.
Smith, Wilfrid K. G., O60548.
Smith, William A., Jr., O60546.
Smolenski, Felix S., O63037.
Snow, James A., O60385.
Snow, Marvin H., O63043.
Sollitto, Basil J., O59796.
Solt, Lowell K., O60200.
Spahr, Delbert D., O60789.
Spector, Sam, O59037.
Spence, Soren E., O85263.
Spettel, Frank J., Jr., O59038.
Spigarelli, Americo W., O60822.
Spinelli, Joseph D., O63488.
Spitzmiller, Bob F., O60188.
Stacy, James E., O63285.
Stacy, Thomas J., O82102.
Stamey, Roderick A., Jr., O59804.
Staples, James T., O60444.
Stark, Lloyd J., O79104.
Starr, Comfort K., O63292.
Starr, Robert N., O60351.
Starry, Donn A., O57249.
Steen, Jud O., O79105.
Stein, Harold, O60540.
Stendeback, William, Jr., O63327.
Stenger, John E., O87933.
Sterling, William R., O79106.
Stevens, Carlton E., Jr., O65033.
Stevens, Richard R., O59039.
Stevenson, Charles B., O60639.
Stevenson, James R., O79107.
Steward, Cleveland R., Jr., O59040.
Stewart, Loren F., O59462.
Stinson, Gerald C., O61997.
Stodgel, James E., O67963.
Stone, Frank J., O60442.
Stone, Virgil M., O59923.
Stone, William M., Jr., O60485.
Street, Robert W., O59042.
Stringer, James K., O62184.
Stryker, Emil J., Jr., O59043.
Sunder, Charles H., O57337.
Swangren, Gordon L., O59045.
Swann, Ralph J., O59046.
Swanson, Paul A., O59047.
Swearengen, George A., O57321.
Sweeney, Harvey E., O59048.
Swenson, Richard W., O79113.
Swilley, George R., O79114.
Swinehart, Lewis S., Jr., O59880.
Swomley, Neely M., O59881.
Swope, Leslie J., O62216.
Sylvester, Allan T., 2d, O50882.
Tackaberry, Thomas H., Jr., O60504.
Taibbi, Raymond V., O63044.
Tank, Albert K., O79117.
Tavzel, Harold S., O50780.
Taylor, Charles H., O66641.
Taylor, John F., O59049.
Taylor, William E., O63308.
Teagle, Charles R., O65053.
Thatcher, David C., O59051.
Thaxton, Halbert C., O59052.
Thevenet, Stanley E., O89840.
Thomas, Henry R., O65548.
Thomas, Lawrence M., O60318.
Thomas, Raymond P., O85271.
Thomas, Wesley E., O60368.
Thomas, Wray R., O60535.
Thompson, John W., O59053.
Thorniley, Robert M., O63802.
Thornton, Paul E., O62815.
Tibbetts, Frederick E., 3d, O57164.
Tiller, Norman L., Sr., O81293.
Tilton, William S., O89301.
Timberman, William H., O62811.
Tippins, Bedell A., Jr., O65479.
Todd, John A., O60511.
Tomlinson, Robert P., O65545.
Tousley, Pershing, O60204.
Townsend, Harry W., O60481.
Tracy, Ollie L., O63722.
Trainer, Clark W., O65006.
Trigg, Harry E., O60470.
Troiano, Lawrence V., O59797.
Tucker, Douglas B., O62169.
Tucker, William H., Jr., O63322.

Tudder, Elwin B., O60541.
Tugman, Robert F., O66110.
Tumlinson, Jack M., O60572.
Tupper, Fred A., O65032.
Tuthill, Jack K., O60833.
Tye, Hiram S., O60692.
Tyree, Thomas B., O57111.
Tyson, Charles M., O63047.
Uffmann, Milton F., O60383.
Ulatoski, Joseph R., O62224.
Ungerleider, Alvin D., O81306.
Van Buskirk, William D., O62147.
Van Eaton, John H., O60497.
Van Horn, Robert O., O60173.
Vaught, James B., O60570.
Vessey, John W., Jr., O65047.
Vincent, Howard, O65703.
Vogelgesang, Ernest J., O60507.
Vranish, Robert L., O60386.
Wadsworth, John B., Jr., O57297.
Waggener, John G., O57084.
Wagner, George I., O60185.
Wagner, Matt R., O80200.
Wagoner, Fred E., Jr., O57253.
Wales, Perry W., O60608.
Walk, James F., O57300.
Walker, Faris T., O79133.
Walker, Fred M., O63333.
Walker, Homer L., O62220.
Walker, Sidney J., O63484.
Walker, William L., O65022.
Wallace, Jerry G., O59812.
Walsh, John J., Jr., O59055.
Walter, Lyle E., O57178.
Walters, Vernon J., O63074.
Wampler, Norman H., O60398.
Ward, David E., O60403.
Ward, Richard H., O62130.
Ward, Robert M., O57158.
Ware, Thomas A., Jr., O57219.
Ware, William B., O62114.
Waters, Ace L., Jr., O65019.
Watson, Edwin A., O59469.
Watt, William A., O63742.
Weaver, Wilburn C., O63407.
Webb, Lloyd E., O60575.
Webb, Ralph J., O65014.
Webber, Kenneth E., Jr., O57220.
Weddle, Charles E., O65695.
Weeks, Milton D., O62128.
Weeks, Robert J., O79138.
Weggeland, Henry N., Jr., O59882.
Weibel, Rodney W., O79139.
Weinzettle, John J., O82119.
Weisinger, Sherman, O59057.
Weisser, Seymour T., O62148.
Wellde, Raymond L., O60423.
Wells, Donal C., O60828.
Wendt, Irving R., O81326.
Wentzel, Donald B., O59800.
Wesley, Craig T., O60193.
West, Luther C., O65704.
Wester, William A., O79141.
White, Charles I., Jr., O59059.
White, Kent B., O65748.
White, Nevin C., O63286.
White, Wolfred K., O59883.
Whitehead, Ennis C., Jr., O57093.
Whitesel, William M., O59806.
Whitledge, Charles H., O62198.
Whitley, Arthur L., O57099.
Whitney, Philip M., O57318.
Whitson, Wiliam W., O57097.
Whittemore, Kenneth S., Jr., O62999.
Whittington, Charles W., O59884.
Wigner, Charles C., O59061.
Wilhide, Glenn C. Jr., O57189.
Wilkinson, Richard F., O59062.
Willard, Leroy L., O63313.
Williams, Dudley A., O60445.
Williams, Harry E., O61091.
Williams, John D., O60446.
Williams, Vernon C., O63062.
Williams, Virgil H., O59064.
Williams, Walworth F., O57310.
Williams, Wayne G., O65550.
Wilson, Charles D., O82124.
Wilson, James J., O85703.
Wilson, Kermit J., O60172.
Wilson, Melville C., Jr., O66646.
Wilson, Raymond C., O63723.
Winget, Kingston M., O62206.
Winston, Sanford H., O62154.
Winter, Leonard M., O82126.
Witko, Andrew B., O57170.
Wittlinger, Frederick J., O59069.
Wolfe, Hiram M., 3d, O61090.
Wolman, Gus A., Jr., O57583.
Wood, Edwin, O60525.
Wood, Roy L., O59071.
Wood, Samuel C., O60598.
Wood, William S., O59072.
Woods, Altus L., Jr., O59885.
Woodside, William W., O63315.
Woolard, Reginald W., O59073.
Wortham, James T., O79152.
Worthen, Robert D., O62207.
Wright, Madison C., 2d, O88533.
Wyckoff, Theodore, O63312.
Wyrick, William E., O65072.
Yakimovicz, Floryan L., O85392.
York, Dennis A., O66212.
Young, Frederick L., O79157.
Young, James W., O60410.
Young, Raymond E., O60484.
Youngblood, Kenneth L., O65543.
Youngs, Evert C., O59074.
Zigmund, Frank J., O59075.
Zobrist, Paul S., O59076.
Zuccardy, Charles A., O64991.
Zuppann, Charles W., O60534.

To be majors, Chaplain

Benson, John D., O89748.
Bloxham, Earl S., O69862.
Blunk, James B., O68080.
Burgreen, Charles L., O71905.
Calter, John T., O71651.
Campbell, Harry G., Jr., O75096.
Carroll, James C., O73211.
Coleman, James V., O69885.
Cowhig, Edward D., O75056.
Gilbert, Bertram C., O72595.
Harris, Thomas A., O71675.
Harvester, James V., O71924.
Huffman, Cloma A., O69688.
Justice, Willard M., O71684.
Malanowski, Thaddeus F., O75072.
McCarthy, Thomas H., O69983.
McMinn, Thomas L., Jr., O78602.
Meek, Charles A., O70431.
O'Neill, John J., O71945.
Paul, William E., Jr., O67603.
Price, Ben S., O70021.
Roth, John D., O71958.
Rowland, Ray M., O70032.
Spence, Edward L., O70510.
Stewart, Duncan C., O71728.
Sullivan, John J., O70520.
Wallace, Francis X., O78146.
Wessman, Willis W., O78152.
Wood, Robert J., O81865.

To be majors, Medical Corps

Abbott, Howard G., O69448.
Bishop, Raymond H., Jr., O69592.
Breen, James L., O69866.
Burham, William A., O71454.
Butler, Donald E., O73990.
Copen, Estis G., O69626.
Cowgill, Herbert F., O72329.
Cupp, Claude M., O70178.
Czarnecki, Stephen W., O69894.
Fisher, William C., O72387.
Geiger, James P., O69489.
Gelinas, Joseph A., O71190.
Gerard, Earl S., O69655.
Gomez, Alphonse C., O69493.
Gorby, Earl W., O69658.
Graham, Harvey P., O73254.
Hanna, Homer H., O69499.
Hardie, Philip W., Jr., O71923.
Hathaway, Robert G., O81799.
Hoagland, Peter W., O73100.
Howard, August A., O71809.
Jaffurs, William J., O70101.
Kilpatrick, William C., Jr., O72338.
Konwinski, Edward S., O69520.
Larson, Arlan P., O69522.
Mahin, Dorsey T., O73453.
Maier, John G., O76365.
McCabe, Lloyd B., O68029.
McKeown, Eugene P., O67846.
Neidlinger, Robert W., O67852.
O'Shaughnessy, Edward J., O71946.
Patton, Maurice G., O70012.
Pedrotty, Francis W., Jr., O69539.
Ransone, James W., O69547.
Sheffield, Frederick J., O67616.
Siebert, Paul E., O69557.
Staats, Robert E., O76661.
Thomas, Paul A., Jr., O69565.
Uhrig, Henry T., O88984.
Westerfield, Frank McC., O74937.
Zamora, Pablo J., O72668.

To be majors, Dental Corps

Everhart, Robert J., O68002.
Fox, Walter H., O66619.
Hare, Charles M., O70361.
Hathaway, John P., Jr., O66624.
Jeronimus, Robert D., O67585.
Karlson, Fredrick A., Jr., O66627.
Knapp, Milton J., O67589.
Lundquist, Donald O., O65685.
McGrew, Billie D., O67941.
Millard, Robert J., O70142.
Miller, Claude R., Jr., O76393.
Mooney, Samuel C., O63842.
Osterholtz, Raymond H., O68392.
Pacocha, Edmund C., O65697.
Schmitz, John F., O70120.
Schneider, Fred, O63845.
Sheridan, Roland C., Jr., O65686.
Smith, Thomas J., O68050.
Sumner, Charles F., 3d, O70049.
Uohara, George I., O67971.
Williams, James F., O76754.
Worcester, Hal C., O65483.
Zislis, Louis, O68066.

To be majors, Veterinary Corps

Anthony, Wallace L., O69849.
Beerwinkle, Milton A., O70269.
Benson, John H., O71642.
Garner, Floris M., O69930.
Gibbs, Roland J., O75060.
McConnell, Stewart J., O68383.
Morley, William J., O73473.
Morris, John H., 2d, O73474.
Raulston, Gilbert L., O70025.
Riley, William E., O65553.
Rosser, William W., O67610.
Slider, Howard B., Jr., O68403.

To be majors, Medical Service Corps

Bost, William L., O58787.
Calmes, Paul M., O84827.
Clovis, Ernest R., O68022.
Coner, Charles E., O78643.
Cook, Maxwell A., O59846.
Cook, Richard A., O67561.
Deakins, John A., O58788.
Devlin, John P., O68796.
Dicker, Frank W., O79676.
Diercks, Fred H., O60890.
Dolson, James F., O78646.
Eddinger, Clyde C., O80292.
Fels, Robert D., O84034.
Foster, Jay W., O84316.
Foubare, Louis H., O65076.
Goldstein, Bernard L., O78647.
Hoffmann, Kenneth L., O78649.
Hume, Joseph W., O84829.
Kneepkens, John A., O78651.
Kotchin, Stanley P., O83554.
Lauterbach, Carl G., O69523.
Lewis, Harold J., O84321.
Luckman, Otis N., O84322.
Mandel, Adrian D., O60889.
McCoy, John P., O84323.
Medcalf, Rex M., O84037.
Morgan, Ralph W., O60887.
Muzyka, Joseph C., O84325.
Nation, Marvin E., O78654.
Newton, Carlos E., Jr., O61082.
Osterhaus, Leo B., O84326.
Packo, Andrew, Jr., O84751.
Parkinson, Ralph W., Jr., O78655.

Power, Earl H., O84327.
Schenker, Hanssen, O63181.
Schlarb, William E., O84753.
Schwarz, William X., O84754.
Snyder, Allan J., O84329.
Swieter, Kenneth L., O84038.

To be majors, Army Nurse Corps

Berman, Thelma L., N2856.
Bond, Margaret M., N1780.
Clift, Mildred A., N1832.
Coxwell, Geraldine V., N1834.
Douglas, Maxine, N1810.
Dunlap, Lillian, N1785.
Galgano, Emma A., N1760.
Gallagher, Eleanor R., N1826.
Gaynor, Eleanor A., N1807.
Gieldseth, Betty M., N2583.
Gilson, Shirley M., N1824.
Goldsmith, Dorothy, N2841.
Hammerly, Aloha B–M., N1815.
Jones, Lois, N1771.
Madden, Betty L., N1778.
McCormick, Helen L., N2914.
Moore, Leota M., N2913.
O'Brien, Mary R., N2846.
Perkins, Sarah E., N2989.
Pettey, Florence L., N1792.
Phillips, Margaret P., N1758.
Ratcliff, Patricia A., N1795.
Roslonowski, Helen I., N2916.
Sheridan, Vivian C., N2917.
Snartemo, Alfa M., N2825.
Tierney, Marian A., N1750.
Wright, Helen E., N2848.

To be majors, Army Medical Specialist Corps

Blanton, Lottie V., J57.
Hathcock, Eva M., M10090.
Knickerbocker, Barbara M., J33.

To be captains

Ackerman, Albert A., O75132.
Adams, Robert L., O70579.
Addison, Richard L., O73541.
Alexander, Lyle K., O81366.
Allan, Walter F. D., O85474.
Allen, Wayne C., O81572.
Alley, Wayne E., O89174.
Alliason, John R., O89587.
Almy, Donald C., O77249.
Altland, Robert W., O71059.
Amisano, Italo B., O72569.
Anderson, John A., O77251.
Anderson, Richard L., O77253.
Andrews, Donald A., O71970.
Andrews, Donald G., O77254.
Andrews, William G., Junior, O78206.
Andy, Charles W., O82134.
Ansted, Genoa W., O71311.
Arciero, Robert G., O77255.
Ardizzione, Leo A., O78207.
Arnold, Thomas W., O81576.
Arnzen, Chester L., O72671.
Arthur, Billy A., O71971.
Ashby, Peter B., O71061.
Austin, Clinton W., O71639.
Austin, Freddie C., O82136.
Austin, Kenneth B., O77256.
Axup, William A., O71974.
Babers, Donald M., O75137.
Badovinac, Nick J., Jr., O78211.
Bailey, James B., O72570.
Bailey, William R., Jr., O77261.
Baker, Frank H., O71440.
Baker, Jack E., O77263.
Baldwin, Noland Y., O75141.
Barber, Richard L., O72437.
Barker, James E., O71975.
Barker, Llyle J., Jr., O85850.
Barnhill, David B., O72572.
Barnwell, Kenneth V., O90521.
Barrere, Richard P., O88562.
Barrett, Francis X., O78220.
Barry, James G., Jr., O79176.
Bartholomew, Roger J., O91750.
Bartos, Robert E., O71140.
Basil, Benjamin J., O91157.
Batchman, Gilbert R., O71976.
Bate, Milford C., O72439.
Bauer, Philip O., O81579.
Bausler, Donald R., O77267.
Baxter, George M., O84947.
Bazilwich, Paul, Jr., O71978.
Beal, Bruce T., O78224.
Bean, Richard J., O71979.
Bean, Robert H., O81580.
Bear, David A., O91159.
Bearden, Winston H., O84948.
Beasley, Lewis E., O80208.
Becker, Donald L., O83102.
Bedsaul, Clare D., O81582.
Beil, Glenn N., O71141.
Bell, Dale M., O91552.
Bell, James F., O71142.
Bell, Joel H., O84949.
Bennett, Joseph D., O71760.
Benoit, William R., O88570.
Berg, Roland E., O77268.
Bergen, James P., O71981.
Bergquist, Robert L., O85291.
Bernard, Paul H., O71643.
Bernhardt, William R., O89180.
Bettinger, Francis D., O85481.
Bickston, Walter J., O71316.
Bill, Gary R., O82142.
Bishop, Ted E., O71982.
Bittl, Frederick E., O72366.
Bjorn, Edward D., O77270.
Black, Ira W., Jr., O71983.
Black, William T., O68904.
Blackburn, Paul L., O72442.
Blahuta, Norman G., O71984.
Blake, Richard J., O77271.
Blandeburgo, Gasper, O87680.
Blasingame, Josiah, Jr., O71646.
Bliss, Charles F., 3d, O71986.
Boden, William C., O71068.
Boehnke, Roger H., O91764.
Boling, Douglas L., O77273.
Booras, Danny, O71150.
Booras, Peter D., O71987.
Borris, Roger J., O78233.
Bossert, Paul W., O71318.
Bourgeois, Edward J., Jr., O85295.
Bowdoin, William R., Jr., O77275.
Bowman, Ronald N., O71647.
Boyd, Bobby K., O71448.
Boyd, Sidney H., O71151.
Boyd, William P., O71989.
Boyer, Gene T., O79193.
Boynton, Marshall E., O71319.
Bracewell, Roland A., O77277.
Bradberry, William N., Jr., O77278.
Bradford, Wilson E., Jr., O78237.
Bradley, William C., O71069.
Brady, Harlan J., O84474.
Bragalone, Raymond A., O89418.
Bramblet, William B., O71451.
Bramlett, James T., O77281.
Brandenstein, Howard C., O89322.
Branscum, Billy R., O87687.
Breedlove, Smedley D., O71764.
Breithaupt, Marvin P., O75153.
Brendel, William J., O84958.
Brokenshire, James R., Jr., O71990.
Brooks, Leo A., O75154.
Brooks, Thomas J., O71991.
Brown, Dallas C., Jr., O71156.
Brown, Donald R., O84901.
Brown, Edward M., O81593.
Brown, George A., O81594.
Brown, Hugh R., Jr., O78174.
Brown, James E., O87695.
Brown, Joe A., O78244.
Brown, John M., O71992.
Brown, Lewellyn A., O91772.
Brown, Raymond V., O75157.
Brown, Robert B., O71993.
Browning, Robert A., O77286.
Brumback, Robert M., O91773.
Brumit, Charles D., O78245.
Brummit, Philip A., O71070.
Bruno, Vito J., O81596.
Bryan, Clyde M., Jr., O82150.
Bryan, Thomas F., O77288.
Buchanan, Gerald H., O71071.
Buchwald, Donald M., O71996.
Bundren, Alva B., Jr., O71997.
Bunyard, Jerry M., O77290.
Burbach, Frederick J. L., O73300.
Burchell, Troy D., O81391.
Burkard, Danny J., O77292.
Burkhart, George A., Jr., O71998.
Burnham, Charles A., O88020.
Burns, Charles W., O88347.
Burns, Joseph C., O82152.
Burns, Paul P., O79559.
Burns, William F., O71074.
Burrus, William S., O71999.
Burton, James, O71159.
Bush, Charles E., O77296.
Bussey, Charles D., O72448.
Butterfield, Dennis O., O72449.
Cage, Willie R., Jr., O91783.
Cairns, Ronald L., O72000.
Cameron, Duane G., O77300.
Camp, Robert E., O72002.
Campbell, Donald R., O71323.
Campbell, Jack P., O72003.
Campbell, Walter E., O72004.
Campbell, William W., Jr., O71769.
Cantrell, Jack R., O71160.
Cantwell, Franklin D., O84477.
Cardillo, Richard G., O72005.
Cardwell, Kenneth E., O77305.
Carlson, Raymond R., O85973.
Caron, John E., O82154.
Carpenter, Robert D., O72006.
Carr, Robert F., O71652.
Caswell, Philip P., Jr., O77311.
Cate, Hugh C., Jr., O71326.
Cathcart, James E., O77312.
Caudill, James M., Jr., O71162.
Cauthen, Lewis J., Jr., O75163.
Cecil, William I., O71164.
Chambers, Andrew P., O71458.
Chambers, John A., O71327.
Chance, Billy J., O72009.
Chandler, Edwin W., O71328.
Chandler, John R., O89041.
Chapin, Gordon R., O77313.
Chapman, Charles W., O78258.
Chapman, Robert B., O72010.
Chikalla, Gerald G., O72012.
Child, Paul W., Jr., O89190.
Childs, Wendell A., O91792.
Ching, Edmund K. S., O71653.
Chitwood, Thomas E., Jr., O71166.
Christensen, John E., O71461.
Cini, Alfred A., O72013.
Cipriano, Alexander W., O77319.
Clark, Robert H., O71655.
Clayton, John B., 3d, O72014.
Click, Edwin F., O77322.
Closs, William R., O77324.
Cochran, John R., O89960.
Coggins, James E., O71330.
Cole, Donald J., O77328.
Coleman, Alton H., O72015.
Collins, Harold E., O71464.
Collins, Harry D., O89046.
Collins, Lonnie L., O83624.
Collins, Marion H., O81604.
Collins, Patrick W., O81605.
Colson, Keith Q., O77330.
Congleton, Roy E., O71656.
Cook, John J., Jr., O72455.
Cooper, James A., O72016.
Cooper, Joe L., O71468.
Corley, William L., O91569.
Cornell, Robert K., O77336.
Corning, Terence C., O71076.
Correll, John E., O81609.
Costino, Michel, O77338.
Cottrell, Walter A., O87496.
Couvillion, Herbert H., O78266.
Coverdale, Craig G., O82509.
Cowan, Robert E., O78267.
Cowden, Carl, Jr., O77341.
Coyle, Lionel R., O72017.
Cozad, Jack G., O79238.
Crabtree, Sidney J., O71774.
Crancer, John W., O72018.
Craven, Thomas T., O72020.
Crawford, William R., O77342.
Crawley, Paul K., O77343.
Creel, Tilford C., O71473.
Cronin, Daniel W., O71333.
Crook, George R., O78270.
Crosby, John S., O71662.
Crosby, Richard D., Jr., O77345.
Cross, Ray S., O78271.
Croswhite, James L., O71334.

Crow, Marvin S., O85148.
Crowell, Howard G., Jr., O71168.
Crum, Luther G., Jr., O81614.
Cuba, Paul J., Jr., O71911.
Cummings, William T., O72022.
Dahl, Winston A., O72457.
Daley, Edmund K., Jr., O81406.
Daniel, John S., Jr., O71335.
Daniels, Geoffrey M., O83103.
Dankers, William H., O72460.
Darling, Allan L., O77350.
Darrah, James T., Jr., O72024.
Darrah, Robert F., O84972.
Dart, Frederick R., O71169.
Davis, Bobby J., O71476.
Davis, Dwight A., O77352.
Davis, Roger K., O71337.
Davis, Thomas H., O89876.
Dax, Raymond E., O72025.
DeAmaral, Charles F., Jr., O78278.
DeFatta, Vincent P., O72696.
DeLong, Clarence A., O72026.
DeMaris, Edgar E., O72027.
DeWitt, William W., O77353.
Deacon, Reynolds J., O82314.
Dean, Bobby J., O71338.
Dearborn, William H., O75170.
Deardorff, Robert E., Jr., O72028.
Dekle, Thomas A., O72462.
Delaney, Robert F., O81409.
Denman, Jerry L., O72029.
Deringer, Clifton H., Jr., O88253.
Detyens, Joseph W., O72698.
Dextraze, William P., O87729.
Dickinson, John R., O78280.
Dickinson, William G., O77358.
Dienst, Daniel W., O72031.
Dill, Bobby M., O77359.
Dillon, James W., O71080.
Dimsdle, Arthur, O73317.
Dinwiddie, Richard W., O72032.
Dirmeyer, Robert P., O77361.
Disbrow, David C., O81622.
Dixon, Allen C., Jr., O77363.
Dixon, Malcolm R., O81623.
Dixon, Philip W., O78175.
Dockler, Gordon S., O71171.
Domeck, Charles R., O72035.
Domenicucci Louis, O71172.
Donohue, John E., O81625.
Dorschler, Richard K., O82165.
Doust, Arol R., O81415.
Doyle, John P., Jr., O72037.
Draper, Leo, O88661.
Dreher, Henry E., O77368.
Drewyor, Richard A., O84479.
Drexler, Charles H., O75179.
Driscoll, Jerome W., O85527.
Drummond, James E., O72038.
Drury, Peter F., Jr., O77370.
Dryer, John E., O72039.
Dubovick, Richard R., O72703.
Duerr, Richard D., O78176.
Dugan, Daniel C., O72040.
Dukes, William C., O77371.
Dulin, Ralph W., O71484.
Dulk, George A., O72041.
Dunaway, Roy S., Jr., O72042.
Dunkelberger, William F., O71342.
Dunn, Earl C., Jr., O71784.
Dunn, Robert F., O71081.
Durbin, James J., O71785.
Durkee, Richard Y., O78177.
Eddins, Watha J., Jr., O72043.
Eddleman, Kenneth T., O89469.
Edmonson, Frank A., O72588.
Edwards, Alfred Y., O71898.
Edwards, William H., Jr., O72044.
Egeland, Edgar, O89472.
Elder, Perry B., Jr., O84777.
Elliott, Bernard V., Jr., O87508.
Ellis, Alvin C., O71175.
Ellison, Henry L., O71176.
Elton, Robert G., O90582.
Enslow, Philip H., Jr., O72045.
Epstein, Marc H., O91222.
Erickson, Roland S., O77379.
Evans, Bobby G., O71489.
Everett, William M., O72386.
Fair, Cecil G., Jr., O72864.
Falbo, John J., O77380.
Fallon, Thomas F., O77381.
Farmer, Garry H., O87738.
Farr, Robert A., O71179.
Farrington, John S., O72047.
Farrow, James H., O77382.
Fasolino, Rosario P., O84693.
Faugust, Robert E., O85321.
Feagin, John A., Jr., O72048.
Felker, Dale R., O77383.
Fene, William R., O85322.
Feore, Patrick L., Jr., O71082.
Fernander, Bobbie B., O77385.
Fernandes, Vincent R., O71491.
Fickett, William A., O77387.
Finger, Herbert C., O72051.
Finkbiner, Glenn G., O78299.
Fiora, Edward F., Jr., O78300.
Fischer, Daniel J., O71083.
Fiscus, James E., O72053.
Fisher, Harry C., Jr., O78301.
Fisher, Saul H., O84904.
Fitzpatrick, William F., O71085.
Fleeger, James E., O72054.
Fleming, Norwood W., O72055.
Fletcher, David F., O82171.
Focht, Charles W., O71493.
Follett, Arthur G., O72056.
Folta, Russell J., O77391.
Foster, Donald G., O71920.
Fraher, James D., O71087.
Fralen, Clifford J., O72058.
Franklin, Joseph P., O72059.
Frear, Harold D., O72061.
Freeman, William C., O81429.
Freeze, Richard S., O87746.
Freshley, Robert L., O78308.
Froelich, James W., O86165.
Fry, Dudley L., Jr., O71187.
Fuellhart, Joseph M., O77396.
Fujii, Eugene I., O85325.
Fuller, Bernard E., O73448.
Fulp, Charles A., O71669.
Furlong, George P., O81432.
Fust, John W., Jr., O71189.
Gabrielli, Robert J., O77398.
Gage, Walter G., O83104.
Gallagher, Robert J., O88692.
Gallup, Elisha, L., Jr., O72065.
Gannon, James V., O91835.
Gantt, Gerald D., O78313.
Garcia, Eliseo J., O72370.
Garcia, Santiago A., O71088.
Garn, Harvey A., O72066.
Garneau, Lucien R., O78315.
Garvais, Donald F., O77400.
Gatti, Michael A., 78317.
Gavin, David C., O81435.
Gay, Forrest T., 3d, O72067.
Geasland, Floyd E., O71348.
Gebelt, Henry F. C., O81437.
George, James R., Jr., O82326.
Gerich, Robert A., O71349.
Gerkey, George E., 3d, O71497.
Gersitz, Chares R., O72068.
Giddings, John H. J., O72069
Gilbreth, Lee E., O70725.
Gillard, Robert W., O71191.
Gillespie, Vernon W., Jr., O81439.
Gilpatrick, David D., O72070.
Ginger, Walter D., O82175.
Ginish, Michael, Jr.,O88073.
Ginn, Charles J., O71498.
Ginter, Kenneth E., O72071.
Gminder, Russell, O77406.
Goeben, Oscar E. K., O84481.
Goetzinger, James E., O84482.
Goldstein, Jack, O72072.
Gontarski, Joseph W., O77408.
Gooch, Charles D., O72714.
Goodall, Billy R., O90118.
Goodrich, Charles R. O.,O72596.
Gordon, James C., Jr., O71671.
Gorey, Paul J., O77409.
Gorman, Irving T., O78321.
Gosney, Durward D., O71192.
Gosney, Robert R., O77410.
Gotte, Jack E., O81644.
Gottron, Richard N., O72073.
Graham, Todd P., O72074.
Graham, William A., Jr., O72075.
Gramly, Pyne A., Jr., O81645.
Granger, John D., O75197.
Gransback, Donald H., O72076.
Grant, John C., O77415.
Graves, James R., O71195.
Gray, Richard H., O72077.
Greeley, Ira E., O84484.
Green, Donald J., O77417.
Green Gilbert R., O87764.
Greenberg, William M., O71503.
Grey, James W., O72079.
Griffith, Gerald S., O81647.
Griggs, John C., O72080.
Grimes, Donald B., O81447.
Grubbs, Edward F., Jr., O72081.
Gruene, Ernest K., Jr., O71351.
Grummt, Otto C., O71201.
Grundvig, Daniel A., O88082.
Guettler, Gerald C., O71352.
Gunderson, Raymond E., O72082.
Gunter, Arlie LaW, O71353.
Guptill, Colin K., O88265.
Guthrey, William L., O78327.
Guthrie, Edward R., O72083.
Haar, Franklin R., O72478.
Haas, William E., O72084.
Hadly, William McK., O72085.
Haendle, Karl V., O77421.
Hagan, Jerome F., O72086.
Hagedorn, Zach, Jr., O72087.
Hale, Marvin L., Jr., O78178.
Hall, David R., O71354.
Hall, Lawrence H., O78331.
Hally, John E., Jr., O77423.
Halsted, Thomas A., O73339.
Haltiwanger, Marion E., O72723.
Hamberlin, Lawrence M., O88086.
Hamel, Albert W., O89497.
Hamel, John F., Jr., O72888.
Hamilton, John M., Jr., O72088.
Hamlett, Ellis H., O71091.
Hanchey, Jennings B., Jr., O78335.
Hancock, Don F., O81649.
Haney, Kenneth W., 2d, O78336.
Hargrove, Richard L., O72089.
Harmon, Leonard J., 2d, O71506.
Harper, Oscar R., O90115.
Harrington, Robert E., O71355.
Harris, James T., Jr., O73155.
Harris, William I., O72480.
Hart, Edward P., O70753.
Hartrick, William L., O77433.
Hasbrouck, Robert W., Jr., O72090.
Hawk, Robert T., O87780.
Hawkins, Douglas K., O92062.
Haydon, James F., O78346.
Hayes, John T., O72725.
Hayes, Moody E., O72092.
Hayward, Arnold C., O71204.
Hayward, Donald P., O78347.
Haywood, Willie M., Jr., O75207.
Heinsoo, Heino, O77437.
Heintz, John P., O82185.
Heiss, John L., 3d, O77438.
Helm, Gunther A., O72727.
Hendon, William A., O71358.
Henne, Carl, Jr., O72600.
Henry, Robert B., O72094.
Hergenroeder, Leo A., O72095.
Herndon, George W., O71510.
Herren, Thomas W., Jr., O72096.
Hertzberg, Hugo H., O71359.
Hess, Carl H., O77441.
Hesson, James M., O90068.
Heuschkel, Donald G., O77443.
Hicks, Conrad O'F., O71360.
Highfill, James K., O77444.
Hilbert, Donald C., O72097.
Hilbert, Donald E., O77445.
Hill, Elbert B., O71361.
Hill, Frank J., O71925.
Hill, Houston C., O81454.
Hill, Michael E., O71515.
Hilton, Maynard E., O77446.
Himmel, Daniel L., O72732.
Hines, Thomas G., O71516.
Hinkin, Paul E., O77447.
Hinrichs, Robert M., O72098.
Hissong, Fred, Jr., O71518.
Hix, Preston D., O81658.
Hobbs, Harry V., O77449.
Hock, Robert C., O77450.

Hodges, Stanley W., O85184.
Hoeferkamp, Harold R., O72099.
Hoey, Stanislaus J., O81456.
Hoffman, Robert L., O81659.
Hoge, Philip R., O78351.
Holbrook, Willard A., O72100.
Holland, Evan F., O71520.
Holland, John J., O77455.
Holmes, Alan K., O71366.
Holt, Daniel R., O78180.
Holt, Xavia M., Jr., O71367.
Honor, Edward, O71368.
Hope, Fred H., O72488.
Horbert, Walter G., O84697.
Horne, William C., Jr., O84489.
Hornish, William E., O77458.
Horst, Thomas G., O72101.
Holster, Howard K., O71807.
Hough, Henry A., O77460.
Houts, Francis C., O78356.
Hrncir, Oran T., O75211.
Hubbard, Charles J., O72491.
Hudson, Samuel R., O77464.
Huff, Don B., O77465.
Huff, William S., O76248.
Hufnagel, David A., O72102.
Huggins, Charles B., O85004.
Huggins, Edward B., O81663.
Hughes, Douglas A., O72493.
Hughes, Frank A., Jr., O84491.
Huhn, John N., O78358.
Hull, Frederick B., Jr., O79337.
Hunter, Kelvin H., Jr., O71523.
Huntley, James E., Jr., O88108.
Hurd, Chetwin M., O77469.
Hurdle, Karl V., O7[illegible]61.
Hurley, William P , Jr., O81664.
Hymes, Morris A., O72390.
Ikeda, Kenneth K., O72104.
Imholz, Robert E., O77472.
Isbell, Don, O72105.
Jackemeyer, Robert, O77476.
Jackson, James C., O88754.
Jackson, Tracy H., O77478.
Janet, Stanley A., O81667.
Jarrett, Richard S., O77480.
Jellison, Cecil D., O72108.
Jennings, Robert H., Jr., O71373.
Jeter, John R., Jr., O72109.
Jimenez, Adam, O72495.
Jobert, A. Philip R., O72910.
Johnson, Charles R., O72110.
Johnson, Jack O., O77484.
Johnson, Richard D., O72112.
Johnson, Robert P., O72113.
Johnson, Stanley M., O72114.
Jones, Beauford Z., O87806.
Jones, Burton D., O77489.
Jones, Cecil P., O81464.
Jones, Charles E., O82278.
Jones, Clifford, Jr., O72115.
Jones, David W., O88762.
Jones, Ed E., Jr., O88113.
Jones, Robert A., O71211.
Jones, Samuel H., Jr., O81675.
Jones, Thomas S., O75220.
Jones, Warren A., O72116.
Jordan, Donald H., O78372.
Jordan, Horace E., O77492.
Joseph, Robert E., Jr., O72117.
Justiss, Robert E., O77493.
Kafonek, Richard H., O72742.
Kallestad, Richard D., O78375.
Kanamine, Theodore S., O77494.
Kanzler, Norbert A., O78377.
Kastner, Joseph H., O71685.
Katenbrink, Irvin G., Jr., O72118.
Kause, Kaye D., O81467.
Keenan, George E., O78378.
Keller, Donald F., O71374.
Keller, Leonard, O85339.
Kelley, Paul B., O71531.
Kelley, Victor P., O77498.
Kellogg, Kenneth E., O91896.
Kelly, Alan C., O81677.
Kelly, Edward J., O78182.
Kelly, Edward J., 3d, O77499.
Kelly, Richard P., Jr., O78383.
Kelly, William H., O77501.
Kemp, Donald T., O91605.
Kennedy, Bruce, O77503.
Kennedy, Donald R., O71213.
Kennedy, George I., Jr., O72375.
Keolanui, Lawrence K., Jr., O72744.
Kershner, Clark LaV., O75007.
Keyes, William G., O77506.
Kilgallen, John E., O78385.
King, John W., O85017.
King, Whitfield, O88276.
Kingsbury, Dave R., O72498.
Kirk, K. Leslie, O78388.
Kleis, C. Frederick, O71688.
Knauss, David S., O90218.
Knight, Emmett F., O81469.
Kohler, Glenn, O71096.
Komarow, Ronald M., O75383.
Konkle, Carl H., O77513.
Kowalczyk, Chester A., O71690.
Kraak, Charles F., O77514.
Krebs, James M., O77515.
Kros, William J., Jr., O77075.
LaCour, Hugh, Jr., O84495.
LaFrenz, Robert L., O72120.
Lamb, David O., O71379.
Lander, Robert B., O77080.
Landkammer, Theodore E., O81476.
Lapinskes, George S., O78183.
Larkin, Phillip S., O82197.
Lasker, Paul E., O77522.
Lassiter, Edward A., O89244.
Lathrop, Lloyd W., O81682.
Laudati, Roger C., O81683.
Lawson, Lawrence L., O81684.
Leach, Robert A., O71546.
Lehnert, Edwin D., O78398.
Leighton, James P., 3d, O89353.
Leisy, Henry J., O71382.
Lemon, Gilman J. K., O72618.
Lenio, Paul T., O72123.
Leonard, Richard J., O78399.
Leslie, George W., O81478.
Levinson, Stanley R., O85024.
Lewi, Kenneth E., O78400.
Lewis, Gerald, O72124.
Lewis, Thomas M., O81480.
Liesman, John S., O85025.
Light, Clarence O., O78403.
Livesay, Theodore J., O72125.
Lizardo, Alex R., O74922.
Lloyd, Joseph W., O77533.
Lloyd, Luther R., O77534.
Lo Re Jesse D., O71935.
Locke, Jimmie M., O88130.
Lokie, Andrew P., O72341.
Long, Arthur W., O88794.
Longanacre, Louis E., O71547.
Lopes, John F., Jr., O71220.
Lopez, Ramon R., O77537.
Lorigan, Robert E., O77538.
Lovelace, Richard S., O77540.
Lowery, George B., O71828.
Lowry, Samuel N., Jr., O72128.
Lozier, William E., O72129.
Lucido, Jack A., O82201.
Ludolph, Anthony A., Jr., O81690.
Ludwig, Daniel D., O72131.
Lumpkin, Walter L., O84699.
Lund, Robert E., Jr., O77542.
Luthultz, Gene H., O74016.
Lybert, Elmer J., O71551.
Lyles, Jesse D., O77545.
Lynn, Charles T., Jr., O78410.
Lynn, Robert G., O91449.
Lyons, Gerald E., O91915.
MacDonald, Bruce S., O72132.
MacDonnell, Thomas A., O77547.
MacManus, Frederick O'N., O77549.
MacDonald, Alexander R., O72133.
MackIntosh, Robert, O75243.
MacMillan, Richard H., Jr., O82202.
Main, Robert G., O77552.
Malone, Daniel K., O72134.
Malone, Howard E., Jr., O75015.
Malooley, Rudolph S., O72135.
March, Miles B., O71936.
Marchioli, Alexander D., O78185.
Marden, Jack M., O87553.
Mariani, John, O82203.
Marion, Charles B., O85618.
Marko, George F., O91919.
Marks, Malcolm L., Jr., O85031.
Marshall, Charles McL., O81696.
Marshall, Raymond E., O71554.
Marshall, Thomas W., 3d., O77557.
Martin, David C., O73568.
Martin, George L., O86458.
Martling, John E., O72136.
Mason, Sidney E., O72137.
Massey, Clyde, Jr., O72138.
Matheney, Harold D., O81483.
Matson, James M., O85034.
Matteson, John R., O72139.
Mattson, Bertil E., O85036.
Mauerhan, Karl E., O71387.
Maurer, David F., O72141.
Maus, William C., Jr., O72142.
Mawhinney, Perin, O70847.
May, William S., O72143.
Mayson, Preston B., Jr., O72144.
McCarthy, John W., O88285.
McCarthy, Thomas W., O72145.
McCarthy, Walter R., Jr., O71388.
McClain, Richard A., O71223.
McClary, Jack D., O85433.
McClelland, Robert R., O72146.
McCloskey, John C., O72147.
McConnell, Richard M., O90446.
McCool, James M., O74017.
McCoole, Delos A., O71224.
McCormack, J. Gordon, O72148.
McCulla, William L., Jr., O72149.
McCusker, George E., O71225.
McDaniel, Cecil D., Jr., O77562.
McDonald, Donald F., O72511.
McDonald, Thomas F., O72512.
McDowell, Billy J., O71226.
McDuff, Charles R., O78423.
McElrath, William T., O72513.
McFather, Bennie S., O72343.
McGar, Robert D., O78424.
McGee, Bernard A., Jr., O71557.
McGee, Carl D., Jr., O71389.
McGee, Ronald R., O72622.
McGregor, Harold W., O88820.
McGrevey, Thomas P., O72150.
McGuire, Martin C., O72151.
McHugh, Thomas E., O77570.
McIlroy, Wilmer L., Jr., O72152.
McKee, Kenneth J., O88824.
McKee, Richard W., O71704.
McKellips, John L., O77573.
McKenna, Thomas P., O86499.
McKenney, Hubert F. Jr., O71390.
McKinley, David J., O71392.
McKinney, Boyce C., O91928.
McKinney, Leon E., O72154.
McLay, Orville K., O75019.
McMillen, Earl J., Jr., O78427.
McNair, Carl H., Jr., O72155.
McNair, Jeptha I., Jr., O77574.
McNamee, Martin L., O72156.
McNeil, Darrell O., O83959.
McNerney, David A., O72157.
McNider, Henry B., O90281.
Meaders, Barney R., 3d, O71560.
Meeker, Don E., O72519.
Meeker, Jo O., O72625.
Meekison, Malcolm V., O72158.
Meetze, Henry W., O72159.
Mellish, James R., O71229.
Mendelson, Joseph R., Jr., O87563.
Mendenhall, Thomas D., O81487.
Mendoza, Joseph A., Jr., O71230.
Metallo, Vincent J., O85044.
Meyer, Gerald J., O78434.
Mikula, Joseph G., O81488.
Milani, John A., O71100.
Miller, Henry T., O71398.
Miller, James R., O72162.
Miller, James R. C., O72163.
Miller, John W., O72164.
Miller, Louis G., O72523.
Miller, Raymond H., O72764.
Miller, Ronald W., O78436.
Millimet, Stanley, O82209.
Miluszusky, Raymond J., O77580.
Minich, Cecil M., O72165.
Mino, Paul L., O81492.
Misajon, Herman G., O77582.
Mitchell, Frederick H., O71564.
Mitchell, James L., Jr., O72525.
Moir, Raymond C., O77584.
Momeier, John L., O75255.

Monaghan, Michael F., O84501.
Moody, Herbert E., O71565.
Moore, David R., O77587.
Moore, George D., Jr., O78440.
Moore, James M., O71401.
Moore, Robert J., O88845.
Moore, Virgil E., Jr., O78444.
Moore, William B., O82289.
Moran, William J., O85221.
Moreau, Thaddee F., O77588.
Morgan, Abbott R., O78186.
Morgan, Jerry T., O71566.
Morris, Eddie L., O71235.
Morris, Patrick W., O82352.
Morrow, Robert D., O71569.
Morse, James W., O81704.
Mort, Bruce M., O84502.
Morton, Bryan D., O72526.
Moscovic, Paul S., O90320.
Moses, Dan, O72166.
Mounts, James A., Jr., O90514.
Mueller, Frederick, O71847.
Muhlherr, Joseph J., O71236.
Mullan, Thomas L., Jr., O72167.
Mullen, Gordon R., O71572.
Mullin, William E., O71102.
Munier, Paul L., O78448.
Munroe, Gary W., Sr., O72169.
Murphy, Charles K., O72346.
Murphy, Clyde L., O81496.
Myers, Maynard D., O78451.
Nack, Thomas P., O72378.
Nakamura, Leslie K., O92103.
Napier, James W., 3d., O72172.
Nave, Billy J., O72767.
Neal, Charles A., O88857.
Neal, James W., O77595.
Negaard, Gordon R., O72173.
Neroni, Frederick J., O71579.
Neroutsos, George H., O75257.
Newman, Jesse K., O72768.
Newton, Robert W., O72174.
Nichols, Sterling R., Jr., O72175.
Nidever, Edward W., O72176.
Nidever, Richard L., O71238.
Nodland, Stanley K., O72769.
Nolan, John D., O71239.
Nork, William G., O89267.
Norwalk, Frank E., O82215.
Nourse, Robert H., O72179.
Nuckolls, Donald R., O90554.
Nunziata, Salvatore W., O71104.
Oakley, Howard H., O77605.
Obermire, John P., O83632.
Oblock, Louis W., O71944.
O'Brien, Francis E., O72180.
O'Connell, Marvin G., O78457.
O'Connor, James J., O89268.
Okazaki, Kenneth T., O71241.
O'Leary, Arthur J., O77608.
O'Leary, Francis D., O77609.
O'Leksy, William G., O71105.
Oliver, Hebren W., O91963.
Olvey, Lee D., O72181.
Ordway, Godwin, 3d, O72182.
Osborn, Phillip C., O77613.
Oshesky, Gerald K., O84504.
Ottinger, Joseph B., O72533.
Owel, William R., O75262.
Owens, Frank E., O77614.
Owings, William M., O71852.
Pacelli, Vincent A., O77615.
Pacha, Leonard E., O71106.
Page, George W., O72184.
Page, Louis V., O81505.
Parchinski, Edward S., O81506.
Parham, Paul B., O77618.
Parker, Alton B., Jr., O72185.
Parker, Don L., O71107.
Parks, Paul F., O72186.
Parks, William T., O72187.
Parrish, Glenwood N., O72771.
Parry, Rafael P., O71584.
Parsons, Russell L., O72188.
Passafiume, John F., O72189.
Pate, Robert I., O71409.
Patnode, Clarence A., Jr., O71109.
Pattakos, Arion N., O72635.
Patterson, Earl A., Jr., O84715.
Patterson, Theodore B., O72190.
Patton, Joe W., O85066.
Payne, Lloyd A., O87877.
Pearson, John C., O72192.
Pede, August R., O72348.
Pemberton, David L., O72193.
Perkins, Rex VanN., O72194.
Perrotto, Anthony J., O85233.
Perry, John W., Jr., O71247.
Perry, Ronald C., O82221.
Perschetz, Gerald, O77622.
Pershing, Jay W., O77623.
Peters, William G., O72195.
Petersen, Darwin A., O85068.
Pettet, Joseph D., O72196.
Pettit, Lewis W., O71855.
Pfaller, Eberhard W., O81508.
Philbrook, Wilbur W., Jr., O77625.
Philippsen, Werner C., O91484.
Phillips, Calvin F., Jr., O82223.
Phillips, Clyde W., O75267.
Pierce, Fred W., Jr., O81717.
Pierce, James R., O71587.
Pierce, John A., O72538.
Pierce, Wilbur R., Jr., O71950.
Pohlod, Leonard G., O85070.
Poor, Thomas D., O70914.
Poorman, Donald C., O72200.
Pospisil, Vladimir A., O91485.
Powel, Ben F., Jr., O81720.
Poydasheff, Robert, O71856.
Pratt, Willis G., O77627.
Prawl, Sherlund D., O78187.
Principe, Martin A., O88883.
Prothero, Ronald P., O77630.
Pruniski, Stephen A., Jr., O81722.
Purchase, Collins J., O84505.
Purdy, Harry E., Jr., O72380.
Putorek, William P., Jr., O78472.
Putz, Robert A., O84506.
Quinn, Hugh, 3d, O72203.
Quinn, James R., O75273.
Raab, Kenneth E., O78188.
Rackley, Jerry D., O71250.
Radtke, William P., O88184.
Ralls, Rawleigh H., 3d., O72204.
Randall, Donald A., O81724.
Randall, Eugene J., O82226.
Randolph, James W., O77637.
Rasmussen, Ronald R., O71411.
Ray, Howard, O71252.
Raymond, Allen D., 3d., O72205.
Reddell, Gerald W., O77639.
Redmond, Robert S., O71412.
Regan, John P., O77641.
Register, Benjamin F., Jr., O77642.
Reid, Donald E., O72206.
Reid, Robert C., O72641.
Reid, Robert L., Jr., O77643.
Reniker, Gene B., O71254.
Rhodes, Roy P., O89949.
Rhyan, Earnest W., Jr., O85077.
Rice, Harley E., O77648.
Richey, Eugene C., O75276.
Rider, Archie A., O77650.
Rider, James D., O77651.
Rimbach, Douglas O., O80227.
Risteter, Vincent A., O81726.
Riviere, George L., O88899.
Rixon, Malcolm D., O91991.
Roberts, Benjamin D., O72207.
Roberts, William P., O75277.
Robertson, Frank J., O72208.
Robinson, George R., O71258.
Robinson, Jerry L., O71861.
Robinson, Thomas J., O78480.
Robinson, Willard L., O72209.
Rodeman, Dean A., O87598.
Rodenhiser, Carl L., O88903.
Rodgers, William E., O78481.
Rohrbach, Roger B., Jr., O82228.
Roop, John R. C., O77656.
Rose, Charles E., O71415.
Ross, Vaughn C., O71261.
Rosser, John C., Jr., O71716.
Roth, Bernard J., O77660.
Rowan, George R., Jr., O71262.
Rudzki, John E., Jr., O72211.
Rungee, James L., O87904.
Rupert, Harry W., Jr., O85798.
Russell, Benjamin B., O77664.
Russell, Cledie B., O70149.
Russell, Dean F., O71264.
Rutledge, Howard L., O77665.
Ryan, James H., O72213.
Ryan, Walter J., O72214.
Rydel, Albert S., Jr., O78487.
Saffold, Albert T., O84918.
Sager, Robert A., O71266.
Sammt, Carl J., O86716.
Sanders, Ralph D., Jr., O73077.
Sands, Clifton A., O88911.
Sands, Robert S., O92000.
Sanford, Jackie W., O90430.
Saunders, Joe W., O84510.
Savoldi, William R., O75284.
Schauer, Franz P., O72216.
Schepps, Madison C., Jr., O72217.
Schick, John L., O72218.
Schick, Robert L., O77671.
Schlotter, Frank J., O72219.
Schmidt, Robert C. H., O72220.
Schnabel, Robert H., O81734.
Schneider, Finis E., O77674.
Schneider, Robert L., O75289.
Schott, Richard S., O82294.
Schouman, Hazen C., Jr., O81518.
Schow, Horace, 2d, O72221.
Schuh, Charles A., O72222.
Schumann, John R., O84511.
Schwartz, James L., O89951.
Schwarz, Henry E., O71268.
Scott, Charles H., O71270.
Scott, Edward M., O91685.
Scott, Frank H., O78493.
Scott, Richard L., O71596.
Scott, William T., O71271.
Screen, Donald D., O71119.
Scribner, Edwin G., O77679.
Seagrave, David A., O78494.
Sears, James M., O84512.
Seaton, Peter P., O78189.
Seguin, Raymond J., O81738.
Selig, William L., O78190.
Senay, David C., O71867.
Senn, Thomas J., O92008.
Serra, Robert R., O90534.
Setzer, Howard L., Jr., O85376.
Seward, John M., O77682.
Shaffer, Robert L., O72224.
Shalikashvili, Othar J., O73583.
Shalz, Roger M., O85254.
Shamblee, Curtis G., O71273.
Shanahan, Norman K., O78497.
Shannon, Robert, O82295.
Sharp, Benjamin F., Jr., O71274.
Shaul, Rollin E., O84513.
Shaylor, Thomas C., O90480.
Shea, Thomas F., O84269.
Shelby, Jerry L., O71419.
Shepard, William C., O78500.
Shilko, Edwin M., O74842.
Shimunek, Richard D., O72226.
Shiraishi, James T., O71275.
Shoemaker, Ronald Z., O72650.
Shreeve, Caleb A., Jr., O71598.
Sietman, William F., Jr., O72227.
Silvanic, George, O89290.
Simmons, Eugene F., Jr., O71276.
Simmons, Frank J., O87916.
Simpson, Billy S., O85257.
Sims, Billy G., O89607.
Siner, Albert P., O88494.
Sisman, Lawrence, O78191.
Skaff, Joseph J., O72228.
Skladal, George W., O71278.
Sliva, Norman E., O77691.
Sloan, John F., O72229.
Slocum, Frederick V., Jr., O79478.
Smith, Alfred L., Jr., O77693.
Smith, Glenn N., O81740.
Smith, James L., Jr., O73196.
Smith, John J., O71874.
Smith, Lawrence D., O90500.
Smith, Lloyd D., O92012.
Smith, Nelson H., O71726.
Smith, Norman M., O72231.
Smith, Richard R., O77695.
Smith, Robert J., O71122.
Smith, Thomas A., O81743.
Smith, Wayne R., O72232.
Smith, William A., O87622.
Smor, Paul R., O72233.
Solinsky, Harold, O86790.

Sontag, Paul D., O88950.
Soupene, James C., Jr., O72358.
Soyster, Frank L., O87919.
Spain, Harold D., O81531.
Spann, Bobby G., O87625.
Sparks, Norman W., O72235.
Spaulding, Alfred J., O72236.
Spegele, John A., O81532.
Spellman, John G., O72237.
Spruill, Joseph L., O71285.
Stallard, James E., 3d, O71123.
Stallings, James D., O82239.
Standeven, Ernest J., O78514.
Stanley, Robert F., O72239.
Stapleton, John R., O77702.
Steakley, John W., O72241.
Steckley, Kenneth D., O89386.
Steine, Joel R., O91694.
Steinman, Charles A., O72242.
Stevens, Charles H., 3d., O72245.
Stevenson, Joseph M., O88960.
Stevenson, Michael A., O72246.
Stewart, Israel W., Jr., O81536.
Stewart, Joe F., O78517.
Stewart, William A., Jr., O77708.
Stockett, Lawrence E., O72247.
Stommel, Raymond R., O87937.
Stone, George J., O75300.
Stone, Howard F., O72248.
Stone, Leon H., Jr., O77711.
Stovall, Don O., O86821.
Strang, Charles W., Jr., O71729.
Strati, Robert A., O72249.
Street, Clover B., Jr., O72359.
Streett, William B., Jr., O72250.
Strickland, James R., O72251.
Strom, John H., O72252.
Strom, Roy M., O77713.
Stuart, Theodore M., O90478.
Stumpff, George F., O89387.
Subotky, Gerson J., O71126.
Sullivan, Andrew J., O89147.
Sullivan, Robert D., O87632.
Sullivan, Roy F., O77717.
Summers, James T., O83107.
Surmiak, Edward P., O82368.
Sutherland, James C., O71421.
Swanson, Robert L., O75302.
Swartwout, Donald C., O77719.
Sweet, William E., O87633.
Sydenham, Stanley R., O72255.
Talbot, Bailey M., O71964.
Tandy, Donald F., O72794.
Tanimoto, Robert H., O71287.
Tawoda, Robert J., O71730.
Taylor, James O., O77723.
Taylor, Richard F., Sr., O74031.
Taylor, William J., Jr., O78522.
Teague, Martin W., O78192.
Templeton, James L., Jr., O78193.
Tennant, Billy M., O72258.
Terrio, William A., O72259.
Terzopoulos, Nicholas, O77727.
Thames, Peter H., O71965.
Thayer, Henry J., O77728.
Thomas, Billy J., Jr., O81750.
Thomas, David L., O75305.
Thomas, Max E., O89300.
Thomas, Richard W., Jr., O88973.
Thomer, Joseph N., O72260.
Thompson, Donald K., O78194.
Thompson, Duayne B., O82246.
Thompson, Harold N., O85092.
Thompson, John U., O77732.
Thompson, Lonnie E., O72796.
Thorp, Lee LaV., O71611.
Tigh, Leland F., Jr., O77736.
Todd, Rouse J., O90149.
Tomberg, Ralph T., O78526.
Toner, Francis J., O77737.
Top, John J., O88980.
Torbett, William C., 3d, O77738.
Torrence, James E., O72262.
Towle, Thomas J., O77739.
Town, James I., O72263.
Trail, Carl F., O92137.
Treadway, Thomas J., O72360.
Treadwell, Millard L., Jr., O71884.
Trent, Warren T., Jr., O77740.
Trevethan, Alexander, O78196.
Trobaugh, Edward L., O72266.
Trosper, Robert L., O78197.
Trowbridge, Clarence A., O78528.
Troyan, Frank D., O72267.
Truitt, Gene A., O86872.
Turner, Gary L., O72798.
Tuten, Jeff M., O71885.
Ueltschi, Donald R., O77746.
Ulcak, Ben J., O72555.
Underwood, Frank E., O78531.
Underwood, Joe D., O84518.
Underwood, John R., O72556.
Valentine, William L., O81547.
Valverde, Robert A., O92141.
Valz, Darwin K., O77748.
Valz, Donald J., O77749.
Van Camp, James P., O71736.
Van Houten, William, 3d, O77750.
Van Pool, Jack L., O77751.
Vanden Bosch, Jon C., O72269.
Vaughan, Charles U., O82302.
Vaught, Ralph R., O71292.
Vavra, George R., O89306.
Ventrella, Rocco F., Jr., O87651.
Vincent, Joseph F., O72271.
Viney, John A., O72272.
Voetsch, John A., 3d, O81549.
Von Gortler, Frederick C., 3d, O77754.
Vosbein, Henry M., Jr., O77755.
Vought, Donald B., O71293.
Vulgas, Edmund, O72274.
Waible, Leo C., Jr., O88990.
Waite, Hugh G., O71295.
Walker, Billy M., O80231.
Walker, Travis L., O90581.
Wall, Harold R., O81756.
Wall, Kary D., O81757.
Wallace, Joel B., Jr., O72661.
Wallace, John R., O73420.
Walter, Francis J., Jr., O71129.
Walter, Paul B., O88993.
Walther, Harry J., O71888.
Walton, Frank G., O72275.
Ward, Gayle G., O71425.
Ward, Stanley D., O77763.
Warner, Leo V., Jr., O72276.
Warren, Carl W., O71622.
Warren, Wilford N., 3d, O90556.
Waterstrat, Rodney L., O72277.
Watson, Henry G., O72431.
Watts, James R., O81553.
Watzling, John K., O77768.
Weatherall, Marcus L., O91413.
Weatherby, Yale D., O71022.
Weaver, John L., O71893.
Weckerling, John H., O71426.
Weiher, Ronald G., O78540.
Weiskirch, Thomas N., Jr., O72362.
Welborn, Carl W., O87661.
Welling, Gerald R., O84519.
Wells, Macon W., O72279.
Welter, William L., Jr., O72280.
Wendelken, William H., O77771.
West, Thomas C., O72282.
Wharrie, Robert E., O72405.
Wheaton, Robert L., O72283.
Wheeler, David E., O72284.
White, Chad B., O71623.
White, Charles E., O77773.
White, Fredrick B., O77774.
White, Marion F., O71300.
Whiteley, Frank G., O71624.
Whiteley, James E., O85101.
Whitmore, Wesley C., O71625.
Whittaker, Howard C., O72285.
Wiegand, Robert D., O72286.
Wiggers, Ralph G., O77776.
Wiggs, Jimmy D., O72665.
Wilcox, William H., O72288.
Wilde, Forrest B., O81557.
Wilkie, James B., 3d, O71302.
Willemse, Cornelius W., O71303.
Willey, Burr McB., O87969.
Williams, Clinton L., Jr., O91725.
Williams, James D., O84070.
Williams, Lewis E., O92148.
Williams, Louis F., Jr., O71428.
Williams, Norman H., O71304.
Williams, Robert C., Jr., O78550.
Williams, Sylvanus J., 3d, O77779.
Williams, Thomas L., Jr., O78551.
Williamson, Rayburn L., O77780.
Williamson, Robert L., O81764.
Willis, William, Jr., O71306.
Wilmes, John J., O71427.
Wilson, Charles E., O89012.
Wilson, Richard A., O81765.
Wilson, William E., O78554.
Wing, John R., O72290.
Wingfield, Damon D., O85285.
Winney, Walter E., Jr., O84520.
Winston, Neil C., O77784.
Winter, William J., Jr., O72667.
Wintz, Edward K., O77786.
Wise, Lynn J., O81561.
Witek, James E., O71308.
Witter, Robert A., O77788.
Wix, William M., O72291.
Woerner, Frederick F., Jr., O72292.
Wood, Graham W., O72293.
Wood, Hector, O81562.
Woodall, James R., Jr., O88531.
Woodmansee, Donald R., O75129.
Woods, Eugene R., O77793.
Wright, William J., Jr., O81564.
Wyatt, David L., O81770.
Yore, Joseph A., O77796.
York, Harry M., O72294.
Young, Carl L., O82304.
Young, Raymond H., O71132.
Young, Roger Q., O78199.
Yuengel, William W., O85395.
Zaborowski, Edward J., O72296.
Zeigler, Charles S., O78562.
Zenk, Daniel R., O72564.
Zimmerman, Fred R., O81771.
Zurbriggen, Donald J., O77801.

To be captains, Chaplain

Adickes, Donald K., O90080.
Combs, Louis K., Jr., O85739.
Cox, Billy H., O88248.
Forrest, Alfred T., O88683.
Garrell, Hubert, O89488.
Graber, Howard M., O88704.
Johnson, Charles M., O88760.
Knowlton, Robert L., O88770.
Kovacic, Francis, O88773.
Lapp, Ernest D., O89085.
Magalee, John E., O89100.
Maguire, Francis N., O86446.
Nelson, Harold E., O88458.
Polhemus, David W., O88878.
Shelton, Wayne G., O89603.
Stover, Earl F., O88961.
Trobaugh, William P., O89157.
Yarborough, Jimmie W., O89168.

To be captains, Women's Army Corps

Albright, Ruth M., L516.
Archambault, Claire A., L547.
Etheridge, Wanda J., L541.
Griffin, Norma B., L589.
Haynes, Christine, L571.
Hunter, Onie R., L543.
Husband, Patricia R., L549.
Keil, Barbara J., L550.
Maybin, Patricia J., L578.
O'Rourke, Kathleen R., L551.
Raidmets, Margaret M., L548.
Roffee, Ruth O., L554.
Shippee, Audrey B., L518.
Steelman, Lois M., L522.

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.

To be lieutenant colonels, Army Nurse Corps

Bowling, Pauline J., N578.
Brown, Helen E., N2558.
Burchfield, Muriel, N276.
Burrows, Mary L., N2152.
Cannoles, Margaret H., N1211.
Cavanaugh, Dorothy W., N2384.
Fischer, Mercedes M., N2089.
Hays, Anna Mae M., N905.
Kammeraad, Angie C., N1529.
Phillips, Kathleen W., N2458.
Schuchmann, Amanda E., N2147.
Tessen, Dorothy A., N1858.
Treacy, Jeanne M., N2093.
Votava, Mary T., N448.

To be lieutenant colonels, Army Medical Specialist Corps

Brigham, Agnes A., M10100.
Marshall, Eleanor M., M10040.
Stack, Mary E., R10072.
Summers, Evelyn G., R10122.

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.

To be first lieutenants

Anderson, John L., O81774.
Evans, William R., O91820.
Martinka, Gerald R., 092092.
Mills, Harry L., O91646.
Napper, John L., O91474.

The following-named person for reappointment to the active list of the Regular Army of the United States, from the temporary disability retired list, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 1211, 3283, 3284, 3285, 3286, 3287, and 3288.

To be colonel

Thackston, Albert J., Jr., O16607.

The following-named persons for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, in the grades specified under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3283, 3284, 3285, 3286, 3287, and 3288:

To be lieutenant colonel

Bachelor, William E., O303253.

To be major

King, Grover C., O449492.

To be captain

Beam, James D., O4012716.
Bertrand, Milton A., O4018908.
Davis, Jonah B., Jr., O4011964.
Davis, Willie L., O4012032.
Dewey, Desmond D., O4006822.
Falter, Vincent E., O4009872.
Fisher, Robert J., O4009747.
Flenniken, David B., O4019789.
Grant, Donald E., O4009881.
Guffey, Howard R., O4009606.
Murtha, James D., O4020836.
Tallon, Richard J., O4026543.
Tom, Harry K. L., O4006805.
Trim, Carl J., O1913498.
Warren, James R., O988693.
Wheeler, William P., O1935824.
Williams, James R., Jr., O4000659.

To be first lieutenants

Ballew, Bobby G., O5301728.
Beaver, Joseph M., O4015444.
Bozeman, Paul, O5302259.
Clark, Davis, O4063734.
Collings, J. Elmer, O5701773.
Dorward, Neil L., O2298722.
Kunard, Donald D., O4071622.
Large, Darrel R., O4074510.
Miles, Jerry M., O5400990.
Miner, William R., O5504199.
Shunk, William A., O5506455.
Stevens, Ronald B., O4063761.

To be second lieutenants

Bennett, Roger M., O5505286.
Britt, James J., O5404474.
Cooke, Charles B., W3150425.
Custer, Leslie L., O5504811.
Gray, Josef E., O5701931.
Johnson, Richard G., O5305693.
Juhnevicz, William B., O5001347.
Koehl, Jacob O., O5411108.
Lane, Harry G., RA11353467.
Lanzotti, Robert E., O5510733.
Leverette, Thomas E., O5311564.
McKenzie, George R., O5409465.
McKeon, James E., O5206150.
Moore, John E., Jr., O5209869.
Regan, Carl J., O5307395.
Robertson, James A., O5306240.
Simons, William H., RA11348877.
Stahlman, John R., O5308731.
Thomas, James E., O5704378.
Ulm, Donald S., O5208902.
Wallace, Richard B., O5212086.

The following-named persons for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, in the grades and corps specified, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3283, 3284, 3285, 3286, 3287, 3288, 3289, 3290, 3291, 3292, 3293, 3294 and 3311:

To be major, Women's Army Corps

Wood, Nancy B., L402096.

To be captain, Army Nurse Corps

Ware, Jean M., N792766.

To be captains, Chaplain

Dryer, Richard E., O1873651.
Stevey, John E., O4403456.

To be captains, Dental Corps

Burger, Robert B., O5206961.
Chandler, Hubert T., O5202550.
Older, Alva H., Jr., O4073668.
Parker, Warren A., O5210350.
Shannon, Charles J., Jr., O4035921.
Shaver, Lloyd F., Jr., O5206862.
Smith, Paul E., O5500984.
Tye, Edward J., O5501115.
Williams, Robert W., O4030303.

To be captains, Medical Corps

Altman, Robert S., O2289688.
Ballard, Michael D.
Bebak, Donald M., O5004195.
Boccagno, Patrick M., O5213481.
Burkhart, Cecil R., O2291439.
Caplinger, Carl B., O4033063.
Cataldo, Joseph R., O2248202.
Clark, Paul K., O2298944.
Conley, William R., O5518006.
Danforth, Howard B., O2291356.
Duley, Norman D., Jr., O2300406.
Friedlander, Harvey L., O2289835.
Froker, Lowell D., O2289700.
Galdieri, Louis G., O2289702.
Grodsky, Leonard H., O4043835.
Hunt, Walter L., O2290105.
Jones, Billy E., O4044644.
Jones, Edward H., O4014662.
Kriz, Francis K., O2295078.
Lambert, Fred M., O4028649.
Mani, John R., O5703113.
Mayes, Hubert A., O2289724.
Montegut, Ferdinand J., Jr., O2291537.
Mulholland, Philip L., O4037754.
Nelson, Roald A., O5703132.
Neumann, Peter H., O5207321.
Palmbaum, Paul J., O5703136.
Peterson, Richard B., O2300704.
Phillips, Ran L., II, O5301194.
Poindexter, James L., O4073448.
Reed, John H., Jr., O2295023.
Reiss, Walter E., O2289712.
Schochet, Howard L., O5501127.
Scotti, Louis N., O4042434.
Sledden, Richard E., O4037771.
Stark, Donald B., O5703194.
Stuart, Ronald R., O4013830.
Warner, Phillip O., O2295028.

To be captains, Medical Service Corps

Mancini, Lawrence H., O2208611.
Sabol, Donald E., O2266007.

To be captain, Judge Advocate General's Corps

Scott, Marvin T., O4044312.

To be first lieutenant, Army Nurse Corps

Bryant, Barbara J., N2290044.

To be first lieutenant, Dental Corps

King, Billie C., O5306783.

To be first lieutenant, Judge Advocate General's Corps

Holtman, Donald R., O2300930.

To be first lieutenants, Medical Corps

Aldrich, Robert C., II, O2298290.
Alexander, Jack L., O2300484.
Anderson, Kirby V., O4060444.
Burdick, Richard E., O2300478.
Butkus, Donald E., O4066594.
Cleary, Jimmie R., O4076004.
Cranston, John P., III.
Edwards, John B., O2298141.
Eisenstein, Elliot M., O2300498.
Lodmell, John G., O2298144.
McClure, Hubert L., O2298156.
Montgomery, Robert C., O2298157.
Stevenson, Robert S., O5703591.
Townsley, James T., III, O5301069.
Watanabe, Henry K., O4078133.

To be first lieutenant, Medical Service Corps

Kaperick, Donald P., O2295354.

To be first lieutenant, Veterinary Corps

Ferrell, John F., O2298289.

To be second lieutenants, Army Nurse Corps

Gosling, Bernadine J., N2298142.
Kucha, Delores H., N2298682.

To be second lieutenants, Medical Service Corps

Benson, Warren D., O5512909.
Fitzgerald, Barry E., O5311206.
Fuller, Gary L., O5705182.
Gilchrist, Robert E., O5705649.
Harris, Leonard G., O5206735.
Monk, Merrill E., O5409671.
Norton, George T., O5003775.

To be second lieutenant, Women's Army Corps

Morris, Sarah L., L5302023.

The following-named distinguished military students for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, in the grade and corps specified, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3283, 3284, 3285, 3286, 3287, 3288, and 3290:

To be second lieutenants, Medical Service Corps

Arroyo, Francisco	Green, Thomas
Blair, Robert A.	McMichael, James H., Jr.
Buckingham, Stuart R.	Swain, Richard H.
Goodstein, Richard K.	Winn, William M.

The following-named distinguished military students for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States in the grade of second lieutenant, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3283, 3284, 3285, 3286, 3287, and 3288:

Agnew, Ramon B.	Flores, Jose M.
Anderson, John R., III	Garth, Robert W., Jr.
Austin, Thomas S., Jr.	Hager, Henry F., III
Avila, Carmelo	Harper, Donald W.
Boesch, John C.	Henderson, Thyrone L.
Bowen, James R.	Hill, Ramen A.
Bradley, Larry E.	Hocking, John W.
Bradley, Robert N.	Holder, Alex M., Jr.
Bridgman, Cain A.	Holder, James R.
Brown, Robert A.	Hope, Terrill C.
Bublys, Romualdas	Iverson, John F.
Byrd, Johnnie P.	Johnson, Milo P.
Callander, Robert D.	Johnston, Benjamin C.
Cantrell, Charles L.	Josten, David A.
Carpenter, John F.	Kienlen, Ronald A.
Carroll, Robert H.	Krajewski, RobertJ.
Carter, Russell L.	Lemp, James F.
Ceccon, Claude R.	Leslie, Larry L.
Cleveland, Conley R.	Lopez-Alonso, Juan R.
Cohen, Franklin S.	Lord, Gerald
Collins, Donovan M.	Lovelace, Guy M.
Collins, Samuel L.	Marrero, Humberto
Conger, Richard W.	Martin, Larry L.
Conway, Peter	McClendon, Miles R.
Cruz-Gonzales, Guillermo	McGurk, Floyd F.
Cunningham, Harold R.	McKinnon, James K.
Dahl, Robert A.	McKissock, William T., Jr.
DeRubbo, Daniel J., Jr.	Melendez, Hector N.
deRubertis, Kim P.	Melton, Otis H., Jr.
DeWitt, Richard L.	Mercado, Alejandro
Edwards, Fred C.	Miller, John C.
Eichorn, Peter K.	Mordeaux, Corry
Emanuel, Peter J.	Oliveras, Manuel
Evans, Charles E., Jr.	O'Sullivan, John
	Pentz, William H., Jr.

Perez, Carlos J.
Perez, Enrique
Perino, George H., Jr.
Peters, Jon R.
Pinkerton, Billy B.
Poe, Phillip W.
Price, Hugh A.
Prince, Ronald Z.
Remmert, Richard L.
Roberts, William M.
Runion, Keith B.
Sampson, Donnie G.
Sanabria, Agripino
Schmit, John W., Jr.
Scholz, Garret A.
Sheffield, Robert W.
Shields, Ronald R.
Shugart, James W., III
Simpson, Allan R.
Skaggs, Frankie L.
Smith, Frank T.
Spampani, Pedro B.
Stokes, Charles E., Jr.
Stone, Ronald P.
Stubbs, Frederic H.
Sucher, Theodore R., III
Tanner, Howard C.
Thompson, Raymond
Thorson, Glen J.
Velez, Agustin E.
Wade, Larkin H.
Walinsky, Samuel H.
Warner, James I.
Warrington, Terrell L.
Welsh, Elbert A.
West, Ronald P.
Whitehead, Joseph D.
Wilson, Terril E.
Windon, Jackson T. O. P., III
Winslow, Sidney W.
Woodfin, John H.
Wynn, Charles W.
Yeates, Clayne M.
Young, Danny A.

The following-named officer for appointment as professor of electricity, U.S. Military Academy, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 4333:

Saunders, Edward A., O27904.

The following-named cadets, graduating class of 1961, U.S. Military Academy, for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States in the grade of second lieutenant, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3283, 3284, 3285, 3286, 3287, and 3288:

Aaronsohn, Jonathan B.
Abraham, Bruce R.
Ackerman, David L.
Adams, Joseph G.
Alexander, Terry L.
Altmeyer, James E.
Angstadt, Richard W.
Anselm, Donald C.
Armstrong, Alan P.
Armstrong, Charles H.
Armstrong, Roy L., Jr.
Babbitt, Leroy A., Jr.
Bacon, Carlton E.
Baird, Thomas H.
Baldwin, Byron S.
Barbour, Donald A.
Barney, Daniel G.
Battle, Brendan J.
Bayless, Harry K., III
Beckett, Ronald L.
Behrenhausen, Richard A., Jr.
Belknap, Willard S.
Bender, Lynn A.
Bennett, Andrew F., Jr.
Benz, Herbert T. G., Jr.
Benzinger, Peter L.
Berinato, John J.
Bernard, Robert K.
Berra, Louis C., Jr.
Biddinger, David E.
Blanda, Frank T.
Blesse, James S.
Boeve, Lucas, III
Bonko, Donald R.
Born, William J. T. M.
Boylan, Peter J., Jr.
Bradford, William B.
Brady, Michael J.
Bragg, Stacy C.
Breslin, Michael G.
Brown, Edward A., III
Brown, Harvey L.
Brown, Reginald J.
Bruner, Edward F.
Buckner, Richard A.
Budge, Larry D.
Burchell, Gail P.
Burgess, Peter D.
Burns, Charles P.
Burns, Robert A.
Buesiecker, Roy F., Jr.
Butterworth, Larry R.
Cain, Robert S., Jr.
Cairns, Robert B.
Campbell, Dale G., Jr.
Campbell, John L.
Cargile, James P., Jr.
Carlson, Gunnar C., Jr.
Carlton, Forrest R., II
Carroll, Patrick J., Jr.
Carroll, Thomas F., III
Casani, Andrew B.
Cerasoli, Roger
Chambers, Barton P.
Chandler, William S.
Chelberg, Robert D.
Cherry, George M., Jr.
Chism, J. W.
Claassen, Walter E., Jr.
Clancy, William E., Jr.
Clarke, Richard D.
Clements, Gerard H.
Clough, Stanley M.
Coddington, Clinton H.
Compton, Martin A., II.
Conant, Richard C.
Conley, Willard C.
Conner, Dan A.
Connolly, James C., II.
Connors, James W., Jr.
Cook, Bromley N., Jr.
Cook, Garry M.
Cook, Jay C.
Corcoran, James R.
Cornelius, Roger L.
Cornelius, Russell M.
Cornelson, John C.
Coulter, Holland B.
Counts, Edward T.
Couvillion, Donald A.
Covington, Benjamin W., III.
Cowan, Bruce M.
Coyle, James M.
Coyne, Michael.
Crews, Ephraim W., Jr.
Crowther, James I., Jr.
Cullum, Richard O.
Cunningham, Norman N.
Custer, Bert H.
Cuthbert, Thomas R.
Czuberki, Joseph A.
Dahle, Joseph S.
Dalgleish, Grant B.
Daniloff, Frederick D.
Davis, Richard J.
DeVries, Paul T.
DeWitt, Howard S.
Denney, Steve H.
Deuel, William T.
Dewar, John D.
DiCarlo, Daniel M., Jr.
Dickson, Robert C.
Dillard, Walter S.
Dluzyn, David A.
Doherty, James W.
Dombrowski, Philip G.
Dorr, John M.
Downey, Arthur J., Jr.
Downey, Gordon K., Jr.
Downing, Harry E.
Dunning, Robert M.
Dyer, Travis N.
Eaton, David G.
Egan, Francis C.
Eggleston, Michael A.
Eielson, John A.
Eiland, Michael D.
Ekman, Michael E.
Enfield, Samuel W.
Erhardt, Franklyn A.
Ericksen, Gordon T.
Esselstein, William D.
Evans, Alexander H.
Eveleth, Robert G.
Evetts, James K., Jr.
Eyler, Frank B.
Fanning, Richard H.
Fischer, John E.
Fishburne, Francis J., Jr.
Flack, Gary L.
Ford, William R.
Fox, George
Frazier, Dean S.
Freeman, Samuel D., III
Fritz, Martell D.
Frix, Robert S.
Gabriel, Henmar R.
Gaither, Harold C., Jr.
Ganderson, Martin L.
Gants, Robert M.
Garens, Ralph W., Jr.
Garretson, Ralph B., Jr.
Geiger, Kenneth H.
Gibson, Francis L.
Gilbert, Nicholas C.
Gillespie, Dallas K.
Gillespie, Frank W., Jr.
Gilmore, Earl W.
Glass, Robert R., II
Gleichenhaus, David P.
Goldstine, James A.
Goldtrap, John W.
Goodell, Eugene K.
Gordon, Thomas R.
Grannemann, Rodney F.
Grant, Clayton, I., Jr.
Graves, Howard D.
Green, Charles S., Jr.
Greene, Channing M.
Griffiths, William R.
Grigg, Neil S.
Gronich, Bruce J.
Guerzenich, Robert H.
Guthrie, John D.
Haas, Charles N.
Habic, Frank J., III
Haise, James R.
Hale, William M.
Hallenbeck, Gilman J.
Halpin, Daniel W.
Halstead, Bruce B.
Hamilton, Robert B.
Hampton, Robert D.
Hannon, Harold M.
Hansell, Charles R.
Hansen, Carl T.
Hanson, Morris F., Jr.
Harden, Monroe B.
Hardiman, Robert R.
Harmon, James J.
Harrell, Robert G.
Harrington, Marshall E.
Harris, Robert F.
Hartford, George A., Jr.
Hastings, David A.
Hathaway, William E.
Heiberg, William L.
Heiman, Charles N.
Heindahl, Peter D.
Henderson, George
Heron, Bruce G.
Herrick, Robert M.
Hersant, Darryl E.
Hiester, David W., Jr.
Higginbotham, Heston W., III
Hillier, Pringle P.
Himes, Howard D.
Hines, Ronald D.
Hodell, Charles B.
Hodge, Walter W.
Hodges, Harold H.
Holmberg, Bruce P.
Holton, Quinton, II
Holz, Roland R.
Horan, Earl C., Jr.
Hoy, Pat C., II
Hricz, George M.
Hruby, Kenneth L.
Hughes, Talbert W.
Hyde, Gary R.
Jackson, James D.
Jackson, Richard K.
Janoska, Robert L.
Java, John J., Jr.
Jenz, James E.
Joulwan, George A.
Kammerdiener, John L.
Kampfer, John B.
Kee, Robert J.
Kemp, John A.
Kenny, Henry J.
Kewley, Robert H.
Kilkenny, John J.
Kirkpatrick, William T.
Kovac, Bruce R.
Kremer, Alvin W., Jr.
LaBorne, Eugene F., Jr.
Lammers, Bruce T.
Lancaster, Dudley C.
Landry, Donald E.
Laurence, John W., Jr.
Leech, Thomas E.
Legge, Barnwell I.
Leinbach, Conwell B.
Leland, Edwin S., Jr.
Lenhart, George D.
Lewis, Donald H.
Liebman, Robert A.
Ligon, Walter B., Jr.
Lilienthal, Henry E.
Lionetti, Donald M.
Livingston, James L.
Lockey, Donald V.
Lombardo, Michael J.
Looram, James F. X.
Lord, Gary R.
Lubke, Alan H.
Lund, Thomas J.
Lynch, James F.
MacLean, John R., Jr.
Mace, David H.
Mack, John H.
Madden, Jim L.
Magness, Thomas H., III
Maio, Joseph R.
Mallory, Glynn C., Jr.
Mallory, Philip H.
Maloney, Michael
Manning, James C.
Marshall, Morris L.
Martin, Jack M.
Mathison, James S.
Matson, Thomas D.
Matthews, Douglas F.
Maus, Reynold M.
McBee, Donald L.
McCann, Joseph J., Jr.
McCarthy, Robert E.
McCollister, Kenneth W.
McCormick, John R.
McCreary, Howard E., Jr.
McCurdy, Robert A.
McGinnis, James P.
McLaughlin, John F.
McNear, Richard E.
Meissner, Kenith E.
Mercer, Thomas K.
Middlesteadt, Roger W.
Miller, Arlen C. T.
Miller, David L., Jr.
Miller, Donn G.
Miller, Hugh H.
Minnehan, Thomas J.
Minor, Henry D., Jr.
Moobs, Thomas T.
Muiznieks, Nikolajs R.
Murphy, Patrick J.
Navarro, Roland M.
Neiger, John J., III
Nesbeitt, William D., Jr.
Nevins, John R.
Nichols, Bruce P.
Nichols, John J.
Nicholson, Robert J.
Nitkowski, Jon F.
Nutt, Samuel C.
O'Neill, Michael E.
Oaks, James F., III
Obermeier, Roger W.
Offringa, Peter
Ogden, William
Olejniczak, Julian M.
Olive, Sergei V.
Oliver, John B.
Oliver, Robert L.
Olson, Edwin N., Jr.
Palmer, Paul C., Jr.
Paone, Joseph F.
Parks, Basil M., II
Parks, William I., Jr.
Parmele, Harmon R.
Paskewitz, Thomas W.
Pearl, Quinn F., Jr.
Pesek, Joseph F.
Peters, Glenn M., Jr.
Petty, John R.
Phelps, Russell M. M.
Ploger, Wayne D.
Popovich, Marko L.
Potter, Howard M.
Potts, Robert L.
Powell, Beverley E., Jr.
Prather, Lawrence H., Jr.
Price, David S.
Protzman, Robert R.
Pryor, James F.
Pusser, Thomas W.
Quinn, Kenneth L.
Raible, John L.
Randall, Howard W.
Randolph, Charles T., Jr.
Rauch, Frank C.
Raynis, James B.
Regan, Raymond R., Jr.
Rennagel, Harry G., Jr.
Reno, William H.
Reynolds, Regis J.
Richards, Darwin L.
Richards, Lawrence A.
Ringdahl, Phillip H.
Ritchie, David M.
Rittgers, Courtney M.
Roberts, Howard H., Jr.
Roberts, James J., III
Robertson, Walter G.
Rooney, Dennis M.
Rosenkranz, Robert B.
Rousseau, Thomas H., III
Royce, James B.
Russo, Joseph P.
Sager, Lee H., Jr.
Sanders, Eugene P., Jr.
Sands, Philip J.
Sarzanini, Andrea A.
Sawtelle, Donald W., Jr.
Schall, James E., Jr.
Schell, Tarey B.
Schultz, Brian G.
Sciple, Carl B.
Scott, James A., III
Seckinger, George M., Jr.
Seidel, Bruce R., Jr.
Seltz, William E.
Seylar, Roland F.
Shaffer, Rohlf A.
Shearer, Cyrus N., Jr.
Sheeder, Richard D.
Sherburne, Thomas N.
Shipley, Dale W.
Showalter, Ted A.
Shroyer, John B.
Sievers, William H.
Sigg, John C.
Silverman, Mark N.
Sisk, Francis G.
Skaggs, Richard C.
Skillman, John E., III
Skotzko, Michael
Sloan, Monte T.
Smalley, Larry F.
Smith, Edgar D.
Smith, George S., Jr.
Sollohub, Charles J.
Solomon, John K.
Starsman, Raymond E.
Steege, Robert J.
Stewart, Joseph W.
Stiehl, Gustav H., IV
Stokes, James M.
Stone, Thomas R.
Stoneham, Laurence J., Jr.
Stork, James L.
Strachan, James D.
Stricklen, William A., III
Stringham, Joseph S., III
Struve, James E.
Stuart, Alexander J., III
Swain, Charles M.
Sykes, Philip A.
Taylor, James B.
Teal, David J.
Tedrick, James L.
Tilghman, Ray L.
Tilton, Franklin T.
Tobin, William G., Jr.
Trinkle, Patrick M.
Tschamler, Joseph R., III
Turnage, John O.
Tyler, James W.
Underwood, Michael L.
Urette, Michael E.
Vader, Paul F., Jr.
Vallely, Paul E., Jr.
Van Gorder, Henry P.

Van Riper, Richard W., III
Vander, Els T.
Vanderbush, Albert, III
Vass, Steven, Jr.
Vaughn, Hubert B.
Vay, Nicolas R.
Veatch, John D.
Vedder, Sanford E., Jr.
Vick, Gerald A.
Votaw, John F.
Wadlington, Warwick P.
Wagner, Hans O. C.
Walker, Steven C.
Walsh, Donald A.
Walsh, Martin W., Jr.
Walters, Anderson H.
Wanner, F. W., Jr.
Watlington, Donald W.
Watt, Joseph F.
Weis, William A.
Wells, Albert L.
Welsh, Charles R.
Welsh, Lawrence E.
Westpheling, Charles T.
Wetzel, Allan R.
White, David W.
White, Lyman G., Jr.
Wilder, Samuel D., Jr.
Wildermuth, John G.
Williams, Francis M.
Williams, Richard G.
Williams, Wayne R.
Williamson, William R.
Willis, Benjamin L.
Winters, James M.
Witherspoon, Eugene S.
Wold, Douglas A.
Woodward, Harry E.
Wooten, R. J.
Worthy, Robert C.
Xenos, Michael J.
Yost, William D., III
Younkin, William M.
Yule, Richard G., Jr.
Zailskas, Roger W.
Zaldo, Martin J.
Zielinski, Robert F., Jr.
Zimmerman, John B.
Zingsheim, Gerald A.

The following-named midshipmen, graduating class of 1961, U.S. Naval Academy, for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States in the grade of second lieutenant, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 541, 3283, 3284, 3285, 3286, 3287, and 3288:

Barineau, John N., III
Bullene, Roger
Chapman, Eveleth W.
Decker, Edward T.
Doherty, Alfred C., Jr.
Doherty, Dennis E.
Gardner, Charles E.
Harvey, Jan V.
Kieffer, Pierre V., III
Kleindorfer, Paul R.
Martin, Lowell L.
Moynahan, Michael J.
Schroeder, Daniel R.
Spencer, Archie W.

The following-named cadets, graduating class of 1961, U.S. Air Force Academy, for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States in the grade of second lieutenant, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 541, 3283, 3284, 3285, 3286, 3287, and 3288:

Clarke, Gordon M.
Pattie, Thomas N.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate May 8, 1961:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

AMBASSADOR

Julius C. Holmes, of Kansas, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Iran.

U.S. ATTORNEY

James B. Brennan, of Wisconsin, to be U.S. attorney for the eastern district of Wisconsin for a term of 4 years.

U.S. MARSHALS

Peyton Norville, Jr., of Alabama, to be U.S. marshal for the northern district of Alabama for the term of 4 years.

Fred F. Hoh, of Ohio, to be U.S. marshal for the southern district of Ohio for the term of 4 years.

William J. Andrews, of Georgia, to be U.S. marshal for the northern district of Georgia for a term of 4 years.

Clayburne A. McLelland, of Maryland, to be U.S. marshal for the district of the Canal Zone for the term of 8 years.

John E. Maguire, Sr., of Florida, to be U.S. marshal for the southern district of Florida for a term of 4 years.

Anton T. Skoro, of Idaho, to be U.S. marshal for the district of Idaho for a term of 4 years.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, MAY 8, 1961

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Amos 5: 24: *Let judgment run down as waters, and righteousness as a mighty stream.*

Almighty God, in these days of crises when our hearts are strangely stirred, we are being constrained more urgently then ever to turn to Thy throne of grace in prayer, for we have nowhere else to go.

May we have the faith to believe and the insight to understand that Thou alone canst give us wisdom to guide us in our perplexities and courage to sustain us when we are in danger of faltering.

We are confident that we are fighting for a cause that is just and righteous but we penitently confess that our own conscience again and again indicts us and convicts us before the judgment of the God of all holiness that we ourselves are far from being just and righteous.

Grant that it may be our daily prayer to have a heart cleansed of sin and desires, and ambitions that are disinfected of selfishness.

Hear us in our Saviour's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, May 4, 1961, was read and approved.

COMDR. ALAN B. SHEPARD, JR.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 10 minutes, and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, we have just received and honored today a fine American, Comdr. Alan B. Shepard, Jr., of the U.S. Navy, who recently performed not only an outstanding but a heroic feat that is dedounding to the credit and the glory of our beloved country.

We can pause for a moment and visualize in our minds the thoughts that ran through his mind and the minds of his associates, any one of whom might have been selected as the first astronaut, in relation to the dangers he was to undergo with reference to his loved ones, and we can also pause and picture in our minds the thoughts that were running through the minds of the loved ones of any of those astronauts that might have been selected by our country for the performance of a feat of this extraordinary nature. Commander Shepard was selected.

Commander Shepard had the mind of a warrior. The very act that he performed shows that he possesses the mind of a warrior. In the world today the totalitarian nations and the leaders of those totalitarian nations might well take heed of the fact that Commander Shepard, with the mind of a warrior, represents the minds of the American people, because the American people are warriors. There is nothing weak in the spirit of America, particularly if the occasion arises when it is necessary to defend our beloved country and the institutions of government we possess.

In paying tribute to Commander Shepard, I think we should also pay tribute to that sweetheart of his, Mrs. Shepard, and their children; also the parents of this great man. We can imagine the thoughts running through the mind of Mrs. Shepard, and other loved ones, knowing the grave danger that husband, father, and son was undergoing.

There is an old saying that the real soldiers are the wives of the members of the Army, Navy, and Air Force. They are the ones who are the real soldiers, the real sailors, the real airmen. The husbands are performing their duty, but the wives are at home and they go through a great mental suffering connected with the husband in the performance of his serious, grave, and responsible duty.

I think special tribute should be paid to Mrs. Shepard because it was her inspiration and her guidance that kept alive the dynamic thoughts of this brave American who brought such honor and glory to our country.

Mr. Speaker, I was particularly happy because I was chairman of the Select Committee on Outer Space out of which committee came the bill, now law, establishing the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. And I know I speak the sentiments of all my colleagues on that special committee, without regard to party, in expressing our feelings of appreciation for this remarkable feat which, in connection with advances made in outer space, means so much and particularly has a tremendous effect throughout the world at this time from many angles, particularly from a psychological angle.

I congratulate Chairman BROOKS of the standing committee and all the members of his committee for the fine contribution that they have made and the members of the Committee on Appropriations of both the House and the Senate for giving NASA the appropriations necessary to bring about this great feat and this great result in our country's national interest. This feat shows that America has the brains; it shows that America has the facilities; it shows that America has the warriors, the men and women with an intense love of our country, willing if necessary to fight and die for our country. All we have got to do is to coordinate those brains and those facilities; not to catch up with the Soviet Union in the field of outer space, particularly in the field of booster strength, but to go ahead of the Soviet Union.

So, we of the Congress are very happy and we congratulate Commander Shepard and Mrs. Shepard and their fine children and his parents for the courage that they displayed, because their courage was not only a personal cour-

age but a courage in the national interest of our country.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the distinguished minority leader.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I want to associate myself with the very appropriate words being spoken by the eminent gentleman from Massachusetts, the majority leader, Mr. McCORMACK. There is no question but that last Friday, May 5, 1961, will go down in history as one of the great days for America. It was a day of magnificent accomplishment; a magnificent accomplishment not only on the part of Commander Shepard, who was in the capsule on the space flight, but for the untold numbers who have worked so diligently and so effectively and so well to make this exploration possible.

One thing impresses me about the whole operation, and that is that in contrast with some other similar events, the proceedings in this country were open to the world at all times. The most remote citizen in the land knew virtually minute to minute what was going on. Although there was the possibility of a failure, there was no effort to hide any failure that might occur. Rather there was a determination that this great event be kept open for all the people over the world to hear or to witness.

For Commander Shepard it was, of course, a glorious feat, demonstrating the courage, the capacity and the strength that I am sure we all like to think pretty much characterizes the men and women of the United States.

It demonstrates, as the majority leader has so well pointed out, that there is no lack of scientific capacity or ability in this great land of ours. Beyond that, for me this event demonstrates again as well as any event in my time, that the productivity, capacity, and efficiency of freemen can never be surpassed by men anywhere else under any sort of system.

And so, Mr. Speaker, I congratulate Commander Shepard. We are happy to welcome him here to the Capitol that we may show our great admiration and respect for him. We wish him well for the future. May he have many, many more similarly successful rides.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I am glad my friend, the minority leader, has called attention to the openness of this feat. It clearly shows to the world one of the basic differences between our way of life and the way of life practiced by totalitarian governments. This is one of the great and powerful lessons that flows from this remarkable feat. Again, we are all, as a nation, indebted to Commander Shepard for his great feat and to that fine girl of his, Mrs. Shepard, and his children and parents, for the bravery they displayed during the many months of his preparation and during the actual feat itself.

COMDR. ALAN B. SHEPARD, JR.

Mr. WALLHAUSER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. DEROUNIAN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, the American people watched with greatest pride, today, as the President presented Comdr. Alan B. Shepard, Jr., U.S. Navy, the Distinguished Service Medal of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, in recognition of his bravery in furthering our scientific experiments toward our ultimate conquest of outer space.

Our fellow Member in Congress, CHESTER MERROW, has our admiration for introducing a resolution of thanks to Commander Shepard.

On behalf of the Congress, I have submitted a joint resolution that the President of the United States be authorized to present, in the name of Congress, a Medal of Honor to our first astronaut. I believe I speak for all my colleagues when I say he has fully earned the greatest recognition we can give him, for no man could display greater courage than he, in his historical flight through outer space. Commander Shepard's name will be recorded in history as the embodiment of America's courage, wisdom, and progress.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, it has been my high privilege this morning to join in welcoming Commander and Mrs. Shepard as honored guests of the Congress of the United States. It was in all respects fitting that we should do this.

Here is an accomplishment that gives us renewed faith in things American, faith in the strength of our industry, faith in the capacity of our science, and, above all, faith in the devotion and courage of our people.

Well done, Commander Shepard.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, every American heart beats more strongly and proudly today in the wake of last Friday's heroic space flight by Comdr. Alan Shepard, Jr., U.S. Navy.

This is a great forward stride in America's space effort, and represents real progress in our continuing effort to establish a world of peace and justice for future generations.

I am sure that every citizen of Oklahoma's Second Congressional District would want me to express today, as we welcome this splendid young American to our Capitol, the warmest congratulations and best wishes of a grateful people.

Mr. WALLHAUSER. Mr. Speaker, words are inadequate to express the gratitude, the pride and the relief of all Americans at the successful conclusion of the man-into-space effort on May 5, 1961. Comdr. Alan Shepard, the scientists who planned it, the members of the Armed Forces, and all civilian helpers in this epochal achievement must know that the thanks of the Nation are theirs. And let us not forget to give praise to the other six astronauts who stood by, ready and willing to assume the heavy responsibility, if called upon.

From an entire Nation to those who participated in this history-making event I add my own words, "Well done."

Mr. TOLL. Mr. Speaker, I was thrilled to see the young naval officer, Alan B. Shepard, Jr., and his very attractive wife, in the old Supreme Court room this morning. He represents the spirit of youth and the New Frontier. His achievement will inspire others and will develop a strong determination in Americans to lead the world in scientific and space activity. I am delighted in Pennsylvania's participation through the person of Mrs. Shepard who undoubtedly was one of the inspirations which led to his extraordinary and outstanding accomplishment. I join in supporting the resolution offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD].

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, less than an hour ago I had the thrill of my life in that I had the great privilege and high honor of meeting and actually shaking hands with Comdr. Alan Shepard, Jr., American astronaut, and his lovely wife. Vice President JOHNSON of the United States of America was there by me as I did so. Actually, Mr. Speaker, I find it impossible to define exactly how I felt as I shook hands with him, but it seemed somewhat as though he was trying to impart to me some of the thrill he had in behalf of the scientific achievements of our beloved Nation. And, of course, Mr. Speaker, I cordially join in all the very deserved and magnificent tributes which have already been extended him and his wife and which will be so extended. I adopt as and for my own, all of these magnificent and deserved tributes; may I likewise extend to each and every person in the military and civilian administration of our beloved Government, and in the executive and legislative branches too, and in the field of the contractors and consultants also—I extend to them, one and all, my heartiest congratulations and appreciation for their individual and group dedicated contributions to this worldwide historical, scientific achievement exemplified by the daring, trust, and confidence of this freedom-born American citizen, Comdr. Alan Shepard, Jr. Thus it is that a freedom-born and freedom-dedicated civilization has again contributed materially to the elements and factors which lead toward a safe and a sound America in a world of enduring peace.

And, Mr. Speaker, I had an additional and exceptional pleasure in meeting the distinguished commander and his wife because as I was about to advance toward him, some man in the huge crowd standing behind me whom I did not know by name, sort of pushed his small son of about 10 years of age into my care and asked if I would see to it he might see our distinguished astronaut. And it so happened that other adults about me

cooperated and we thus saw this American lad whom I did not know or meet by name, also had the experience of meeting this great American hero and his wife and the Vice President of the United States.

Needless to say, Commander Shepard and his lovely wife, and the Vice President of the United States were all very gracious in extending a cordial handshake to this American lad. Who knows? Who knows but that this lad may some day, as partly result of this unexpected event in his life, lead out and forward also to great scientific achievements in behalf of our beloved Nation.

Mr. Speaker, with pleasure and pride, as I always have occasion to feel, I noted the very gracious and timely words by your own good self in the former chambers of the U.S. Supreme Court when you presented our illustrious hero, Commander Shepard. I know that every Member of the Senate and House there present, and the hundreds of others, were also aware of the nice and proper way in which you presented Commander Shepard and his wife. And then, too, as is always the case, the distinguished majority leader, Hon. JOHN MCCORMACK, of Massachusetts, promptly returned to the House Chamber where he opened a very appropriate and timely tribute session to Commander Shepard and his lovely wife so that the Members of the House could participate in accordance with their desires to pay tribute to all concerned on this historic day.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, today by our cheers, our prayers, our medals for achievement, and in a thousand separate ways, we Americans honor Comdr. Alan B. Shepard, America's first astronaut, for his courageous, intelligent, effective mission into space.

In him we have found a vision of the kind of American we want to be; in his accomplishment the kind of initiative coupled with courage, resourcefulness, and competence that has been, and for all times will be, the benchmark of America and Americans.

ASTRONAUT SHEPARD EPITOMIZES AMERICA AT ITS BEST

And, no one knows better than Alan Shepard that for that brief half hour of glory he epitomized America at its best; he flew his Mercury capsule in honor of the many people whose efforts pushed him into the skies—the American taxpayer who paid the bill, the Congressmen and Senators who saw the need and translated that need into laws and appropriations; the officials who had to make the hard decisions on policy and direction; the scientists and technicians who had to translate ideas to paper, to hardware, to rockets, capsules, ground and air equipment; to the testers who had to be sure that lives were not risked unnecessarily; and most of all, to the six other Astronauts who stood by assisting Alan in his, and their, day of peril, ordeal, and victory.

Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Appropriations Subcommittee concerned with National Aeronautics and Space Administration programs, I congratulate all of these and the many more who in their own specialized way helped to push American Alan Shepard into space and to catch him neatly, safely, and affectionately as he returned to earth.

NASA OFFICIALS HAD CONFIDENCE IN SUCCESS OF MISSION

We members of the Appropriations Committee tend to get very cautious about promises of things to come made by Government agencies. This perhaps is why I was so impressed by the quiet confidence in the success of this experiment that was shown by those in NASA's man-in-space program. These, the men who knew most about the problems and the promises of this program, most of its difficulties and potential heartbreaks, were sure they could do it and they did put Alan Shepard into space and brought him back.

Mr. Speaker, I was impressed with the confidence before the shot was made. I am more impressed with it now because with that confidence came the courage to make this experiment before the whole world. Millions of Americans and non-Americans were at Cape Canaveral via their television screens. Every form of public news media was fully used to bring to those who agreed to see the immediate, firsthand, down-to-the-second incidents of the entire experiment in America's first pilot-flown space effort. It is a shame that Russian Astronaut Gagarin's countrymen could not be given a similar history of his famous flight.

COMMANDER SHEPARD'S SUCCESS SOMETHING WORTHY TO BE REMEMBERED

Mr. Speaker, I can think of no words more appropriate for this occasion of welcoming Astronaut Shepard to the U.S. Capitol than those uttered decades ago by a fellow New Englander serving in the Congress from Commander Shepard's home State of New Hampshire, Senator Daniel Webster. These words appear on the plaque on the wall behind me, directly over the Speaker's chair:

> Let us develop the resources of our land, call forth its powers, build up its institutions, promote all its great interests, and see whether we also in our day and generation may not perform something worthy to be remembered.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I include with my remarks editorials from the Springfield, Mass., Daily News and the Springfield Union of May 6, 1961, concerning Astronaut Shepard's space feat:

[From the Springfield Daily News, May 6, 1961]

NATIONAL MORALE UP

Astronaut Alan B. Shepard, Jr.'s 302-mile trip yesterday was by no means, and was never intended to be, evidence that the United States has taken the space lead over the U.S.S.R.—not by a long shot down range.

But it was the kind of pulse-tingling, bated-breath experience that this country has sorely needed, and morale, which has been taking all kinds of buffetings on many fronts, rose just as surely skyward as the test pilot's booster rocket.

And what is more, all parts of the world in which communications remain free were invited, nearly, to look over the astronaut's shoulder.

Tons of communications equipment, not to mention a huge assemblage of reportorial manpower, were assembled to cover both launching and descent.

This was in marked contrast to the secrecy which continues to surround the orbiting flight of the Soviet's Yuri Gagarin last month.

Perhaps it would be unduly prideful to say that this event somehow expresses the adventure that is America. But it had many of the qualities that Americans most admire—courage on the part of the pilot, a focusing of many skills, and, beyond these things, a willingness to let endeavor stand forth on its own merits before what, in the case of failure, would have been the harsh judgment of the people.

National spirits today are much higher than they were the day before yesterday.

[From the Springfield Union, May 6, 1961]

THE PROOF IS IN THE PERFORMANCE

The cheers that greeted Comdr. Alan B. Shepard, Jr., on the decks of the *Lake Champlain* yesterday morning were raised on behalf of all America. His ride to the fringe of space was the triumph of his own courage, and of the patience, care and planning of the Project Mercury team.

This combination had cut the risk to a minimum and reduced the procedure to clockwork. The reward was a perfect operation and the desired proof that a man can function under the conditions imposed by blast-off, weightlessness and descent.

Confidence had been born of preparation, but the moments of national tautness were understandable. The hazard of last-minute malfunction haunted this flight as it has all rocketry, and the consequences of failure in the eyes of the world were greater than ever.

Yet, we would not have wanted it otherwise. Space exploration is the people's business. This is a field where the national interest depends as much on the people knowing what is afoot as it does on keeping the American image of success bright. The difficulty in the past has been due to the newness of the entire space adventure. Disappointments we have had and everyone has known about them, but there was no other way to learn. We are reaching the point now where the apparent failures of the past fit into the context of gradual progress. Scientists learn the techniques and the public learns the pattern of advance.

The Mercury success was a major milestone, and it was necessary. It did not appear so to a segment of scientific opinion that believed the money and effort could be better spent on instrumentation capable of gleaning more secrets from space than a man. This debate will continue, but the barrier to manned space flight has long been ripe for breaking. If the pressure of adventurous spirits were not enough alone, the Soviet Union has provided the difference by drawing us, willingly or not, into a competition that cannot be ignored.

This competition, unfortunately, is not measured by scientific facts, one of which is that we have gained a lot more of them than the Soviet Union.

A simple, unscientific fact is that Commander Shepard and his Mercury capsule did not score a world "first." But they did what they had to do, and that was to succeed admirably in keeping America in the race before spectators who expect such feats. Commander Shepard's valor, coolness, and determination have given the greatest impetus yet to expanding our space program.

Space yields its dominion slowly. We will best move into it with a combination of instrument and manned ventures supported by our strongest weapon, a free flow of the knowledge we gain. Meantime, we owe a debt to the Mercury team that worked and waited for its time of glory.

For Commander Shepard, it makes no difference that doubt of eventual success was cast off long ago. The deed itself, performed in the face of the unknown, required a bravery that few of us ever are called upon to summon. There should be no hesitation about the award of the Medal of Honor to the first American astronaut.

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, I should like to join with my colleagues of the House in expressing congratulations to Commander Shepard for his courage, achievement, and for his great contribution to our Nation and the cause of freedom.

In connection with the remarks which have just been made concerning the openness of our space exploration which is in sharp contrast to the secrecy of the Russian space shot, I would like to include with my congratulations my weekly newsletter which was written Friday immediately after Commander Shepard's successful space flight and commending him for this outstanding achievement.

The newsletter follows:

CAPITOL COMMENTS

(By Hon. JOE L. EVINS, of Tennessee)

The big news in Washington, the Nation and the world this week was the successful U.S.-manned flight into space.

The eyes and ears of the Nation and much of the world were fastened to the 1-ton Mercury space capsule carrying Navy Commander Alan B. Shepard, Jr., as it vaulted off the launching pad at Cape Canaveral, Fla., on its spectacular flight into near space. Members of the House and Senate Appropriations Committees and of the Science and Astronautics Committees were privileged by invitation of Director James E. Webb of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration to witness here in Washington a special viewing of the historic effort.

The televised flight with every possible detail made available to the public was in marked difference to the Russian space flight some 23 days ago which was surrounded by secrecy with very few details revealed to the press and the public.

Although there was some criticism about announcing America's space flight in advance for fear that a failure might result, the perfect flight has demonstrated our Nation's capabilities and renewed America's confidence in this Nation's space program, in designing and perfecting sophisticated instruments which meet the severest of tests.

Our advance announcement of the test and time schedule might be compared to Babe Ruth's most famous home run which came after he pointed to the right field stands in Yankee Stadium and indicated to the cheering crowd what he intended to do. Certainly, all Americans applaud Commander Shepard and the Space Agency in this successful scientific achievement. The ball game is not over and the winner will be the United States.

Commander Shepard will go down in history for his 115-mile-high rocket into space, along with Wilbur and Orville Wright and Charles A. Lindbergh as a pioneer and as a hero of the space age.

Mr. SANTANGELO. Mr. Speaker, all America was thrilled on Friday, May 5. This day will go down in history as a day of hope, joy, and rebirth. The successful flight of Astronaut Alan Shepard is a demonstration of democracy in action, teamwork, and complete faith. The television and radio rendered a service to freedom greater than it has ever done before.

As the countdown reached its climax, all America stopped. I, for one, stopped to say a silent prayer for the success of this intrepid astronaut, for the American people, and for peace. Not for one moment did I feel that the exploration into space into new frontiers would fail. Alan Shepard had proven his capacity, ability and confidence. Our scientists had proven their ability to put a missile in space and into orbit. The only question which was uncertain was whether man could live in space or in orbit. Prior events by the Russians demonstrated that this was not only possible but a reality. Only a technical flaw could prevent our American scientists and our astronaut from succeeding. The success not only revived the hopes of mankind, but it also neutralized advantages, psychological or otherwise, that Russia might have obtained by putting Yuri Gagarin into orbit. While the Russians performed their accomplishment in secrecy, ours was done before the eyes and within the hearing of all people. Our technical superiority in having our astronaut control the descent of the missile and capsule dimmed the luster of the Russian accomplishment.

Just as the minuteman fired the shot at Lexington which was heard around the world, so did the scientists fire the astronaut into space which was heard and seen around the world. Neutral nations will recognize, not only our humanitarian and generous attitudes, but also our capacity to overtake and surpass any scientific and bold people. The implications of Alan Shepard's exploit are many. The greatest one is that it will neutralize the belligerency of the Russian leaders and will prove to be a lodestone for the uncertain, the doubtful, and the neutrals to the cause of freedom and to America. We salute Alan Shepard, our first frontiersman and let us redouble our efforts to follow successfully in the path which he has blazed.

Mr. DOWNING. Mr. Speaker, last Friday, millions of Americans joined in silent prayer, first for the safety of a brave young astronaut and secondly for the success of a flight which could play havoc with our national prestige if it had failed. And when the huge Redstone missile paused momentarily on its pad seconds before the actual lift-off there were the same millions who were literally "pushing" the rocket onward and upward.

The flight was a huge success and a grateful Nation is now taking time to thank those who had a part in it.

It is my good fortune to represent the First Congressional District of Virginia and in this historic and unique area there are thousands of people who have more than the usual reasons to be immensely proud.

First and foremost we are proud that Lt. Comdr. Alan B. Shepard, Jr., the man whose bravery and scientific abilities are now apparent to the world, is a resident of Virginia Beach, Va. He and his lovely wife, whose courage matched that of her husband's, along with their fine children have graced this delightful area for many months. We sincerely hope that they will see fit to make it their permanent home.

And then too, no one should forget the team of astronauts who originally trained at Langley Field NASA near Hampton, Va., and at Wallops Island, Va. Only one man could make the epochal ride in space but the entire team was necessary to insure success. And that was what all seven wanted more than anything else. The courage of one was the courage of seven combined into that one.

We should be extremely proud of Dr. Robert R. Gilruth, the brilliant director of Project Mercury. Upon his shoulders rested the responsibility of the whole venture. If the project had failed it would have been his failure. Now that it has succeeded, it is his success.

Then there are the employees of the great agency, NASA, who have both directly and indirectly contributed so much to the scientific advancement of our aeronautic and space programs. Without them, the accomplishment we celebrate today would have been virtually impossible. These dedicated men and women have met and are meeting the almost impossible demands thrust on them.

These and others too, no less dedicated, are the reasons we are joyous today. We are grateful for their untiring efforts and limitless abilities.

This achievement as great as it is, is only the beginning of an endeavor which could go beyond the realm of reasonable imagination. It is like the first simple flight of the Wright brothers at Kitty Hawk. We will not rest on our laurels to be sure, but for the moment Americans everywhere can be justly proud.

Mr. RIEHLMAN. Mr. Speaker, I want to express in behalf of the people of Syracuse and Onondaga County, N.Y., the tremendous sense of pride we all have in the accomplishment of Commander Shepard, his fellow astronauts, and the hundreds of hard-working and dedicated persons whose efforts were responsible for the success of the Mercury-Redstone shot last Friday.

Mere words are not adequate to describe the feelings of millions of people whose hearts literally stood still during that countdown, during the perfect lift-off of that Redstone rocket, and during every subsequent step in Commander Shepard's historic flight.

Millions of prayers were with him during those fateful few moments in space, and millions of hearts rejoiced when, with each passing second, it became more and more apparent that countless hours of devoted effort had produced a masterful blending of man and machine.

The final result was particularly gratifying to those of us who have maintained steadfast confidence in the ultimate success of Project Mercury, and who have explicit faith in our ability to forge ahead in the conquest of outer space and to surpass any Soviet efforts in this field.

Every man and woman involved in the many months of preparation for Friday's flight and for the flights that will follow deserves a genuinely heartfelt "Thank you" from America.

COMDR. ALAN B. SHEPARD, JR.

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, I offer a concurrent resolution and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. CON. RES. 296

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Congress hereby commends Commander Alan B. Shepard, Junior, United States Navy, of Derry, New Hampshire, for his outstanding achievement and the courage and skill displayed by him in his flight into space on May 5, 1961, in the Mercury capsule known as Freedom 7.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Hampshire?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the concurrent resolution.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMDR. ALAN B. SHEPARD, JR.

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Hampshire?

There was no objection.

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, a happy and grateful Nation is elated over the eminently successful space flight completed by Comdr. Alan B. Shepard, Jr., last Friday. Every American is proud of this unparalleled achievement, and the free world acclaims the commander as a great pioneer in man's exploration of space.

I am proud and pleased that Commander Shepard is from East Derry, N.H., located in the First Congressional District which I have the honor of representing. This son of New Hampshire has brought glory to his town, to his State, and to his Nation. His name is now in history as one of the greatest explorers of all time. He is a pioneer in blazing the pathway to space. We applaud him, we applaud the great host of scientists and all those who had a part in making possible his historic flight which has given us so much knowledge and so many answers to the problems that would be obtained from an orbital flight.

We are exceedingly grateful that this first step in space by an American has resulted in the collection of so much data, that it was completed with such great perfection and precision and that it has paved the way for a successful orbital journey. The space era is definitely opened. In the future, there will be many space flights. Today mankind stands at the opening of one of the most challenging and exciting ages of all history. For centuries he has looked upward at the stars wondering what the vast recesses of the universe contain. Now he has moved outward. Commander Shepard and those who made his flight successful have blazed the trail which will ultimately lead to new universes in the vast recesses of the now unknown. We acclaim him; we congratulate him; and we extend to him and his fellow astronauts our best wishes for the future.

FDIC—BANKING AND PUBLIC BULWARK

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include an article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I insert in the body of the RECORD the following article from the U.S. Investor entitled "FDIC—Banking and Public Bulwark":

FDIC—BANKING AND PUBLIC BULWARK

There are several approaches to the recent rash of bank embezzlements. The one representing the greatest disappointment is the number and magnitude of the happenings.

Everybody in the banking business knows that bankers' associations everywhere have been engaged in a mission designed to cut drastically the volume of embezzlements. The cause of inner controls and of bank audits has been preached vigorously. The preaching ought to be showing its effect by this time, but recent figures seem to imply at least that no great headway is being made.

There is one area, however, in which present day developments show a good deal of improvement. Time was when such considerable stealings that have occurred at some of the banks would have brought distress to the entire community and not only to the stockholders as is today the normal condition.

We refer to those cases where the stealings have not only greatly exceeded the bank's fidelity bond coverage but have seriously impaired the bank's capital position. The bank has had no option but to go into receivership. That is, of course, to be regretted, for the community needs the services of live banking institutions.

The forward step to which we refer is that thanks to the existence of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, the closing of the bank does not now bring loss to any large number of depositors, if to any at all. It does not embarrass them or their employees, or their customers, by tying up their deposits; it does not prevent local businessmen from their usual transactions with outside manufacturers and wholesalers, and probably does not throw anybody out of work. If the bank must close, the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation hurries to the scene and within a surprisingly short number of days, is paying off the depositors in full if their accounts are less than $10,000 or up to $10,000 if their accounts exceed that figure. Experience shows that a number of accounts paid in full is high up in the 90 percent bracket. Indeed, the final liquidation of banks under FDIC auspices has shown that 99 percent of its depositors have been paid in full and that 98 percent of the deposit dollars have so fared. Of course, the accounts that are over $10,000 have received their pro rata share of additional funds in the liquidation.

PUBLIC CONFIDENCE

It seems to us that with so much publicity given recently to bank embezzlements, and what with the great service which is being done for the public, a few paragraphs are quite in order about the FDIC itself. It has recently completed 27 years of operation. It has changed banking sentiment and public sentiment, too, concerning itself, in the course of those years, from a considerable degree of skepticism at the outset to a high degree of confidence in its effectiveness today. It has accumulated an insurance fund of over $2,232 million besides paying off every dollar, with interest, of the $289 million of original capital which the Treasury and the Federal Reserve Banks provided. The outstanding quality of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation is preparedness. It has earned the public confidence in its ability to rectify ailing bank situations. Its activity is much broader than the mere insuring of deposits. That might mean no more than the liquidation of an ailing bank and the return of the depositor's principal up to $10,000 in each case. Instead, the corporation does splendid preventive work, turning banks back to better procedures when they are erring. We shall see, in a later paragraph, how effectively the Corporation can use its funds in such curative action.

Of course, the factor which enables the Corporation to turn banks back before they have gone too far in error, is the examination of banks which the Corporation conducts. It will be remembered that of the more than 13,000 banks which the Corporation insures, some 7,000 are examined every year by the Corporation's own examiners. That is, it examines all State-chartered banks not members of the Federal Reserve System. It has access also to the reports of all the national bank examiners and to the reports of those who examine the Reserve System members. Thus, it knows the internal condition of the banks the country over and is put on notice, promptly, if any bank's condition calls for curative measures.

A volume could be written about the helpful conferences which the FDIC has had with banks, how it has persuaded them to raise credit standards, to be more discriminating in the making of loans, and in some instances, to increase their capital to sturdier proportions. If worse comes to worse, the Corporation has power to deprive any bank of its insurance and you may be sure that in the rare cases where this has been necessary, the bank so punished has concluded to retire from business rather than try to operate without insurance. Thus, the FDIC has brought to the banking scene an influence which did not exist previously. It is a great preventive of bank failures and a highly efficient one at that.

INSURANCE FUND

Turning now to the Corporation's insurance fund and the activity in connection therewith, an interesting story could be written. Back in 1934 when the Corporation began business, the entire capital of the Corporation was only $289 million. A not infrequent criticism of the Corporation, therefore, was that it was undertaking too huge a job in the insurance of the Nation's bank deposits with so modest a reserve. That capital reserve amounted to only about eight-tenths of 1 percent of the deposit dollars which it was undertaking to protect. The feeling was rather general that the deposit insurance so financed would have to have aid from the Government if any serious demand upon it came into being. On the contrary, as it turned out, the Corporation, quite without such aid, has built up an insurance fund of its own of $2,232 million through regular bank assessment, has increased from $2,500 to $10,000 the amount of coverage it will provide for each deposit, has paid back with interest every dollar of capital provided by the Treasury and by the Federal Reserve banks, and has given our whole banking system a sturdy support which has contributed much to public confidence.

It can fairly claim a large measure of credit for the fact that bank runs have

ceased to be. Rumors of internal weakness of individual banks such as used to send depositors scurrying to tellers' windows, no longer have that effect. Bank customers dispose of such rumors with a shrug of the shoulders and the comment that the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation is on guard and will let no harm come to them.

ANNUAL ASSESSMENTS

Indeed, there are some people who declare that the annual assessment of banks for building up the FDIC insurance fund could be discontinued. They argue that the income from the Corporation's own investments will provide any such capital growth as is needed. The Directors of the Corporation do not share this belief. They have, it is true, joined in the changes of law that have reduced the assessment from the original figure of one-twelfth of 1 percent of each bank's deposits to the current ratio of about one thirty-second of 1 percent. But to abolish the assessment entirely is against their own judgment. Huge as the insurance fund is, it is still less than nine-tenths of 1 percent of the insurance coverage which it undertakes to provide. Furthermore, the Directors see further sturdy increases in the deposits of the American banking system and therefore, a need for keeping the growth of the insurance fund in pace with the expansion of the risks which it is covering. Rather interesting, isn't it, that a ratio of approximately eight-tenths of 1 percent in the early days was rated as inadequate whereas today almost the same ratio is regarded as a comfortably sufficient reserve?

We have already mentioned, when discussing embezzlements, that the closing of a bank no longer throws a pall of business suspension and discouragement upon a whole community. Again, the credit for such better business conditions goes to the FDIC. It does not believe in classifying itself as an insurance organization and nothing else and acting accordingly. If that were its only function, it could operate in a leisurely manner paying off deposits as the liquidation of the bank proceeds. Instead, it charges itself with the double task of paying off depositors promptly and of preserving banking service to the community with as little interruption as possible.

The failure of any bank has little more than come to pass when the FDIC has headed for the scene with ample funds readily available. It obtains access to the books and other records of the failed bank—frequently acting as receiver of the same—and as soon as lists of the depositors and the amounts of their deposits can be made available, it begins paying them off in full or up to $10,000 if their balance exceeds that figure. The time the Corporation requires for getting ready to pay is a matter of only a few days. Thus, the pall of business quietude or discouragement does not take shape. Business, as usual, becomes pretty much the order of the day in the community.

PRESERVING BANKING SERVICE

The technique of the Corporation is actually more flexible than is implied herein. Under the law, the Corporation can choose an alternative method. Instead of with cash, it can pay the depositor with an equivalent account in another bank in the same vicinity, thus preserving banking service for him. The Corporation stands back of the other bank. The deposits so presented are payable in cash at once if so desired—which, of course, the depositor prefers not to do. He prefers a good safe bank account subject to check or to passbook, as the case may be. You see, the Corporation regards itself as charged with preserving banking service to a community, particularly if the failed bank would leave the community without a bank. It can arrange for this other local bank to take over the deposit obligations and such of the assets of the failed bank as it regards to be wholesome. The Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation provides cash to the bank for the difference between the aggregate deposits and the asserts which it is taking over. Congress has given the Corporation power to do this either through purchase of sufficient unsound assets or through a loan or through a deposit of its own made subordinate to the other deposits.

How essential deposit insurance has become for banks is indicated by the almost universal character of the Corporation's membership. Ninety-five percent of the banks of the country are insured. Although the $10,000 maximum coverage applies to all of these accounts, 98 percent of all accounts are in actual fact insured.

RECENT BANK EMBEZZLEMENT FIGURES

Although the figures for bank embezzlements are not yet available for the full year 1960, they can be had for the first 6 months of the year. It is a regrettable fact that the number of embezzlements of $10,000 or more in each case for the first half of 1960 exceeded the number for the first half of 1959. There were 49 of them in the first half of 1960 as against 39 in the first half of 1959. Measured in dollars the losses for the 1960 half-year were $3,812,478. Due to a single defalcation of $3,719,710—an astonishing total—the loss in dollars was heavier in 1959.

That the number should have increased in the first half of 1960 over the number for the first half of 1959 can possibly be explained by the greater interest banks are taking in inner controls and audits.

COMDR. ALAN SHEPARD, JR.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I, of course, join my distinguished colleague from New Hampshire in his tribute to Commander Shepard, but I should like to advise the Speaker that Commander Shepard is a Pennsylvanian.

Today I have introduced a joint resolution calling upon the Congress to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to strike a special gold medal to be presented to Commander Shepard by the Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration in behalf of the Congress.

THE LATE ROLLA C. McMILLEN

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, it is with great sorrow that I announce to the House the death of one of our former beloved colleagues, Rolla C. McMillen, of Decatur, Ill. Our former colleague died Saturday, in Evanston, Ill. The funeral is today at 1 p.m., at Westminster Presbyterian Church, in Decatur, and burial will be in Greenwood Cemetery, in Decatur.

Rolla McMillen was my predecessor from the 22d Congressional District of Illinois. He was born at Monticello, Ill., where he grew up and was educated in the Monticello schools. He later attended the University of Illinois and was graduated from the University of Michigan Law School in 1906. Since that time he had been practicing law at Decatur and for many years was a member of a prominent firm in Decatur, McMillen, Garman & McMillen. He was one of the prominent members of the bar of Illinois and had an excellent reputation in the particular field of estates. He was a delegate to the National Republican Convention in 1940.

On the death of the late William H. Wheat, of Rantoul, Mr. McMillen succeeded Mr. Wheat in an interim election and served from 1944 until his voluntary retirement in 1950. While in the Congress, he was a member of the Banking and Currency Committee and was considered one of the more knowledgeable members of that committee on the Republican side. He was elected by very substantial majorities, which demonstrated that he had the backing of the people in the 8 counties of the 22d Congressional District.

He was married to the former Ruth Roberts and they have three children, Thomas R., Mrs. William C. Beall, and Martha H. I know that Mr. McMillen's many friends now in the Congress will be bereaved to learn of his passing. He was indeed an able lawyer, a gentleman of the old school, and a distinguished Member of this body. I know that all of us extend to Mrs. McMillen and to the children our deepest sympathy upon a loss so great.

TAX-EXEMPT FOUNDATIONS

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] is recognized for 40 minutes.

STUDY NEEDED TO PRESERVE FOUNDATIONS

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, on previous occasions I have cited for the RECORD the phenomenal growth of the uncontrolled, tax-exempt foundations. These have included:

First. The astronomic growth in number and accumulations of wealth of foundations with every indication that both will continue.

Second. The withdrawing from our economy, for tax purposes, of more than $11.5 billion of the Nation's wealth.

Third. The dangers of perpetuating vast fortunes and industrial empires in a single family or closed group.

Fourth. The potential power and influence of large foundations over many segments of our economy.

Fifth. The lack of adequate Federal or State regulation of foundation assets, their grants, or their purpose for existence.

These matters, it seems to me, call for further study, not with any intent to abolish tax-exempt foundations, but to preserve for them a purpose. I have no doubt they have served worthy and beneficial causes. In some instances, however,

they may have bypassed their legally stated reasons for existence.

As far as accumulating vast wealth is concerned, Congress added section 504 to the Internal Revenue Act of 1950 to prohibit an unreasonable accumulation of funds. But Internal Revenue officials have told me this provision is ambiguous, and leaves a serious question as to what constitutes an unreasonable accumulation of resources.

The pattern among the larger foundations appears to be to make grants at between 3 percent and 3.5 percent of total assets while assets accumulate at an undetermined, but varying, higher rate.

IRS NEEDS SHARPER TOOLS

With the tools available the Internal Revenue Service has done a creditable job of policing activities of tax-exempt organizations, but two important questions arise:

First. Should not the Congress provide IRS with more efficient instruments to cope with a growing problem?

Second. Can we not improve coordination in this area between the Federal and State Governments?

Some thoughts of this nature were expressed by the House Special Committee To Investigate Tax-Exempt Foundations when it submitted its report in 1954.

That committee recommended a continued study to look into avenues of tax-exemption for which that group had neither the time, staff, or resources. In whatever manner the study was to be continued, the special committee said, it should be primarily a matter of research. "Facts are best secured by this method, rather than through the examination and cross-examination of a parade of witnesses," the committee report said.

A major reason for recommending continuation of the study was the astonishing growth of tax-exempt foundations in numbers and wealth. In 1954 the committee talked of capital assets totaling $7.5 billion. As of 1959 we have referred to assets totaling $11.5 billion. Surely, this leaping growth should challenge, not just our curiosity, but constructive action to help worthwhile foundations and to correct existing abuses.

To indicate the size and growth of tax-exempt foundations, I am listing here, the names of the 30 foundations having assets in excess of $20 million, followed by the names currently available from the Library of Congress of the 757 foundations with assets of $1 million or more.

Please notice how the assets of the larger group of foundations have swollen between 1953 and 1959—the latest year for which complete figures are available. Only a few show lower asset totals. For instance, the John A. Hartford Foundation, chartered in New York City, was not large enough to be included in the list of foundations having assets of $20 million or more in 1953. In 1959 Hartford Foundation assets were in excess of $413 million.

I have suggested before that we should take another look at the economy of our country—how the giant industries and interstate chains are draining the wealth of our smaller communities by withdrawing their profits. We should be concerned whether these giant corporations have drained smaller communities to the extent they no longer have means to support their local education and welfare needs and provide the facilities necessary to a healthy community life.

This is the "seed corn" money that deprives your local banks of adequate reserve funds. It is the "seed corn" money that could have been planted to help smaller communities grow and prosper.

Foundations with assets of $20,000,000 or more in 1959 along with comparison to 1953 assets

Name and address of foundation	1953 assets	1959 assets	1959 grants
Ford Foundation, 477 Madison Ave., New York, N.Y.	$520,232,000	$3,316,000,000	$110,132,848
Rockefeller Foundation, 49 West 49th St., New York, N.Y.	318,229,000	647,694,858	22,599,735
Carnegie Corp. of New York, 589 5th Ave., New York, N.Y.	196,007,000	261,244,471	7,935,175
W. K. Kellogg Foundation, Battle Creek, Mich.	109,812,000	215,184,419	7,747,199
Duke Endowment, 30 Rockefeller Plaza, New York, N.Y.	108,000,000	414,754,543	7,276,387
Commonwealth Fund, Harkness House, 1 East 75th St., New York, N.Y.	96,308,000	119,904,614	3,448,496
Kresge Foundation, 2727 2d Ave., Detroit, Mich.	86,233,000	95,316,048	3,497,722
Philadelphia City Trusts, Philadelphia, Pa.	70,168,000	76,690,760	3,901,064
Carnegie Institution of Washington, 16th and P Sts. NW., Washington, D.C.	65,168,000	80,838,528	[1] 2,389,256
Rockefeller Brothers Fund, 30 Rockefeller Plaza, New York, N.Y.	59,785,000	53,174,210	3,841,169
Hayden (Charles) Foundation, 25 Broad St., New York, N.Y.	56,124,000	67,385,801	1,066,000
Lilly Endowment, 914 Merchants Bank Bldg., Indianapolis, Ind.	53,856,000	157,013,165	4,057,940
Olin Foundation, 1 East 44th St., New York, N.Y.	52,531,000	39,723,742	[2] 1,900,000
James Foundation of New York, Inc., 39 East 19th St., New York, N.Y.	47,720,000	78,417,589	2,477,772
Mellon (A. W.) Educational and Charitable Trust, 525 William Penn Pl., Pittsburgh, Pa.	43,612,000	43,571,273	3,963,448
Mayo Association, 102 2d Ave. SW., Rochester, Minn.	43,478,000	59,100,000	1,054,000
Sloan (Alfred P.) Foundation, 30 Rockefeller Plaza, New York, N.Y.	$38,188,000	$175,553,110	$5,779,120
Guggenheim (John Simon) Memorial Foundation, 551 5th Ave., New York N.Y.	31,992,000	45,000,000	1,492,506
Anderson (M. D.) Foundation, First National Bank in Houston, Houston, Tex.	31,966,000	37,443,237	2,656,730
El Pomar Foundation, in care of Broadmoor Hotel, Colorado Springs, Colo.	31,290,000	23,809,212	1,892,754
China Medical Board, 30 East 60th St., N.Y.	31,216,000	39,698,954	598,777
Avalon Foundation, 713 Park Ave., New York, N.Y.	28,447,000	74,326,593	2,342,727
Woodruff (Emily and Ernest) Foundation, Post Office Box 4418, Atlanta, Ga.	27,826,000	26,409,750	71,000
Markle (John and Mary R.) Foundation, 511 5th Ave., New York, N.Y.	25,132,000	38,033,275	1,047,293
Reynolds (Z. Smith) Foundation, 1206 Reynolds Bldg., Winston-Salem, N.C.	24,837,000	50,000,000	967,700
Macy (Josiah, Jr.) Foundation, 16 West 46th St., New York, N.Y.	22,856,000	33,721,316	813,346
New York Community Trust, 71 Vanderbilt Ave., New York, N.Y.	21,423,000	35,528,485	1,586,366
Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, 345 East 46th St., New York, N.Y.	20,684,000	22,577,134	54,048
Hartford (The John A.) Foundation, Inc., 420 Lexington Ave., New York, N.Y.	3,680,486	413,229,391	3,945,813
Danforth Foundation, The, 835 South 8th St., St. Louis, Mo.	[3] 7,803,369	110,292,491	2,817,505

[1] Expenditures. [2] Toward grants and reserve fund. [3] 1950 figure.

FOUNDATIONS WITH ASSETS OF OVER $1 MILLION

Key: (1) Assets [M=Market value; L=Ledger value], (2) Expenditures, (3) Grants, included in expenditures.

ALABAMA

Avondale Educational and Charitable Foundation, Inc., Sylacauga, as of December 31, 1956: (1) $1,926,240 (L), (2) $159,644, (3) $154,720.

Ingalls Foundation Inc., Birmingham, as of December 31, 1956: (1) $1,171,000 (L), (2) $62,494, (3) $59,350.

Ingco Foundation (Incorporated), Birmingham, as of December 31, 1956: (1) $1,061,574 (L), (2) $15,107, (3) $15,000.

Meyer (Robert R.) Foundation, Birmingham, as of December 31, 1956: (1) $6,202,936 (M), (2) $358,850—all in grants.

Warner (David) Foundation, Tuscaloosa, as of May 31, 1957: (1) $1,270,933 (L), (2) $7,577, (3) $7,000.

ARIZONA

Lincoln Foundation, Inc., Phoenix, as of March 31, 1957: (1) $2,805,821 (L), (2) $189,457, (3) $171,974.

CALIFORNIA

Atkinson Foundation, South San Francisco, as of December 31, 1956: (1) $1,118,505 (L), (2) $192,649, (3) $192,279.

Atkinson (Myrtle L.) Foundation, Los Angeles, as of December 31, 1957: (1) $1,169,017 (L), (2) $80,602, (3) $80,337.

Babcock (William) Memorial Endowment, San Rafael, as of June 30, 1958: (1) $2,614,430 (L), (2) $102,073, (3) $72,402.

Bank of America—Giannini Foundation, San Francisco, as of December 31, 1956: (1) $1,276,391 (L), (2) $110,331, (3) $108,885.

Bing Fund, Inc., Los Angeles, as of December 31, 1957: (1) $9,657,456 (L), (2) $309,280, (3) $307,775.

Boswell (The James G.) Foundation, Los Angeles, as of December 31, 1956: (1) $3,574,767 (L), (2) $266,091—all in grants.

Bothin Helping Fund, San Francisco, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $2,880,116 (L), (3) $129,500.

Boyar Foundation, Beverly Hills, as of November 30, 1958: (1) $1,582,599 (M), (2) $166,738, (3) $95,656.

Braun (Carl F.) Trust, Pasadena, as of December 31, 1957: (1) $1,392,823 (L), (2) $71,569, (3) $71,000.

California Community Foundation, Los Angeles, as of October 31, 1958: (1) $9,955,162 (M), (2) $366,742, (3) $295,126.

Campbell (Ina T.) Trust, Santa Barbara, as of January 1, 1956: (1) $1,603,611 (L), (2) $77,040, (3) $53,050.

Christopher (L. J.) Trust, Los Angeles, as of January 1, 1956: (1) $1,728,604 (L), (2) $16,982.

Clune Memorial Trust, Los Angeles, as of October 31, 1957: (1) $2,500,000 (M), (2) $282,087, (3) $70,000.

Connell (Michael J.) Charities, Ltd., Los Angeles, as of December 31, 1957: (1) $6,500,000 (M), (2) $370,000, (3) $332,000.

Cowell (S. H.) Foundation, San Francisco, as of 11 months ended August 31, 1959: (1) $14,520,000 (L), (2) $359,265.

Crown Zellerbach Foundation, San Francisco, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $6,200,000 (M), (2) $675,000, (3) $635,000.

Fund for the Republic, Inc., Santa Barbara, as of September 30, 1957: (1) $6,667,022 (M), (2) $2,157,127, (3) $574,937.

Goldwyn (The Samuel) Foundation, Los Angeles, as of December 31, 1956: (1) $1,785,260 (L), (2) $169,847, (3) $164,533.

Haynes (The John Randolph Haynes and Dora) Foundation, Los Angeles, as of August 31, 1958: (1) $2,569,412 (L), (2) $336,717, (3) $299,708.

Hearst (William Randolph) Foundation, Los Angeles, as of March 31, 1957: (1) not reported (according to 1956 press reports, the foundation will receive $43,732,407 as a result of the settlement of the estate of William Randolph Hearst), (2) $50,934, (3) $50,316.

Hilton (Conrad N.) Foundation, Beverly Hills, as of February 28, 1958: (1) not reported; accumulated income, $1,420,336, (2) $173,011, (3) $172,721.

Hoag Foundation, Hollywood, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $2,500,000 (M), (2) $165,000, (3) $150,000.

Hollywood Canteen Foundation, Los Angeles, as of February 28, 1958: (1) (1959) $1,000,000 (M), (2) $132,716, (3) $127,889.

Hunt Foods Charitable Foundation, Los Angeles, as of November 30, 1958: (1) $1,087,200 (L), (2) $112,969, (3) $112,489.

Irwin (The William G.) Charity Foundation, San Francisco, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $2,303,581 (L), (2) $77,475, (3) $77,473.

Kaiser (The Henry J.) Family Foundation, Oakland, as of December 31, 1956: (1) $16,140,279 (L), (2) $27,279, (3) $26,760.

Layne Foundation, Los Angeles, as of December 31, 1957: (1) $1,388,399 (L), (2) $26,973, (3) $14,500.

Lloyd (The Ralph B.) Foundation, Beverly Hills, as of December 31, 1957: (1) $3,044,634 (L), (2) $745,535, (3) $745,186.

Lockheed Leadership Fund, Burbank, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $1,345,611 (L), (2) $217,478, (3) $105,835.

Lux (Miranda) Foundation, San Francisco, as of June 30, 1958: (1) $1,471,695 (M), (2) $44,650, (3) $30,000.

Mayer (The Louis B.) Foundation, Beverly Hills, as of year beginning January 1, 1956: Net worth zero; expenditures $24,952, including $19,600 in grants. News reports indicate the foundation will receive assets of more than $10,500,000 upon settlement of Mr. Mayer's estate.

Mayr (George Henry) Trust, Beverly Hills, as of year ended July 31, 1957: (1) $2,521,388 (M), (2) $184,804, (3) $121,000.

McBean (The Atholl) Foundation, San Francisco, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $1,107,123 (M), (2) $37,870, (3) $37,405.

Newhouse Foundation, Inc., San Francisco, as of December 31, 1956: (1) $2,252,814 (L), (2) $135,984, (3) $103,058.

Putnam Foundation, San Diego, as of April 1, 1956: (1) $1,305,497 (L), (2) $299,236, (3) $282,672.

Richards (The Mabel Wilson) Scholarship Fund, Los Angeles, as of March 31, 1957: (1) $2,466,852 (M), (2) $85,944, (3) $64,195.

Rosenberg Foundation, San Francisco, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $10,274,110 (M), (2) $423,364, (3) $362,697.

San Francisco Foundation, San Francisco, as of June 30, 1959: (1) $1,813,561 (M), (2) $388,127, (3) $363,689.

Santa Barbara Foundation, Santa Barbara, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $1,270,648 (L), (2) $78,254, (3) $68,372.

Trust Funds, Inc., San Francisco, as of December 31, 1956: (1) $1,044,860 (L), (2) $91,968, (3) $71,724.

Volker (William) Fund (formerly William Volker Charities Fund), Budlingame, as of September 30, 1957: (1) $16,936,331 (L), (2) $911,763, (3) $823,029.

COLORADO

Bemis-Taylor Foundation, Colorado Springs, as of December 31, 1956: (1) $1,660,658 (M), (2) $78,204, (3) $73,353.

Boettcher Foundation, Denver, as of December 31, 1957: (1) $10,601,543 (L), (2) $2,939,684, (3) $1,420.075.

El Pomar Foundation, Colorado Springs, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $23,809,212 (L), (2) $1,907,619, (3) $1,892,754.

Hunter (A. V.) Trust, Inc., Denver, as of December 31, 1956: (1) $2,319,885 (L), (2) $133,677, (3) $126,210.

Johnson (Arthur E.) Foundation (formerly the Johnson Foundation), Denver, as of December 31, 1957: (1) $1,010,206 (L), (2) $42,816, (3) $42,171.

Mullen (the John K. and Catherine S.) Benevolent Corp., Denver, as of December 31, 1956: (1) $1,563,158 (L), (2) $59,855, (3) $59,657.

Phipps (The Lawrence) Foundation, Denver, as of December 31, 1957: (1) $3,337,874 (L), (2) $189,881, (3) $180,145.

CONNECTICUT

Auerbach (The Beatrice Fox) Foundation, Hartford, as of December 31, 1956: (1) $1,270,832 (L), (2) $56,449, (3) $56,443.

Bedford Fund, Inc., Fairfield County, as of June 30, 1957: (1) $1,982,386 (L), (2) $86,338, (3) $78,755.

Beinecke Foundation, Greenwich, as of December, 31, 1956: (1) $1,849,664 (L), (2) $246,968, (3) $238,498.

Bissell (J. Walton) Foundation, Hartford, as of December 31, 1956: (1) $1,315,333 (L), (2) $58,380, (3) $52.055.

Childs (The Jane Coffin) Memorial Fund for Medical Research, New Haven, as of June 30, 1957: (1) $10,507,637 (M), (2) $294,762, (3) $264,290.

Concordia Foundation, Hartford, as of December 31, 1956: (1) $1,475,905 (L), (2) $48,133, (3) $44,525.

Dana (The Charles A.) Foundation, Inc., Greenwich, as of December 31, 1957: (1) $9,007,938 (L), (2) $824,718, (3) $810,109.

Eno Foundation, Saugatuck, as of December 31, 1956: (1) $1,576,962 (L), (2) $131,333, (3) $950.

Ensworth Charitable Foundation, Hartford, as of year ended May 31, 1958: (1) $2,131,000 (M), (2) $52,260—all in grants.

Foundations' Fund for Research in Psychiatry, New Haven, as of June 30, 1958: (1) (Research Grant Program) $4,582,332 (L), (Training Grant Program) $561,033 (L), (2) (Research Grant Program) $447,638, (Training Grant Program) $181,727, (3) (Research Grant Program) $415,357, (Training Grant Program) $140,168.

Fuller (The Anna) Fund, New Haven, as of March 5, 1958: (1) $2,201,438 (M), (2) $88,329, (3) $80,639.

Hartford Foundation for Public Giving, Hartford, as of September 30, 1958: (1) $9,264,347 (L), (2) $345,068, (3) $324,829.

Hazen (The Edward W.) Foundation, Inc., New Haven, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $3,118,050 (M), (2) $175,473, (3) $117,705.

List (Albert A.) Foundation, Inc., Byram, as of June 30, 1957: (1) $3,289,079 (L), (2) $45,116, (3) $27,530.

McLean Trust Fund, Hartford, as of December 31, 1956: (1) $1,713,401 (L), (2) $111,364, (3) $103,201.

New Haven Foundation, New Haven, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $12,800,000 (M), (2) $389,800, (3) $385,501.

Palmer (The Frank Loomis) Fund, Hartford, as of July 31, 1957: (1) $2,129,121 (L), (2) $126,854, (3) $119,685.

Porter Foundation, Greenwich, as of December 31, 1956: (1) $1,077,292 (L), (2) $7,472, (3) $6,600.

Public Health Foundation for Cancer and Blood Pressure Research, Inc., Stamford, as of June 30, 1957: (1) $5,931,818 (L), (2) $275,327, (3) $185,442.

Rogoff Foundation, Rowayton, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $1,989,185 (M), (2) $47,968, (3) $35,700.

Stanley (Alix W.) Charitable Foundation, New Britain, as of December 31, 1956: (1) $1,053,779 (L), (2) $75,658, (3) $73,600.

Suisman Foundation, Inc., Hartford, as of April 30, 1957: (1) $1,007,862 (L), (2) $117,731, (3) $111,103.

DELAWARE

Beneficial Foundation, Inc., Wilmington, as of December 31, 1957: (1) $1,963,078 (L), (2) $35,721, (3) $34,400.

Dietrich (The Daniel W.) Foundation, Inc., Wilmington, as of December 31, 1957: (1) $3,489,133 (L), (2) $106,956, (3) $106,781.

Longwood Foundation, Inc., Wilmington: (1) not reported. A 1955 press report indicates receipt of a "major portion" of an estate appraised at $60 million.

Raskob Foundation for Catholic Activities, Inc., Wilmington, as of December 31, 1956: (1) $17,744,796 (L), (2) $838,429, (3) $771,700.

Welfare Foundation, Inc., Wilmington, as of December 31, 1955: (1) $1,521,770 (L), (2) $161,733, (3) $160,450.

Winterthur Corp., Wilmington, as of March 31, 1957: (1) $12,374,935 (L), (2) $617,691, (3) $24,738.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

American Foundation for Pharmaceutical Education, Washington, as of August 31, 1958: (1) $1,674,958 (L), (2) $229,896, (3) $181,043.

Automotive Safety Foundation, Inc., Washington, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $1,259,835 (M), (2) $1,688,811, (3) $830,724.

Brookings Institution, Washington, as of June 30, 1958: (1) $11,334,455 (L), (2) $945,581, (3) $72,580.

Carnegie Institution of Washington, Washington, as of June 30, 1958: (1) $80,838,528 (M), (2) $2,389,256.

Council on Library Resources, Inc., Washington, as of June 30, 1958: (1) $4,410,006 (M), (2) $508,562, (3) $403,361.

Fellowship Fund of the American Association of University Women Educational Foundation, Washington, as of June 30, 1958: (1) $2,748,772 (M), (2) $254,119, (3) $209,781.

Link Foundation, Washington, as of June 30, 1958: (1) $1,041,129 (L), (2) $43,483, (3) $28,975.

Meyer (Eugene and Agnes E.) Foundation, Washington, as of December 31, 1956: (1) $10,988,920 (L), (2) $129,762, (3) $512,779 (1958).

Resources for the Future, Inc., Washington, as of September 30, 1958: (1) $6,187,049 (L), (2) $862,779 in grants and for direct operations.

Stewart (Alexander and Margaret) Trust, Washington, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $7,499,611 (L), (2) $332,238, (3) $292,100.

Strong (Hattie M.) Foundation, as of August 31, 1956: (1) $1,036,356 (L), (2) $52,565, (3) $4,147 in loans.

FLORIDA

Crane (Raymond E. and Ellen F.) Foundation, Miami, as of December 31, 1956: (1) $2,978,436 (L), (2) $316,178, (3) $297,900.

Wolfson Family Foundation, Inc., Jacksonville, as of September 30, 1956: (1) $1,151,055 (M), (2) $293,602, (3) $275,717.

GEORGIA

Bradley (W. C. and Sarah H.) Foundation, Columbus, as of December 31, 1956: (1) $3,822,500 (L), (2) $125,318, (3) $118,866.

Callaway Community Foundation, La Grange, as of September 30, 1957: (1) $15,844,792 (L), (2) $1,351,301, (3) (grants approved during the year totaled $730,848).

Callaway (Fuller E.) Foundation, La Grange, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $3,999,235 (L), (2) $115,299, (3) $73,919.

Callaway (Ida Cason) Foundation, Pine Mountain, as of December 31, 1955: (1) $1,960,105 (L), (2) $206,958, (3) $157,920.

Campbell (John Bulow) Foundation, Atlanta, as of December 31, 1958; (1) $15,078,020 (M), (2) $172,530, (3) $117,527.

Community Enterprises, Inc., Thomaston, as of June 30, 1958: (1) $2,222,004 (L), (2) $127,360, (3) $124,352.

Evans (Lettie Pate) Foundation, Inc., Atlanta, as of December 31, 1957: (1) $10,578,665 (L), (2) $577,118, (3) $567,164.

Manget Foundation, Inc., Newman, as of December 31, 1957: (1) $1,387,125 (L), (2) $209,315, (3) $127,801.

Pickett and Hatcher Educational Fund, Inc., Columbus, as of June 30, 1957: (1) $4,255,912 (M), (2) $515,383, (3) $446,981.

Rich Foundation, Inc., Atlanta, as of January 31, 1959: (1) $1,825,000 (M), (2) $51,198, (3) $48,790.

Schwob (Simon) Foundation, Inc., Columbus, as of December 31, 1957: (1) $1,701,278 (L), (2) $84,480, (3) $84,129.

Southern Education Foundation, Inc., Atlanta, as of June 30, 1958: (1) $6,804,390 (M), (2) $276,678, (3) $235,551.

Steiner (Albert) Charitable Fund, Atlanta, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $1,193,170 (L), (2) $48,050.

Trebor Foundation, Inc., Atlanta, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $2,100,353 (L), (2) $79,133, (3) $78,800.

Whitehead (Joseph B.) Foundation, Atlanta, as of December 31, 1956: (1) $5,801,963 (L), (2) $341,535, (3) $334,375.

Whitehead (Lettie Pate) Foundation, Inc., Atlanta, as of December 31, 1956: (1) $2,020,884 (L), (2) $122,871, (3) $120,000.

Woodruff (Emily and Ernest) Foundation, Atlanta, as of December 31, 1957, (1) $26,409,750 (L), (2) $85,113, (3) $71,000.

HAWAII

Atherton (Juliette M.) Trust, Honolulu, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $1,810,057 (L), (2) $207,933, (3) $196,198.

Castle (Samuel N. and Mary) Foundation, Honolulu, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $2,707,935 (L), (2) $148,293, (3) $140,767.

Wilcox (G. N.) Trust, Honolulu, as of December 31, 1957, (1) $2,661,414 (M), (2) $133,742, (3) $124,625.

IDAHO

Anderson (C. C. and Henrietta W.) Foundation, Inc., Boise, as of February 28, 1957: (1) $1,752,995 (L), (2) $82,661, (3) $21,986.

ILLINOIS

Allstate Foundation, Skokie, as of December 31, 1956: (1) $1,395,260 (L), (2) $412,364, (3) $407,132.

Beidler (Francis) Charitable Trust, Chicago, as of December 31, 1956: (1) $1,580,231 (L), (2) $131,245, (3) $115,000.

Borg-Warner Foundation, Inc., Chicago, as of December 31, 1956: (1) $1,000,000 (L), (2) $382,006, (3) $382,005.

Chicago Community Trust, Chicago, as of October 31, 1958: (1) $28,911,238 (M), (2) $1,313,563, (3) $1,188,400.

Concora Foundation, Chicago, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $1,898,392 (L), (2) $247,069 all in grants.

Crown (Arie) Memorial Fund, Chicago, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $1,427,606 (L), (2) $223,828, (3) $223,807.

Cuneo Foundation, Chicago, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $1,056,890 (L), (2) $263,451, (3) $257,734.

D. and R. Fund, Chicago, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $1,348,703 (L), (2) $56,656, (3) $48,782.

Division Fund, Chicago, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $1,079,420 (L), (2) $123,642, (3) $123,563.

Deere (John) Foundation, Moline, as of October 31, 1958: (1) $3,771,317 (M), (2) $156,056, (3), $155,967.

Ecko Foundation, Inc., Chicago, as of December 31, 1957: (1) $1,669,780 (L), (2) $107,878, (3) $86,795.

Farm Foundation, Chicago, as of April 30, 1959: (1) $5,011,122 (M), (2) $193,395, (3) $91,323.

Forest Fund, Chicago, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $1,271,828 (L), (2) $179,903, (3) $179,896.

Forest Park Foundation (formerly Forest Park Home Foundation), Peoria, as of December 31, 1956: (1) $5,500,000 (M), (2) $154,076, (3) $138,536.

Gardner-Denver Foundation, Quincy, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $1,131,400 (M), (2) $38,175—all in grants.

General Service Foundation, Chicago, as of December 31, 1956: (1) $3,063,213 (L), (2) $923,486, (3) $919,261.

Graham Foundation for Advanced Studies in the Fine Arts, Chicago, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $1,124,663 (L), (2) $117,897, (3) $56,305.

Hales Charitable Fund, Inc., Chicago, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $1,167,512 (L), (2) $27,869, (3) $27,409.

Illinois Philanthropic and Educational Foundation, Elsah, as of June 30, 1957: (1) $2,591,924 (M), (2) $205,549, (3) $201,402.

Illinois Health Foundation, Inc., Chicago, as of December 31, 1956: (1) $2,804,807 (L), (2) $110,318, (3) $49,247.

Inland Steel-Ryerson Foundation, Inc., (formerly Inland Steel Foundation, Inc.), Chicago, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $3,298,586 (L), (3) $999,266.

International Harvester Foundation, Chicago, as of October 31, 1958: (1) $2,220,859 (L), (2) $950,821, (3) $950,793.

Kemper (The James S.) Foundation, Chicago, as of September 30, 1957: (1) $2,161,997 (M), (2) $91,092, (3) $84,956.

Kettering Family Foundation, The, Hinsdale, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $1,689,880 (L), (2) $383,952, (3) $56,058.

Kettering (Charles F.) Foundation, Hinsdale, as of September 30, 1959: (1) $69,313,071 (M), (2) $515,714, (3) $497,714.

Marquette Charitable Organization, Chicago, as of December 31, 1956: (1) $3,361,416 (L), (2) $175,086, (3) $167,231.

McCormick (Elizabeth) Memorial Fund, Chicago, as of October 31, 1958: (1) $3,513,671 (M), (2) $124,424, (3) $86,851.

McGraw Foundation, Chicago, as of June 30, 1959: (1) $3,016,136 (M), (2) $37,263, (3) $36,286.

Meyer-Ceco Foundation, Cicero, as of December 31, 1956: (1) $1,427,346 (L), (2) $37,431, (3) $36,462.

Moorman Foundation, Quincy, as of March 31, 1957: (1) $2,004,934 (L), (2) $199,950, (3) $196,024.

Morton (Mark) Foundation, Chicago, as of December 31, 1956: (1) $6,351,374 (L), (2) $224,659, (3) $213,892.

National Merit Scholarship Corp., Evanston, as of June 30, 1959: (1) $10,607,991 (L), (2) $2,748,690, (3) $2,432,116.

Olin Mathieson Chemical Corp., East Alton, as of October 31, 1957: (1) $6,426,119 (L), (2) $438,968, (3) $429,205.

Pullman (George M.) Educational Foundation, Chicago, as of July 31, 1959: (1) $8,450,000 (M), (2) $290,300, (3) $241,200.

Pullman, Inc., Foundation, Chicago, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $1,445,006 (M), (2) $199,824, (3) $195,755.

Regenstein (The Joseph and Helen) Foundation, Chicago, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $2,526,493 (L), (2) $225,705, (3) $80,500.

Rotary Foundation of Rotary International, Evanston, as of June 30, 1958: (1) $3,172,686 (L), (2) $404,186, (3) $323,434.

Santa Fe Foundation, Inc., Chicago, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $1,402,357 (L), (2) $457,007 all in grants.

Schwab (Charles H. and Rachel M.) Memorial Foundation, Chicago: as of February 28, 1959: (1) Not reported. A 1959 press release reports that the foundation is beneficiary of Mr. Schwab's $2,450,000 trust estate. (2) $76,000—including grants.

Seabury Foundation, Chicago, as of December 31, 1956: (1) $1,270,661 (L), (2) $98,895, (3) $63,650.

Sears-Roebuck Foundation, Chicago, as of April 30, 1959: (1) $22,430,770 (M), (2) $1,880,738, (3) $1,862,038.

Sprague (The Otho S. A.) Memorial Institute, Chicago, as of December 31, 1956: (1) $3,693,965 (L), (2) $213,186, (3) $207,275.

Standard Oil Foundation, Inc., Chicago, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $22,268,587 (M), (2) $1,048,932, (3) $1,048,033.

Swift & Co. Foundation, Chicago, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $1,244.021 (L), (2) $284,929, (3) $284,688.

Wieboldt Foundation, Evanston, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $8,147,023 (M), (2) $292,266, (3) $246,944.

Wilkie Foundation, Des Plaines, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $1,167,053 (L), (2) $102,573, (3) $63,187.

Woods Charitable Fund, Inc., Chicago, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $7,121,000 (M), (3) $424,661.

INDIANA

Baxter Foundation, Indianapolis, as of July 31, 1958: (1) $2,006,621 (L), (2) $105,820, (3) $92,310.

Christian Foundation, Columbus, as of November 30, 1956: (1) $3,495,419 (L), (2) $229,790, (3) $227,083.

Honeywell Foundation, Inc., Wabash, as of December 31, 1956: (1) $5,720,958 (L), (2) $267,652, (3) $96,496.

Indianapolis Foundation, Indianapolis, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $6,529,447 (L), (2) $288,752, (3) $275,565.

Inland Container Corporation Foundation, Inc. (formerly Inland Foundation, Inc.), Indianapolis, as of December 31, 1957: (1) $2,220,709 (L), (2) $141,782, (3) $85,574.

Jordan (Arthur) Foundation, Indianapolis, as of March 31, 1957: (1) $5,680,000 (L), (2) $126,000 all in grants.

Lilly Endowment, Inc., Indianapolis, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $157,013,165 (M), (2) $4,127,762, (3) $4,057,940.

McMillen Foundation, Fort Wayne, as of December 31, 1956: (1) $1,056,947 (L), (2) $48,653, (3) $48,652.

Storer (The Oliver W.), A Scholarship Foundation, Indianapolis, as of February 28, 1957: (1) $2,174,571 (L), (2) $79,879, (3) $71,276.

IOWA

Cowles (Gardner) Foundation, Des Moines, as of December 31, 1957: (1) $1,313,927 (L), (2) $318,435, (3) $318,417.

Meredith (Edwin T.) Foundation, Des Moines, as of May 31, 1957: (1) $2,155,023 (L), (2) $71,290, (3) $67,125.

Norris Foundation, Marshalltown, as of November 30, 1956: (1) $1,042,514 (L), (2) $52,437, (3) $52,020.

Wahlert Foundation, Dubuque, as of November 30, 1957: (1) $1,698,137 (L), (2) $42,690, all in grants.

KANSAS

Schowalter Foundation, Inc., Newton, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $1,035,158 (L), (2) $92,962, (3) $60,195.

KENTUCKY

Bernheim (The Isaac W.) Foundation, Louisville, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $5,493,000 (M), (2) $161,774.

Brown (James Graham) Foundation, Louisville, as of December 31, 1956: (1) $2,394,260 (L), (2) $206,270, (3) $197,681.

Robinson (E. O.) Mountain Fund, Lexington, as of June 30, 1957: (1) $2,607,348 (L), (2) $124,241, (3) $87,400.

LOUISIANA

Hurley (Ed E. and Gladys) Foundation, Shreveport, as of December 31, 1956: (1) $1,489,896 (L), (2) $22,890.

Rosa Mary Foundation, New Orleans, as of December 31, 1956: (1) $2,175,352 (L), (2) $81,610, (3) $80,500.

Schlieder (Edward G.) Educational Foundation, New Orleans, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $2,996,461 (L), (2) $172,844, (3) $157,771.

Stern (Edgar) Family Fund, New Orleans, as of December 31, 1956: (1) $3,960,271 (M), (2) $630,983, (3) $622,280.

MAINE

Davenport (George P.) Trust Fund, Bath, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $1,910,225 (L), (2) $85,514, (3) $75,520.

MARYLAND

Blaustein (The Louis and Henrietta) Foundation, Inc., Baltimore, as of December 31, 1956: (1) $2,494,269 (L), (2) $447,965, (3) $447,949.

Commercial Credit Companies Foundation, Inc., Baltimore, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $1,829,960 (L), (2) $124,281, (3) $121,110.

Frederick (George A. and Mary E.) Memorial, Inc., Baltimore, as of December 31, 1956: (1) $1,276,027 (L), (2) $99,499, (3) $89,613.

Gottschalk Foundation, Inc., Baltimore, as of December 31, 1956: (1) $1,016,379 (L), (2) $34,428, (3) $32,246.

Heller (The Ralph C.) Foundation, Baltimore, as of December 31, 1956: (1) $1,038,433 (L), (2) $56,332, (3) $54,772.

Hoffberger Brothers Fund, Inc., Baltimore, as of December 31, 1956: (1) $1,336,030 (L), (2) $66,658 all in grants.

Straus (The Aaron Straus and Lillie) Foundation, Inc., Baltimore, as of December 31, 1956: (1) $6,194,322 (L), (2) $600,104, (3) $204,755.

MASSACHUSETTS

Adams (Frank W. and Carl S.) Memorial Fund, Boston, as of March 20, 1959: (1) $2,900,000 (M), (2) $82,000 (1958), all in grants.

Alden (George I.) Trust, Worcester, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $3,707,807 (L), (2) $353,960, all in grants.

Ames (Hobart) Foundation, Boston, as of December 31, 1957: (1) $2 million (M), (2) $202,709, (3) $197,603.

Bay State Charitable Trust, Boston, as of December 31, 1957: (1) $1,454,129 (L), (2) $72,802, (3) $69,750.

Beveridge (Frank Stanley) Foundation, Westfield, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $3,386,018 (L), (2) $230,952, (3) $208,694.

Blanchard Foundation, Boston, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $3,410,980 (L), (2) $151,035, (3) $139,295.

Boston Foundation, Boston, as of August 31, 1957: (1) $4,289,565 (L), (2) $72,497, (3) $24,200.

Crabtree (Trustees under the Will of Lotta M.), Boston, as of December 31, 1957: (1) $3,532,300 (L), (2) $311,672, (3) $90,101.

Daniels (Fred Harris) Foundation, Inc., Worcester, as of October 31, 1958: (1) $2,505,108 (L), (2) $158,391, (3) $153,580.

Dexter (Eugene A.) Charitable Fund, Springfield, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $3,250,599 (M), (2) $93,435, (3) $86,739.

Eaton Foundation, Inc., Boston, as of December 31, 1957: (1) $2,068,914 (L), (2) $91,201, (3) $84,000.

Edwards Scholarship Fund, Boston, as of July 31, 1958: (1) $2,288,844 (M), (2) $78,557, (3) $66,975.

Elks National Foundation, Boston, as of April 30, 1959: (1) $8,509,410 (M), (2) $218,328 all in grants.

Filene (Lincoln and Therese) Foundation, Inc., Boston, as of January 31, 1959: (1) $1,347,078 (L), (2) $130,039, (3) $129,250.

Fuller Foundation, Inc., Boston, as of December 31, 1956: (1) $2,297,409 (L), (2) $751,957, (3) $745,329.

Fuller (George F. and Sybil H.) Foundation, Worcester, as of December 31, 1957: (1) $1,096,902 (L), (2) $39,736, (3) $39,700.

Gillette Charitable and Educational Foundation, Boston, as of December 30, 1958: (1) $1,022,174 (L), (2) $33,380, (3) $30,891.

Hood (Charles H.) Dairy Foundation, Boston, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $3,333,924 (L), (2) $181,760, (3) $164,054.

Hyams (Sarah A.) Fund, Inc., Boston, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $2,001,716 (M), (2) $84,840, (3) $83,505.

King (Charles A.) Trust, Boston, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $1,459,398 (L), (2) (1956) $101,742, (3) $77,000.

Lahey Foundation, Boston, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $1,202,938 (L), (2) $70,627, (3) $16,085.

Levy (June Rockwell) Foundation, Inc., Boston, as of December 31, 1957: (1) $2,218,597 (L), (2) $76,508, (3) $66,645.

Moses (Horace A.) Foundation, Inc., West Springfield, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $3,613,253 (L), (2) $201,262, (3) $175,963.

Parker (Theodore Edson) Foundation, Boston, as of December 31, 1956: (1) $3,200,000 (M), (2) $125,536, (3) $115,400.

Permanent Charity Fund, Inc., Boston, as of June 30, 1959: (1) $27,775,381 (M), (2) $751,601, (3) $721,872.

Peters (G. Gorham) Trust, Boston, as of May 1, 1957: (1) $1,530,860 (M), (2) (1956) $26,043, (3) $18,800.

Pilgrim Foundation, Brockton, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $1,192,244 (L), (2) $52,762, (3) $40,466.

Sagamore Foundation, Boston, as of December 31, 1956: (1) $1,133,739 (L), (2) $101,420, (3) $101,400.

Schrafft (William E. Schrafft and Bertha E.) Charitable Trust, Charlestown, as of December 31, 1956: (1) $2,773,716 (L), (2) $78,644, (3) $70,525.

Smith Charities, Northampton, as of April 30, 1959: (1) $2,242,717 (L), (2) $76,832, (3) $48,966.

Stevens (Nathaniel and Elizabeth P.) Foundation, Boston, as of December 31, 1957: (1) $3,921,357 (L), (2) $175,753, (3) $175,500.

Stoddard Charitable Trust, Worcester, as of December 31, 1957: (1) $2,306,652 (L), (2) $108,975, (3) $108,400.

Thompson (Thomas) Trust, Boston, as of May 31, 1957: (1) $1,735,602 (L), (2) $79,047, (3) $68,102.

Webster (The Edwin S.) Foundation, Boston, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $2,555,038 (L), (2) $245,838, (3) $236,400.

World Peace Foundation, Boston, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $1,400,000 (M), (2) $70,000.

Ziskind (Jacob) Trust for Charitable Purposes, Boston, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $2,660,538 (L), (2) $116,778, (3) $102,494.

MICHIGAN

Besser Foundation, Alpena, as of December 31, 1955: (1) $2,762,326 (L), (2) $63,947, (3) $59,950.

Chrysler Fund, Detroit, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $4,526,292 (L), (2) $1,079,328 all in grants.

Cranbrook Foundation, Bloomfield Hills, as of June 30, 1959: (1) $9,317,178 (L), (2) $456,105, (3) $151,368.

Dow (The Herbert H. and Grace A.) Foundation, Midland, as of December 31, 1956: (1) $6,913,248 (L), (2) $334,262, (3) $324,529.

EPH Foundation, Highland Park, as of December 31, 1956: (1) $2,710,085 (L), (2) $87,494, (3) $87,279.

Earhart Foundation, Ann Arbor, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $1,703,913 (L), (2) $191,044, (3) 156,564.

Ferry (D. M.), Junior Trustee Corp., Detroit, as of December 31, 1956: (1) $2,447,520 (L), (2) $61,434, (3) $59,537.

Ford (Eleanor Clay) Fund, Detroit, as of December 31, 1957: (1) $1,135,574 (L), (2) $294,198, (3) $293,496.

Ford Motor Co. Fund, Dearborn, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $16,818,824 (D), (2) $4,545,737; (3) $4,384,607.

Fruehauf (Roy) Foundation, Inc., Detroit, as of December 31, 1956: (1) $1,302,806 (L), (2) $75,086, (3) $70,989.

George (The Edwin S.) Foundation, Birmingham, as of March 31, 1959: (1) $1,394,563 (L), (3) $431,890.

Gerber Baby Foods Fund, Fremont, as of May 31, 1959: (1) $2,552,413 (M), (2) $121,705, (3) $114,968.

Gordon (The Josephine E.) Foundation, Detroit, as of December 31, 1956: (1) $9,060,678 (L), (2) $73,652, (3) $50,800.

Grand Rapids Foundation, Grand Rapids, as of June 30, 1956: (1) $500,129 (L) (according to a 1959 press report, the foundation has received a $5 million bequest, the income from which is to be spent at the discretion of the trustees), (2) $21,458, all in grants.

Herrick Foundation, Detroit, as of September 30, 1956: (1) $5,519,696 (L), (2) $301,016, (3) $299,662.

Hudson-Webber Foundation, Detroit, as of December 31, 1956: (1) $3,562,699 (M), (2) $188,336, (3) $185,505.

Joy (The Helen Newberry) Fund, Detroit, as of December 31, 1956: (1) $1,024,147 (L), (2) $67,262, (3) $63,600.

Kalamazoo Foundation, Kalamazoo, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $21,087,000 (M), (2) $642,000, (3) $578,000.

Kellogg (W. K.) Foundation, Battle Creek, as of August 31, 1959: (1) $215,184,419 (M), (2) $8,147,434, (3) $7,747,199.

Kresge Foundation, Detroit, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $95,316,048 (M), (2) $3,623,689, (3) $3,497,722.

McGregor Fund, Detroit, as of June 30, 1958: (1) $21,799,115 (M), (2) $1,506,213, (3) $1,440,820.

Mott (Charles Stewart) Foundation, Flint, as of December 31, 1956: (1) $23,582,249 (L), (2) $1,025,108, (3) $930,845.

Pardee (Elsa U.) Foundation, Midland, as of January 1, 1953: (1) $4,287,614 (L), (2) (1956) $132,771, all in grants.

Ranson Fidelity Co., Lansing, as of December 31, 1956: (1) $3,445,269 (L), (2) $126,511, (3) $97,451.

Relm Foundation, Ann Arbor, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $6,733,564 (L), (2) $304,658. (3) $257,038.

Sackner (Wade E. and Viola) Foundation, Grand Rapids, as of November 30, 1958: (1) $2,273,113 (L), (2) $94,372, (3) $72,000.

Upjohn (W. E.) Unemployment Trustee Corp., Kalamazoo, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $6,089,000 (L), (2) $126,517, (3) $124,838.

Webber (Eloise and Richard) Foundation, Detroit, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $2,550,947 (L), (2) $123,427, (3) $119,425.

Whiting Foundation, Flint, as of June 30, 1958: (1) $1,027,000 (L), (2) $69,200, (3) $69,000.

Wickes (Harvey Randall) Foundation, Saginaw, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $1,236,736 (L), (2) $55,293, (3) $52,315.

MINNESOTA

Bayport Foundation, Inc., Bayport, as of November 30, 1958: (1) $1,742,000 (L), (2) $107,824, all in grants.

Bean (F. A.) Foundation, Inc., Minneapolis, as of December 31, 1956: (1) $1,585,-050 (L), (2) $246,077, (3) $237,878.

Bigelow (F. R.) Foundation, St. Paul, as of December 31, 1956: (1) $1,225,565 (L), (2) $51,008 all in grants.

Blandin (Charles K.) Foundation, Grand Rapids, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $1,088,-000 (L), (2) $73,000, (3) $70,000.

Bremer (Otto) Foundation, St. Paul, as of November 30, 1958: (1) $1,466,123 (L), (2) $245,232, (3) $243,978.

Bush Foundation, St. Paul, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $3,025,385 (M), (2) $45,553, (3) $44,131.

Cargill Foundation, Minneapolis, as of December 31, 1956: (1) $2,245,341 (L), (2) $83,322, (3) $83,250.

Dayton Foundation, Minneapolis, as of November 30, 1956: (1) $2,687,405 (L), (2) $146,176, (3) $146,150.

Hamm Foundation, Inc., St. Paul, as of August 31, 1958: (1) $1,321,416 (L), (2) $359,842, (3) $332,250.

Harris Foundation, St. Paul, as of May 15, 1957: (1) $1,053,409 (M), (2) $32,017, (3) $29,936.

Hill (Louis W. and Maud) Family Foundation, St. Paul, as of February 28, 1959: (1) $22,375,972 (L), (2) $1,243,985, (3) $1,164,835.

Hormel Foundation, Austin, as of November 30 1957: (1) $2,338,984 (L), (2) $195,452, (3) $105,150.

Mayo Association, Rochester, as of December 31, 1958, (1) $59,100,000 (L), (2) $1,121,-000, (3) $1,054,000.

Minneapolis Foundation, Minneapolis, as of December 31, 1956: (1) $4,177,519 (M), (2) $129,352, (3) $113,557.

Minneapolis Star and Tribune Fund, Minneapolis, as of May 31, 1957: (1) $1,650,-121 (L), (2) $83,478, (3) $83,434.

Minnesota Mining & Manufacturing Foundation, Inc., St. Paul, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $1,471,859 (L), (2) $210,589 all in grants.

Ordean (Albert and Louise) Charity, Duluth, as of December 31, 1956: (1) $4,-257,278 (L), (2) $162,979, (3) $107,310.

O'Shaughnessy (I. A.) Foundation, Inc., St. Paul, as of December 31, 1956: (1) $2,-875,091 (L), (2) $1,035,378 all in grants.

Phillips Foundation, Minneapolis, as of December 31, 1957: (1) $2,966,509 (M), (2) $564,192, (3) $136,517.

Tozer Foundation, Inc., St. Paul, as of Cctober 31, 1958: (1) $4,055,247 (M), (2) $101,440 grants and scholarships.

Walker (Archie D. and Bertha H.) Foundation, Minneapolis, as of December 31, 1956: (1) $1,809,940 (L), (2) $71,381, (3) $61,791.

Walker (T. B.) Foundation, Inc., Minneapolis, as of December 31, 1956: (1) $6,912,-019 (L), (2) $294,334, (3) $214,611.

Western Foundation, Inc., Minneapolis, as of May 31, 1957: (1) $2,522,619 (L), (2) $138,896, (3) $138,505.

Wilder (Amherst H.) Foundation, St. Paul, as of June 30, 1958: (1) $26,073,373 (M), (2) $736,206.

MISSISSIPPI

None.

MISSOURI

Anheuser-Busch Charitable Trust, St. Louis, as of September 30, 1957: (1) $2,656,-557 (L), (2) $324,112, (3) $314,090.

Blewett (Parsons) Memorial Fund, St. Louis, as of June 30, 1958: (1) $3,537,527 (M), (2) $45,606.

Danforth Foundation, St. Louis, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $110,292,491 (M), (2) $2,913,664, (3) $2,817,505.

Falstaff Foundation, St. Louis, as of June 30, 1958: (1) $1,868,426 (L), (2) $160,247, (3) $123,744.

Gaylord (Clifford Willard) Foundation, St. Louis, as of December 31, 1956: (1) $2,555,-466 (L), (2) $180,198, (3) $163,875.

Gaylord Foundation, St. Louis, as of December 31, 1956: (1) $2,326,284 (L), (2) $159,580, (3) $140,710.

Hallmark Educational Foundation, Kansas City, as of January 1, 1956: (1) $2,253,-016 (L), (2) $47,293, (3) $47,280.

Loose (Carrie J.) Fund, Kansas City, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $3,799,681 (M), (2) $123,940, (3) $111,140.

Loose (Ella C.) Fund, Kansas City, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $3,634,876 (M), (2) $166,010, (3) $151,206.

Loose (Jacob L.) Million Dollar Charity Fund Association, Kansas City, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $1,133,395 (M), (2) $40,000, (3) $36,304.

May Stores Foundation, Inc., St. Louis, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $1,472,299 (L), (2) $474,078, (3) $473,853.

McDonnell Aircraft Corp. Foundation (formerly McDonnell Aircraft Corp. Charitable Trust), St. Louis, as of June 30, 1957: (1) $2,557,891 (L), (2) $43,286, (3) $35,648.

Monsanto Charitable Trust, St. Louis, as of December 31, 1956: (1) $1,118,567 (L), (2) $559,718, (3) $553,614.

Nelson (The William Rockhill) Trust, Kansas City, as of December 31, 1956: (1) $12,308,131 (L), (2) $630,209, (3) $335,061.

Ralston Purina Charitable Trust, St. Louis, as of August 31, 1957: (1) $1,074,318 (L), (2) $168,406, (3) $162,478.

Steinberg Charitable Trust, St. Louis, as of December 31, 1956: (1) $1,390,187 (L), (2) $903,133, (3) $888,518.

Sunnen Foundation, St. Louis, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $1,138,298 (L), (2) $137,961, (3) $135,479.

Swinney (Edward F.), Kansas City, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $2,784,912 (M), (2) $61,970, (3) $55,570.

Wohl Foundation, St. Louis, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $3,716,174 (L), (2) $350,000 all in grants.

MONTANA

None.

NEBRASKA

Cooper Foundation, Lincoln, as of December 31, 1956: (1) $3,529,274 (L), (2) $523,119, (3) $85,975.

Eppley (Eugene C.) Foundation, Inc., Omaha, as of June 30, 1959: (1) $21,470,836 (L), (2) $1,019,822.

McDonald (J. M.) Foundation, Inc., Omaha, as of June 30, 1959: (1) $21,470,836 (L), (2) $1,019,822.

McDonald (J. M.) Foundation, Inc., Hastings, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $4,391,427 (L), (2) $190,000, (3) $176,500.

Swanson (Carl and Caroline) Foundation, Inc., Omaha, as of December 31, 1957: (1) $1,778,918 (L), (2) $120,516, (3) $100,465.

NEVADA

Fleischmann (Max C.) Foundation of Nevada, Reno, as of June 30, 1959: (1) $66,759,-400 (M), (2) $1,957,409, (3) $1,771,987.

NEW HAMPSHIRE

Cogswell Benevolent Trust, Manchester, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $1,314,210 (L), (2) $69,809, (3) $59,797.

Spaulding-Potter Charitable Trusts, Concord, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $8,519,634 (L), (2) $2,545,042, (3) $2,467,263.

NEW JERSEY

Borden (The Mary Owen) Memorial Foundation, Rumson, as of December 31, 1956: (1) $1,971,033 (L), (2) $283,287, (3) $117,271.

Campbell Soup Fund, Camden, as of June 30, 1958: (1) $2,263,821 (L), (2) $235,021, (3) $228,750.

Fuld (Helene) Health Foundation, Trenton, as of December 31, 1956: (1) $8,184,604 (L), (2) $410,124, (3) $400,928.

Huber Foundation, Red Bank, as of December 31, 1956: (1) $1,758,402 (L), (2) $62,160, (3) $62,050.

Johnson (John Seward) Charitable Trust, New Brunswick, as of December 31, 1957: (1) $3,431,528 (M), (2) (1956) $57,059, (3) $56,809.

Johnson (Robert Wood) Foundation, New Brunswick, as of December 31, 1957: (1) $4,456,494 (M), (2) (1956) $71,887, (3) $71,343.

Ladd (Kate Macy) Fund, Newark, as of December 31, 1957: (1) $19,304,651 (M), (2) $686,483, (3) $651,031.

Rippel (Fannie E.) Foundation, Newark, as of April 30, 1958: (1) $21,201,511 (L), (2) $866,278, (3) $800,000.

Schering Foundation, Inc., Bloomfield, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $1,025,464 (L), (2) $101,420, (3) $100,333.

Turrell Fund, East Orange, as of December 31, 1957: (1) $15,224,993 (M), (2) $504,-057, (3) $468,803.

Victoria Foundation, Inc., Glen Ridge, as of December 31, 1957; (1) $10,294,765 (L), (2) (1958) $247,199, (3) $237,750.

NEW MEXICO

None.

NEW YORK CITY

Allen (Vivian B.) Foundation, Inc., New York, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $3,528,000 (M), (2) $128,781, (3) $120,296.

Allied Stores Foundation, Inc., New York, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $1,983,770 (L), (2) $49,703, (3) $48,438.

Altman Foundation, New York, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $11,156,622 (L), (2) $498,558, (3) $476,017.

Altschul Foundation, New York, as of June 30, 1958: (1) $1,983,460 (L), (2) $240, 540, (3) $224,135.

American Fore Loyalty Foundation, New York, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $1,431,583 (L), (2) $98,854, (3) $98,600.

American Missionary Association, New York: (1) $19,259,915 (L), (2) $2,610,869, (3) $2,423,061.

American Scandinavian Foundation, New York, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $1,349,605 (L), (2) $156,423, (3) $60,418.

Aron (J.) Charitable Foundation, Inc., New York, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $4,015,462 (L), (2) $223,750, (3) $220,925.

Ascoli (Marion R.) Fund, New York, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $1,082,252 (L), (2) $159,913, (3) $146,594.

Association for the Aid of Crippled Children, New York, as of March 31, 1959: (1) $21,436, 653 (M), (2) $776,375, (3) $475,-927.

Astor (The Vincent) Foundation, New York, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $3,896,598 (M), (2) $187,645, (3) $185,300.

Avalon Foundation, New York, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $74,326,593 (M), (2) $2,473,701, (3) $2,342, 727.

Bagley (The Nancy Reynolds) Foundation, New York, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $2,564,139 (L), (2) $89,386, (3) $85,000.

Baird (David, Josephine, and Winfield) Foundation, Inc., New York, as of December 31, 1957: (1) $8,699,628 (L), (2) $695,866, (3) $685,395.

Baird (Winfield) Foundation, New York, as of December 31, 1957: (1) $14,622,258 (L), (2) $8,421,937, (3) $8,061,431.

Baker (The George F.) Trust, New York, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $14,487,808 (L), (2) $696,610, (3) $596,450.

Banbury Fund, Inc., New York, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $1,782,173 (L), (2) $99,525, (3) $96,425.

Bay (Charles Ulrick and Josephine) Foundation, Inc., New York, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $9,069,832 (L), (2) $388,179, (3) $367,484.

Belgian American Educational Foundation, Inc., New York, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $4,421,212 (M), (2) $200,716, (3) $99,366.

Benenson (Robert and Nettie) Foundation, New York, as of November 30, 1958: (1) $5,575,725 (L), (2) $23,260 all in grants.

Biddle (Margaret T.) Foundation, New York, as of December 31, 1957: (1) $1,509,072 (L), (2) $107,156, (3) $106,164.

Bodman Foundation, New York, as of December 31, 1957: (1) $7,804,848 (L), (2) $386,513, (3) $379,226.

Bollingen Foundation, Inc., New York, as of December 31, 1957: (1) $6,057,181 (M), (2) $1,058,395, (3) $835,223.

Booth Ferris Foundation, New York, as of October 1958: (1) Not reported—Assets not fully determined, but reported by the press to be in the neighborhood of $17 million.

Brez Foundation, New York, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $2,140,116 (M), (2) $71,534, (3) $65,500.

Bronfman (The Samuel) Foundation, Inc., New York, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $1,380,662 (L), (2) $62,456, (3) $62,156.

Brookdale Foundation, New York, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $1,333,801, (2) $295,717, (3) $75,318.

Brooks (Walter) Foundation, New York, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $3,857,682 (M), (2) $577,311, (3) $556,572.

Bunbury Co., Inc., New York, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $1,019,311 (L), (2) $104,473, (3) $102,992.

Calder (The Louis) Foundation, New York, as of October 31, 1958: (1) $26,776,780 (L), (2) $783,121, (3) $614,734.

Campe (The Ed Lee and Jean) Foundation, Inc., New York, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $1,370,001 (L), (2) $63,764, (3) $61,690.

Carnegie Corp. of New York, New York, as of September 30, 1959: (1) $261,244,471 (M), (2) $8,715,682, (3) $7,935,175.

Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, New York, as of June 30, 1958: (1) $22,577,134 (M), (2) $770,744, (3) $54,048.

Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, New York, as of June 30, 1959: (1) $20,043,859 (M), (2) $1,463,908, (3) $1,427,418 (chiefly for retiring allowances and pension grants).

Cheatham (Owen) Foundation, New York, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $2,214,181 (M), (2) $34,964, (3) $26,797.

China Medical Board of New York, Inc., New York, as of June 30, 1958: (1) $39,698,954 (L), (2) $746,056, (3) $598,777.

Clark Foundation, New York, as of June 30, 1958: (1) $8,504,843 (L), (2) $252,047, (3) $105,000.

Coe Foundation, New York, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $3,698,179 (L), (2) $407,439, (3) $312,400.

Collins (Joseph) Foundation, New York, as of June 30, 1958: (1) $1,995,871 (M), (2) $90,966, (3) $83,865.

Commonwealth Fund, New York, as of June 30, 1959: (1) $119,904,614 (M), (2) $3,972,862, (3) $3,448,496.

Compton Trust, New York, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $1,388,670 (L), (2) $1,226,695 (1956), (3) $1,226,143.

Council on Economic and Cultural Affairs, Inc., New York, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $4,520,539 (M), (2) $500,717, (3) $397,328.

Cowles Charitable Trust (formerly The Fleur and Gardner Cowles Charitable Trust), New York, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $1,105,166 (L), (2) $121,010, (3) $121,000.

Culpeper (Charles E.) Foundation, Inc., New York, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $1,311,256 (L), (2) $255,712, (3) $245,919.

Deering Milliken Foundation, New York, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $1,891,461 (L), (2) $441,380, (3) $439,354.

de Hirsch (The Baron) Fund, New York, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $4,271,177 (L), (2) $185,600, (3) $152,185.

Dillon Fund, New York, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $4,197,194 (L), (2) $144,244, (3) $136,956.

Dodge (Cleveland H.) Foundation, Inc., New York, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $4,645,162 (L), (2) $473,220, (3) $467,350.

Doherty (The Henry L. and Grace) Charitable Foundation, Inc., New York, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $1,322,044 (L), (2) $302,456, (3) $289,176.

Dreyfus (The Camille and Henry) Foundation, Inc., New York, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $4,099,520 (L), (2) $232,089, (3) $224,826.

Duke (Angier B.) Memorial, Inc., New York, as of June 30, 1958: (1) $2,253,968 (L), (2) $120,323, (3) $104,012.

Duke Endowment, New York, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $414,754,543 (M), (2) $7,913,866, (3) $7,276,387.

Dula (The Caleb C. and Julia W.) Educational and Charitable Foundation, New York, as of December 31, 1957: (1) $3,694,725 (L), (2) $310,986, (3) $261,500.

Educational Foundation for Jewish Girls, New York, as of March 31, 1959: (1) $2,963,799 (M), (2) $103,148, (3) $87,657.

Engineering Foundation, New York, as of September 30, 1958: (1) $1,651,446 (L), (2) $88,302, (3) $72,000.

Esso Education Foundation, New York, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $2,614,768 (L), (2) $1,644,050, (3) $1,638,715.

Farfield Foundation, Inc., New York, as of December 31, 1957: (1) $1,262,063 (L), (2) $853,730, (3) $811,744.

Field Foundation, Inc., New York, as of September 30, 1959: (1) $32,662,385 (L), (2) $2,038,513, (3) $1,849,424.

Fischel (Harry and Jane) Foundation, New York, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $1,411,702 (L), (2) $63,489, (3) $50,981.

Ford Foundation, New York, as of September 30, 1959: (1) $3,316,000,000 (M), (2) $112,145,678, (3) $110,132,848.

Frasch (Herman) Foundation for Chemical Research, New York, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $3,091,659 (M), (2) $124,721, (3) $110,730.

Frueauff (Charles A.) Foundation, Inc., New York, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $6,258,618 (L), (2) $489,083, (3) $427,308.

Fund for the Advancement of Education, New York, as of September 30, 1959: (1) $6,298,648 (M), (2) $2,435,205, (3) $1,929,504.

General Education Board, New York, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $8,112,706 (M), (2) $2,155,256, (3) $690,452.

Gilman Foundation, Inc., New York, as of April 30, 1959: (1) $2,207,125 (L), (2) $209,370, (3) $207,205.

Gottesman (D. S. and R. H.) Foundation, New York, as of October 31, 1958: (1) $1,709,261 (L), (2) $467,266, (3) $427,617.

Grand Street Boys' Foundation, New York, as of December 31, 1957: (1) $1,700,033 (M), (2) $314,230, all in grants.

Grant Foundation, Inc., New York, as of October 31, 1958: (1) $13,687,212 (M), (2) $942,491, (3) $840,970.

Griffis Foundation, Inc., New York, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $2,260,529 (L), (2) $49,389, (3) $45,245.

Guggenheim (The Daniel and Florence) Foundation, New York, as of March 31, 1959: (1) $4,879,794 (L), (2) $497,034, (3) $447,487.

Guggenheim (John Simon) Memorial Foundation, New York, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $45 million (M), (2) $1,760,568, (3) $1,492,506.

Guggenheim (The Murry and Leonie) Foundation, New York, as of March 31, 1959: (1) $18,300,000 (M), (2) $807,000, (3) $730,000.

Guggenheim (The Solomon R.) Foundation, New York, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $17,665,759 (L), (2) $501,999, (3) $44,097.

Gulbenkian (Gullabi) Foundation, Inc., New York, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $1,235,242 (L), (2) $41,291, all in grants.

Haas (Leo Oppenheimer and Flora Oppenheimer) Trust, New York, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $3,286,065 (L), (2) $187,801, (3) $135,992.

Haggin (Margaret Voorhies) Trust, New York, as of December 31, 1958, (1) $6,511,429 (L), (2) $197,726, (3) $180,882.

Harkness (William Hale) Foundation, Inc., New York, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $1,961,279 (L), (2) $101,943, (3) $89,250.

Harriman (Mary W.) Trust, New York, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $4,454,120 (L), (2) $190,489, (3) $178,922.

Hartford (The John A.) Foundation, Inc., New York, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $413,229,391 (M), (2) $3,998,697, (3) $3,945,813.

Haskins & Sells Foundation, Inc., New York, as of August 31, 1959: (1) $1,012,325 (L), (2) $76,378, (3) $73,173.

Havens Relief Fund Society, New York, as of December 31, 1957: (1) $2,840,271 (L), (2) $96,002, (3) $83,617.

Hayden (Charles) Foundation, New York, as of September 30, 1959: (1) $67,385,801 (M), (2) $1,273,481, (3) $1,066,000.

Heckscher Foundation for Children, New York, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $3,925,748 (L), (2) $147,661, (3) $131,768.

Hineman Foundation for Research, Educational, Charitable, and Scientific Purposes, Inc., New York, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $1,979,556 (L), (2) $52,822, (3) $48,261.

Herskowitz (Harry) Foundation, Inc., New York, as of November 30, 1958: (1) $1,965,119 (L), (2) $223,185 all in grants.

Hirschman (Henrietta and Stuard) Foundation, New York, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $2,581,682 (L), (2) $599,550, (3) $587,466.

Hofheimer (Nathan) Foundation, Inc., New York, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $1,635,512 (L), (2) $139,514, (3) $131,800.

Hutchins (Mary J.) Foundation, Inc., New York, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $1,419,552 (L), (2) $54,841, (3) $53,953.

Hyde (The Lillia Babbitt) Foundation, New York, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $9,249,494 (L), (2) $438,712, (3) $399,200.

Ingersoll-Rand Fund, New York, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $1,146,652 (L), (2) $52,741, (3) $49,283.

International Paper Co. Foundation, New York, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $5,781,927 (L), (2) $410,491, (3) $377,632.

Ittleson Family Foundation, New York, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $9,812,927 (M), (2) $361,223, (3) $318,195.

J. M. Foundation, New York, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $3,205,296 (L), (2) $216,715, (3) $216,532.

James Foundation of New York, Inc., New York, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $78,417,589 (M), (2) $2,618,646, (3) $2,477,772.

Jones (W. Alton) Foundation, Inc., New York, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $7,035,308 (L), (2) $799,184, (3) $792,184.

Joseloff (Morris) Foundation, Inc., New York, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $1,313,244 (L), (2) $93,676, (3) $89,843.

Juilliard Musical Foundation, New York, as of June 30, 1958: (1) $22,932,867 (M), (2) $635,119, (3) $563,270.

Kade (Max) Foundation, Inc., New York, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $1,877,912 (L), (2) $408,929, (3) $395,961.

Kaplan (The J. M.) Fund, Inc., New York, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $16,496,739 (L), (2) $404,073, (3) $358,269.

Kaufmann (Henry) Foundation, New York, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $10,313,115 (M), (2) $421,757, (3) $409,292.

Kennedy (The Joseph P.), Jr., Foundation, New York, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $6,191,768 (L), (2) $1,937,378, (3) $1,826,550.

Kevorkian Foundation, New York, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $3,235,994 (L), (2) $159,270, (3) $31,823.

Klau (The David) Foundation, New York, as of December 31, 1957: (1) $1,783,518 (L), (2) $154,021, (3) $153,996.

Klingenstein (The Esther A. and Joseph) Fund, Inc., New York, as of September 30, 1958: (1) $3,641,591 (L), (2) $234,068, (3) $234,050.

Knapp Foundation, Inc., New York, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $2,113,188 (L), (2) $78,492, (3) $75,047.

Kress (Samuel H.) Foundation, New York: as of August 31, 1958: (1) $45,000,000 (M), (2) $1,663,235, (3) $1,113,468.

Lasker (Albert and Mary) Foundation, Inc., New York, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $3,783,225 (L), (2) $967,852, (3) $869,389.

Lavanburg Corner House, Inc., New York, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $1,652,939 (L), (2) $967,852, (3) $869,389.

Lavanburg Corner House, Inc., New York: as of December 31, 1958: (1) $1,652,939 (L), (2) $87,857, (3) $83,800.

Lavanburg (Fred L.) Foundation, New York, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $1,300,000 (M), (2) $100,366, (3) $69,150.

Lesavoy Foundation, New York, as of December 31, 1957: (1) $1,270,106 (L), (2) expenditures none.

Leviton Foundation, Inc.—New York, Brooklyn, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $1,075,827 (L), (2) $171,872 all in grants.

Levy (Adele R.) Fund, Inc., New York, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $2,062,101 (L), (2) $336,800, (3) $323,700.

Li Foundation, Inc., New York, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $1,023,660 (L), (2) $51,638, (3) $51,498.

Life Insurance Medical Research Fund, New York, as of June 30, 1958: (1) $1,753,914 (L), (2) $1,055,655, (3) $980,779.

Lindsley (John) Fund, New York, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $4,076,704 (L), (2) $113,856, (3) $104,430.

Littauer (The Lucius N.) Foundation, Inc., New York, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $2,218,694 (L), (2) $159,079, (3) $111,591.

Lowenstein (Leon) Foundation, Inc., New York, as of December 31, 1957: (1) $7,526,-753 (L), (2) $552,421, (3) $504,589.

Luce (The Henry) Foundation, Inc., New York, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $1,697,250 (L), (2) $113,230, (3) $113,000.

Macy (Josiah), Jr., Foundation, New York, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $33,721,316 (M), (2) $1,303,776, (3) $813,346.

Markle (The John and Mary R.) Foundation, New York, as of June 30, 1959: (1) $38,-033,275 (M), (2) $1,208,973, (3) $1,047,293.

Martin Foundation, Inc., New York, as of October 31, 1958: (1) $1,680,329 (L), (2) $128,619, (3) $49,759.

Mazer (The Abraham) Family Fund, Inc., New York, as of July 31, 1957: (1) $1,283,371 (L), (2) $152,824, (3) $135,682.

Memton Fund, Inc., care of Milbank, Tweed, Hope & Hadley, New York, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $1,433,364 (L), (2) $63,404, (3) $60,950.

Merrill Lynch, Pierce, Fenner & Smith Foundation, Inc., partners of (formerly the Merrill Lynch, Pierce, Fenner & Beane Foundation, Inc.), New York, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $1,245,659 (L), (2) $434,313, (3) $433,864.

Mertz (Martha) Foundation, Inc., care of the Chase Manhattan Bank, New York, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $1,248,455 (L), (2) $49,112, (3) $45,500.

Milbank (the Dunlevy) Foundation, Inc., New York, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $1,-726,399 (L), (2) $82,730, (3) $82,450.

Milbank Memorial Fund, New York, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $21,639,685 (M), (2) $668,482, (3) $373,568.

Monell (The Ambrose) Foundation, care of W. Barrett Brown, New York, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $8,541,459 (L), (2) $516,836, $502,500.

Morgan Guaranty Trust Co. of New York Foundation, (formerly Guaranty Trust Co. of New York Foundation), New York, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $1,741,858 (L), (2) $220,500, all in grants.

Morgenstern (Morris) Foundation, New York, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $3,648,545 (L), (2) $140,342, (3) $66,384.

Morris (The William T.) Foundation, Inc., New York, as of June 30, 1959: (1) $8,995,-741 (L), (2) $311,870, (3) $275,059.

Moses (Henry and Lucy) Fund, Inc., care of Moses & Singer, New York, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $3,022,461 (L), (2) $150,148, (3) $149,547.

Mosler Foundation, Inc., New York, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $1,291,853 (L), (2) $52,411, all in grants.

Munitalp Foundation, Inc., The, New York, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $1,021,-942 (L), $125,186, (3) $26,600.

Music Performance Trust Funds of the Recording Industries, care of Samuel Rosenbaum, New York, as of June 30 1958: (1) $7,770,146 (M), (2) $4,070,848, (3) $3,708,005 (musical performances).

National Biscuit Co. Foundation, New York, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $1,252,641 (L), (2) $45,700, all in grants.

National Lead Foundation, Inc., The, New York, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $4,372,-715 (L), $224,750, all in grants.

New World Foundation, The, New York, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $8,390,000 (M), (2) $307,000, (3) $242,000.

New York Community Trust, New York, as of December 31, 1959: (1) $35,528,485 (M), (2) $1,675,008, (3) $1,586,366.

New York Foundation, New York, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $18,578,192 (M), (2) $1,022,541, (3) $958,334.

Newhouse (Samuel I.) Foundation, Inc., Jamaica, as of October 31, 1958: (1) $6,164,-279 (L), (2) $174,627, (3) $174,100.

Nias (Henry) Foundation, Inc., New York, as of November 30, 1958: (1) $2,663,369 (L), (2) $153,662, (3) $142,500.

1907 Foundation, Inc., New York, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $2,005,281 (L), (2) $127,077, (3) $83,460.

Noble (Edward John) Foundation, New York, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $13,520,-352 (M), (2) $413,253, (3) $218,985, leadership grants, $164,015, charitable grants.

Norman (The Aaron E.) Fund, Inc., New York, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $6,232,184 (M), (2) $207,883, (3) $201,485.

Noyes (Jessie Smith) Foundation, Inc., New York, as of December 31, 1957: (1) $3,913,358 (L), (2) $331,853, (3) $228,080.

Nutrition Foundation, Inc., New York, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $1,917,856 (M), (2) $654,378, (3) $545,180.

Oaklawn Foundation, New York, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $1,373,841 (L), (2) $65,165, (3) $62,327.

Old Dominion Foundation, New York, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $43,172,902 (M), (2) $17,777,229, (3) $17,631,729.

Olin Foundation, Inc., New York, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $39,723,742 (L), (2) $2,085,167, (3) $1,900,000.

Ottinger Foundation, Inc., New York, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $1,203,543 (L), (2) $68,909, (3) $66,804.

Overbrook Foundation, New York, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $1,510,230 (L), (2) $248,553, (3) $220,869.

Palmer (Francis Asbury) Fund, New York, as of December 31, 1956: (1) $1,243,529 (L), (2) $25,406, (3) $22,906.

Parshelsky (Moses L.) Foundation, Brooklyn, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $3,-528,959 (L), (2) $159,433, (3) $107,522.

Pfeiffer (Gustavus and Louise) Research Foundation, New York, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $10,113,776 (L), (2) $500,536, (3) $445,543.

Pforzheimer (The Carl and Lily) Foundation, Inc., New York, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $3,632,836 (L), (2) $205,409, (3) $133,699.

Pope (The Generoso) Foundation, Inc., New York, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $1,-797,319 (L), (2) $163,163, (3) $163,115.

Population Council, Inc., New York, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $2,770,899 (M), (2) $849,639, (3) $650,749.

Reeves Brothers Foundation, Inc., New York, as of June 30, 1957: (1) $1,066,177 (L), (2) $90,358, (3) $81,325.

Reid Foundation, Inc., New York, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $2,736,000 (L), (2) $34,317, (3) $30,000.

Research Corp., New York, as of October 31, 1958: (1) $11,980,684 (M), (2) $1,615,098, (3) $1,222,662.

Richardson Foundation, Inc., New York, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $13,025,114 (L), (2) $603,471, (3) $427,326.

Rockefeller Bros. Fund, New York, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $53,174,210 (L), (2) $4,053,411, (3) $3,841,169.

Rockefeller Foundation, New York, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $647,694,858 (M), (2) $25,106,079, (3) $22,599,735.

Rogosin Foundation, New York, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $7,208,539 (L), (2) $477,398, (3) $458,105.

Rosenstiel (Dorothy H. and Lewis) Foundation, New York, as of December 31, 1956: (1) $5,394,315 (L), (2) $389,800, (3) $351,813.

Rosenthal (Benjamin) Foundation, Inc., New York, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $15,-000 (L) (corpus of trust, $4,886,000), (2) $227,500, (3) $202,300.

Rubicon Foundation, Inc., New York, as of June 30, 1959: (1) $2,973,062 (M), (2) $402,-458, (3) $400,326.

Rubin (Leah and Joseph) Foundation, Inc. (formerly Leah Rubin Foundation, Inc.), Brooklyn, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $1,080,257 (L), (2) $28,697 (all in grants).

Rubin (Samuel) Foundation, Inc., New York, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $9,498,-758 (L), (2) $553,988, (3) $551,799.

Sage (Russell) Foundation, New York, as of September 30, 1959: (1) $28,506,033 (M), (2) $882,778, (3) $730,317 (project expenditures).

Sams (Earl C.) Foundation, Inc., New York, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $7,303,-468 (L), (2) $439,738, (3) $426,273.

Schepp (The Leopold) Foundation, New York, as of April 30, 1959: (1) $3,226,442 (L), (2) $186,402, (3) $127,650.

Scheuer (S. H. and Helen R.) Family Foundation, Inc., New York, as of November 30, 1958: (1) $1,536,801 (L), (2) $96,582, (3) $95,778.

Schweckendieck (Edith M.) Trusts, New York, as of January 1, 1959: (1) $1,500,000 (M), (2) $51,900, all in grants.

Schweitzer (The Peter J.) Foundation, Inc., New York, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $1,064,489 (L), (2) $175,050, (3) $173,179.

Scott (Walter) Foundation, New York, as of September 30, 1958: (1) $1,205,350 (L), (2) $46,763, (3) $24,082.

Scriven Foundation, Inc., New York, as of June 30, 1958: (1) $6,258,301 (L), (2) $252,-933, (3) $208,423.

Sealantic Fund, Inc., New York, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $13,250,000 (M), (2) $5,523,042, (3) $5,494, 185.

Shell Cos. Foundation, Inc., New York, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $2,232,600 (L), (2) $1,098,064 all in grants.

Shubert (Sam S.) Foundation, Inc., New York, as of May 31, 1959: (1) $2,371,091 (L), (2) $66,771, (3) $66,746.

Sloan (Alfred P.) Foundation, New York, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $175,553,110 (M), (2) $6,208,110, (3) $5,779,120.

Smithers (The Christopher D.) Foundation, Inc., New York, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $4,807,083 (M), (2) $463,331, (3) $447,341.

Social Research Foundation, Inc., New York, as of March 31, 1959: (1) $1,202,959 (L), (2) $61,188, (3) $20,000.

Sprague (The Seth) Educational and Charitable Foundation, New York, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $11,540,936 (L), (2) $617,632, (3) $502,000.

Statler Foundation, New York, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $10,235,469 (M), (2) $737,657, (3) $618,180.

Stetson Foundation, New York, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $1,420,252 (L), (2) $84,622, (3) $79,283.

Summerfield (Solon E.) Foundation, Inc., New York, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $6,-336,335 (L), (2) $332,845, (3) $271,621.

Teagle Foundation, Inc., New York, as of May 31, 1959: (1) $3,472,866 (L), (2) $233,-151, (3) $229,331.

Tiffany (Louis Comfort) Foundation, New York, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $1,551,-169 (M), (2) $42,808, (3) $24,000 (scholarships).

Tuch (Michael) Foundation, Inc., New York, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $1,021,-436 (L), (2) $51,241, (3) $37,546.

Twentieth Century Fund, Inc., New York, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $17,552,441 (M), (2) $832,248, (3) $345,311.

Union Bag Charitable Trust, New York, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $1,344,333 (L), (2) $191,809, (3) $188,812.

United States Steel Foundation, Inc., New York, as of November 30, 1958: (1) $22,127,-809 (L), (2) $3,299,224, (3) $3,297,225.

Warburg (Felix M. and Frieda Schiff) Foundation, New York, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $2,636,367 (L), (2) $409,504, (3) $404,990.

Watson (The John Jay and Eliza Jane) Foundation, New York, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $7,000,000 (M), (2) $175,769, (3) $171,186.

Weinstein (J.) Foundation, Inc., Brooklyn, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $1,200,614 (L), (2) $183,106, (3) $178,867.

Wenner-Gren Foundation for Anthropological Research, Inc., New York, as of January 31, 1959: (1) $6,631,864 (M), (2) $330,-797, (3) $265,162.

Western Electric Fund, New York, as of November 30, 1958: (1) $2,163,761 (L), (2) $541,161, (3) $540,870.

Whitehall Foundation, Inc., New York, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $6,857,030 (L), (2) $779,006, (3) $746,712.

Whitney (Gertrude Vanderbilt) Trust, New York, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $1,500,304 (L), (2) $27,614, (3) $11,150.

Whitney (The Helen Hay) Foundation, New York, as of June 30, 1959: (1) $11,773,-701 (M), (2) $479,254, (3) $399,480.

Whitney (John Hay) Foundation, New York, as of June 30, 1959: (1) $1,614,014 (L), (2) $433,283, (3) $368,360.

Whitney (William C.) Foundation, New York, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $1,516,-770 (L), (2) $77,851, (3) $56,763.

Wiggin (Albert H. and Jessie D.) Foundation, New York, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $1,302,540 (L), (2) $57,890, (3) $48,950.

Wilson (Woodrow) Foundation, New York, as of April 30, 1959: (1) $1,771,898 (M), (2) $162,740, (3) $24,000.

Winfield Foundation, New York, as of September 30, 1958: (1) $1,086,225 (L), (2) $73,949, (3) $72,000.

Wollman (The William J.) Foundation, New York, as of March 31, 1959: (1) $2,305,-125 (L), (2) $1,632,678, (3) $1,620,585.

Woodward Foundation, New York, as of July 31, 1959: (1) $1,087,020 (L), (2) $18,-428, (3) $15,000.

Wurzweiler (The Gustav) Foundation, Inc., New York, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $4,680,353 (L), (2) $250,521, (3) $212,134.

Ziegler (The E. Matilda) Foundation for the Blind, Inc., New York, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $1,478,191 (L), (2) $80,527, (3) $75,500.

NEW YORK STATE

Arkell Hall Foundation, Inc., Canajoharie, as of November 30, 1958: (1) $3,820,192 (L), (2) $91,323, (3) $9,010.

Baird Foundation, Buffalo, as of September 15, 1955: (1) $1,865,931 (L), (2) $111,457, (3) $94,287.

Baird (Frank B.), Jr., Foundation, Buffalo, as of March 31, 1957: (1) $1,556,030 (L), (2) $47,120, (3) $47,050.

Bell Foundation, Inc., Buffalo, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $1,082,938 (L), (2) $274,295, (3) $271,023.

Buffalo Foundation, Buffalo, as of December 31, 1958, (1) $3,474,093 (M), (2) $158,147, (3) $143,683.

Burke (The Winifred Masterson) Relief Foundation, White Plains, as of March 31, 1959: (1) $13,342,506 (M), (2) $940,249.

Carrier Foundation, Inc., Syracuse, as of September 30, 1958: (1) $1,472,316 (L), (2) $477,700, (3) $475,700.

Corning Glass Works Foundation, Corning, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $4,270,230 (L), (2) $613,502, (3) $603,502.

Emerson (Fred L.) Foundation, Inc., Auburn, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $16,-547,824 (L), (2) $571,032, (3) $553,484.

Fund for Adult Education, White Plains, as of June 30, 1959: (1) $11,837,244 (L), (2) $3,309,132, (3) $2,987,630.

General Electric Foundation (formerly General Electric Educational and Charitable Fund), Ossining, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $26,538,000 (M), (2) $1,100,000, all in grants.

Gifford (The Rosamond) Charitable Corp., Syracuse, as of December 31, 1959: (1) $6,-510,116 (M), (2) $262,671, (3) $220,384.

Julia R. and Estelle L. Foundation, Inc., Buffalo, as of December 31, 1956: (1) $1,856,-453 (L), (2) $212,861, (3) $212,799.

Knox (Seymour H.) Foundation, Inc., Buffalo, as of December 31, 1956: (1) $2,230,228 (L), (2) $121,876, (3) $119, 322.

Lasdon Foundation, Inc., Yonkers, as of November 30, 1957: (1) $3,100,000 (M), (2) $982,994, (3) $168,979.

Manning Gallagher Foundation, Inc., Troy, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $1,367,526 (M), (2) $75,610, (3) $72,400.

Merrill (The Charles E.) Trust, Ithaca, as of September 30, 1959: (1) $2,635,000, all in grants; assets, none.

Ogden (Ralph E.) Foundation, Inc., Mountainville, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $2,-574,547 (L), (2) $15,528, (3) $5,800.

Potts Memorial Institute, Inc., Hudson, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $1,172,426 (L), (2) $26,343, all in grants.

Reader's Digest Foundation, Pleasantville, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $2,375,471 (L), (2) $192,829, (3) $192,390.

Surdna Foundation, Inc., Yonkers, as of June 30, 1959: (1) $25,546,235 (L), (2) $3,417,-672, (3) $3,397,801.

Tucker (Marcia Brady) Foundation, Inc., Mount Kisco, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $1,393,150 (L), (2) $88,681, (3) $88,150.

Weed Foundation, Inc., Buffalo, as of December 31, 1956: (1) $1,140,102 (L), (2) $21,-856, all in grants.

Western New York Foundation (formerly the Wildroot Foundation), Buffalo, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $2 million (M), (2) $69,985, (3) $69,167.

NORTH CAROLINA

Babcock (Mary Reynolds) Foundation Inc., Winston-Salem, as of August 31, 1957: (1) $17,368,644 (M), (2) $711,633, (3) $680,773.

Burlington Industries Foundation, Greensboro, as of September 30, 1959: (1) $6,200,000 (M), (2) $636,300, (3) $622,600.

Cannon Foundation, Inc., Concord, as of September 30, 1957: (1) $16,638,056 (L), (2) $677,150, (3) $571,778.

Morehead (The John Motley) Foundation, Charlotte, as of June 30, 1959: (1) $7,159,089 (M), (2) $239,348, (3) $174,590.

Reynolds (Kate B.) Charitable Trust, Winston-Salem, as of January 1, 1956: (1) $5,128,998 (L), (2) $200,137, (3) $183,162.

Reynolds (Z. Smith) Foundation, Inc., Winston-Salem, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $50,000,000 (M), (2) $972,050, (3) $967,700.

Winston-Salem Foundation, Winston-Salem, as of August 31, 1959: (1) $11,660,731 (M), (2) $537,910, (3) $505,714.

NORTH DAKOTA

None.

OHIO

Akron Community Trusts, Akron, as of October 31, 1959: (1) $1,114,000 (L), (2) $26,266, (3) $21,187.

Alms (Eleanora C. U.) Trust, Cincinnati, as of December 31, 1955: (1) $1,147,734 (L), (2) $19,699, (3) $15,063.

American Foundation, Cleveland, as of 6 months ended June 30, 1959: (1) $3,132,465 (M), (2) $56,350, (3) $49,328.

Armco Foundation, Middletown, as of September 30, 1958: (1) (January 1, 1959), $5,053,024 (M), (2) $286,721, all in grants.

Ashtabula Foundation, Ashtabula, as of December 31, 1956: (1) $1,127,870 (L), (2) $486,549, (3) $36,370.

Austin Co. Foundation, Cleveland, as of December 31, 1956: (1) $1,055,533 (L), (2) $57,562, (3) $57,555.

Beaumont (The Louis D.) Foundation Inc., Cleveland, as of December 31, 1956: (1) $18,486,686 (L), (2) $1,266,467, (3) $1,216,752.

Bentz Foundation, Columbus, as of October 31, 1958: (1) $2,195,674 (L), (2) $121,000, all in grants.

Bingham (The William) Foundation, Cleveland, as of April 30, 1957: (1) $1,455,779 (L), (2) $80,005, (3) $80,000.

Champion Paper Foundation, Hamilton, as of March 31, 1959: (1) $3,697,003 (L), (2) $152,358, (3) $144,223.

Charities Foundation, Toledo, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $4,241,015 (M), (2) $455,503, (3) $452,200.

Cincinnati Milling Machine Foundation, Cincinnati, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $1,034,429 (L), (2) $131,014, (3) $124,300.

Cleveland Foundation, Cleveland, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $36,009,930 (M), (2) $1,104,724, (3) $1,018,422.

Columbus Foundation, Columbus, as of December 31, 1959: (1) $1,468,595 (L), (2) $205,547, all in grants.

Emery (The Thomas J.) Memorial, Cincinnati, as of December 31, 1956: (1) $7,190,-262 (L), (2) $432,269, (3) $95,615.

Firestone Foundation, Akron, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $5,845,139 (L), (2) $370,344, (3) $362,766.

Firestone Trust Fund, Cleveland, as of December 31, 1956: (1) $6,069,783 (L), (2) $339,118, (3) $330,750.

Goodrich (The B. F.) Fund, Inc., Akron, as of December 31, 1956: (1) $4,752,953 (L), (2) $444,651, (3) $439,067.

Hankins Foundation, Shaker Heights, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $1,195,483 (L), (2) —, (3) $44,462.

Hanna (Leonard C.), Jr. Fund (Formerly Hanna Fund), Cleveland, as of August 31, 1959: (1) $10,784,523 (L), (2) $22,739,124, (3) $22,625,843.

Hayes (The Rutherford B. Hayes and Lucy Webb) Foundation, Fremont, as of October 4, 1959: (1) $2,000,000 (M), (2) $48,000.

Hoover Co. Charitable Trust, North Canton, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $1,048,338 (L), (2) $64,274, (3) $60,025.

Humphrey (George M. and Pamela S.) Fund, Cleveland, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $1,008,087 (L), (2) $28,874, (3) $28,873.

Kroger Company Charitable Trust, Cincinnati, as of December 31, 1956: (1) $1,195,637 (L), (2) $293,258, all in grants.

Kulas Foundation, Cleveland, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $4,634,779 (L), (2) $278,696, (3) $237,375.

Kuntz Foundation, Dayton, as of December 31, 1956: (1) $1,180,285 (L), (2) $51,951, (3) $51,945.

Libbey-Owens-Ford Philanthropic Foundation, Toledo, as of 10 months ended October 31, 1959: (1) $1,150,883 (L), (2) $238,725, all in grants.

Lubrizol Foundation, Wickliffe, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $1,140,000 (L), (2) $114,000 all in grants.

N.C.R. Foundation, Dayton, as of December 31, 1956: (1) $1,488,280 (L), (2) $123,144, (3) $120,000.

National Machinery Foundation, Inc., Tiffin, as of December 31, 1956: (1) $1,976,-744 (L), (2) $94,742, (3) $78,605.

Ohio Oil Co. Foundation, Inc., Findlay, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $1,324,948 (M), (2) $295,891, all in grants.

Polk Foundation, (formerly the Sheffield Foundation), Dayton, as of December 31, 1956: (1) $1,037,877 (L), (2) $37,490, (3) $36,535.

Prentiss (The Elisabeth Severance) Foundation, Cleveland, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $14,600,000 (M), (3) $528,616.

Procter and Gamble Fund, Cincinnati, as of June 30, 1956: (1) $6,305,836 (L), (2) $923,630, (3) $917,897.

Republic Steel Corp. Educational and Charitable Trust, Cleveland, as of December 31, 1956: (1) $10,880,282 (L), (2) $608,479, (3) $607,558.

Ritchie (The Charles E. and Mabel M.) Memorial Foundation, Akron, as of December 31, 1956: (1) $1,275,083 (M), (2) $41,013, (3) $34,500.

Schmidlapp (Charlotte R.) Fund, Cincinnati, as of December 31, 1955: (1) $1,276,534 (L), (2) $30,131, (3) 29,845.

Schmidlapp (Jacob G.) Trust, Cincinnati, as of December 31, 1955: (1) $1,606,057 (L), (2) $81,451, (3) $71,920.

Seinsheimer (Walter) Trust, Cincinnati, as of year beginning January 1, 1956: (1) $1,036,984 (L), (2) $8,113, (3) $2,250.

Stranahan Foundation, Toledo, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $4,988,635 (L), (2) $137,658, (3) $129,800.

Timken Foundation of Canton, Canton, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $8,113,127 (L), (2) $1,101,868, (3) $1,095,500.

Timken Roller Bearing Co. Charitable Trust, Canton, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $2,035,393 (L), (2) $299,940, (3) $297,450.

Wade (Ellen Garretson) Memorial Fund, Cleveland, as of December 31, 1956: (1) $2,260,234 (L), (2) $259,281, (3) $247,441.

Wagnalls Memorial, Lithopolis, as of December 31, 1956: (1) $3,518,313 (L), (2) $61,976, (3) $32,664.

Wean (the Raymond John) Foundation, Warren, as of December 31, 1956: (1) $2,430,307 (L), (2) $122,882, (3) $120,121.

Wehrle Foundation, Newark, as of December 31, 1956: (1) $3,734,225 (L), (2) $580,713, (3) $543,586.

White (Thomas H.) Charitable Trust, Cleveland, as of June 30, 1959: (1) $3,481,423 (M), (2) $39,093, (3) $37,513.

Willson (the Alfred L.) Charitable Foundation, Columbus, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $3,546,444 (M), (2) $80,159, (3) $75,529.

Youngstown Foundation, Youngstown, as of December 31, 1957: (1) $1,600,000 (L), (3) $92,500.

OKLAHOMA

Alexander Memorial Fund, Tulsa, as of October 31, 1957: (1) $1,493,022 (L), (2) $109,345, (3) $52,871.

Broadhurst Foundation, Tulsa, as of December 31, 1956: (1) $2,233,637 (L), (2) $50,930, (3) $38,171.

Kirkpatrick Foundation, Inc., Oklahoma City, as of April 30, 1957: (1) $1,145,563 (L), (2) (1958) $45,382, (3) $41,609.

Mabee (The J. E. and L. E.) Foundation, Inc., Tulsa, as of August 31, 1959: (1) $10,762,000 (L), (2) $1,750,522, (3) $1,747,055.

McMahon Foundation, Lawton, as of March 31, 1959: (1) $3,033,130 (L), (2) $180,390, (3) $160,373.

Noble (The Samuel Roberts) Foundation, Inc., Ardmore, as of October 31, 1957: (1) $15,767,324 (L), (2) $818,482.

Phillips (The Frank) Foundation, Inc., Bartlesville, as of December 31, 1957: (1) $7,604,196 (L), (2) $197,744, (3) $179,590.

Warren (The William K.) Foundation, Tulsa, as of December 31, 1956: (1) Not reported; accumulated income $3,940,148, (2) $825,782, (3) $482,267.

Young (The R. A.) Foundation, Oklahoma City, as of November 30, 1957: (1) $1,000,788 (L), (2) $1,857, (3) $1,025.

Brown (The E. C.) Trust, Portland, as of June 30, 1959: (1) $1,045,037 (L), (2) $35,626, (3) $27,616.

Collins Foundation, Portland, as of December 31, 1957: (1) $1,884,462 (L), (2) $116,031, (3) $111,300.

PENNSYLVANIA

Alcoa Foundation, Pittsburgh, as of December 31, 1956: (1) $14,330,222 (L), (2) $743,949, (3) $730,347.

American Foundation, Inc., Philadelphia, as of April 30, 1955: (1) $5,800,000 (L), (2) $170,000.

American Philosophical Society, Philadelphia, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $10,892,960 (L), (2) $613,813, (3) $251,950.

Annenberg Fund, Inc., Philadelphia, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $1,416,895 (L), (2) $93,917, (3) $92,499.

Annenberg (The M. L.) Foundation, Philadelphia, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $1,666,038 (L), (2) $574,303, (3) $573,704.

Beatty (Helen D. Groome) Trust, Philadelphia, as of December 31, 1957: (1) $1,925,123 (M), (2) $71,462, (3) $59,000.

Benedum (Claude Worthington) Foundation, Pittsburgh, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $12,984,108 (M), (2) $401,129, (3) $393,460.

Board of Directors of City Trusts, City of Philadelphia, Philadelphia, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $76,690,760 (L) (excluding value of real estate), (2) $4,271,989, (3) $3,901,064.

Bok (The Mary Louise Curtis) Foundation, Philadelphia, as of May 31, 1959: (1) $14,082,814 (L), (2) $404,695, (3) $366,100.

Buhl Foundation, Pittsburgh, as of June 30, 1959: (1) $16,866,512 (M), (2) $569,871, (3) $358,397.

Cairncrest Foundation, Bryn Athyn, as of April 30, 1958: (1) $2,067,386 (L), (2) $85,200, (3) $84,855.

Carnegie Hero Fund Commission, Pittsburgh, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $10,137,320 (M), (2) $328,896, (3) $200,271.

Cassett (Louis N.) Foundation, Philadelphia, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $1,574,268 (M), (2) $62,966, (3) $62,452.

Coxe (The Sophia G.) Charitable Trust Fund, Philadelphia, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $1,010,517 (L), (2) $52,306, (3) $22,052 (and $17,156 for maintenance and operation of home).

Davis (The Arthur Vining) Foundation, Pittsburgh, as of December 31, 1957: (1) $3,627,440 (L), (2) $184,333, (3) $176,000.

Dolfinger-McMahon Foundation, Philadelphia, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $3,500,000 (M), (2) —, (3) $141,010.

Donner Foundation, Inc., Philadelphia, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $40,972,121 (M), (2) $1,453,320, (3) $1,350,729.

Elkin (The Lewis) Fund, Philadelphia, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $2,786,489 (M) (Oct. 15, 1959), (2) $109,057, (3) $103,272.

Falk (The Maurice and Laura) Foundation, Pittsburgh, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $17,083,434 (M), (2) $558,133, (3) $487,135.

Fels (Samuel S.) Fund, Philadelphia, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $19,191,358 (M), (2) $1,356,307. (3) $1,202,459.

Finley (J. B.) Trust, Pittsburgh, as of December 31, 1957: (1) $1,050,000 (M), (2) $27,150, (3) $16,000.

Food Fair Stores Foundation, Philadelphia, as of April 30, 1958: (1) $1,637,177 (L), (2) $177,160, all in grants.

Frick (Childs) Corp., Pittsburgh, as of December 31, 1956: (1) $2,385,647 (L), (2) $153,546, (3) $96,040.

Gibson (Addison H.) Foundation, Pittsburgh, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $3,299,696 (L), (2) $166,038, (3) $133,954.

Glencairn Foundation, Bryn Athyn, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $4,946,332 (L), (2) $177,905, (3) $175,935.

Greenfield (The Albert M.) Foundation, Philadelphia, as of August 31, 1959: (1) $2,236,000 (L), (2) $117,256, all in grants.

Heinz (Howard) Endowment, Pittsburgh, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $20,792,191 (M), (2) $653,130, (3) $618,904.

Hershey (The M. S.) Foundation, Hershey, as of April 30, 1959: (1) $1,329,959 (L), (2) $277,225, (3) $276,225.

Hillman Foundation, Inc., Pittsburgh, as of December 31, 1956: (1) $2,016,357 (L), (2) $136,334, (3) $135,000.

Hunt Foundation, Pittsburgh, as of December 31, 1956: (1) $2,374,835 (L), (2) $49,403, (3) $43,200.

Janssen (Henry) Foundation, Inc., Reading, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $2,407,028 (L), (2) $73,857, (3) $64,800.

Koppers Foundation, Pittsburgh, as of December 31, 1956: (1) $1,100,221 (L), (2) $204,497, (3) $200,878.

Laurel Foundation, Pittsburgh, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $1,618,569 (M), (2) $28,580, (3) $22,450.

Mack (J. S.) Foundation, McKeesport, as of December 31, 1956: (1) $2,098,242 (L), (2) $38,084, (3) $23,629.

McShain (John) Charities, Inc., Philadelphia, as of March 31, 1958: (1) $1,472,759 (L), (2) $94,761, (3) $92,290.

Mellon (The A. W.) Educational and Charitable Trust, Pittsburgh, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $43,571,273 (M), (2) $4,200,780, (3) $3,963,448.

Mellon (Richard King) Foundation, Pittsburgh, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $58,867,325 (M), (2) $2,987,497, (3) $2,903,300.

Moore (The Hugh) Fund, Easton, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $1,073,959 (M), (2) $77,702.

Murphy (G. C.) Company Foundation, McKeesport, as of December 31, 1956: (1) $1,029,708 (L), (2) $63,250 all in grants.

Pew Memorial Trust (formerly The Pew Memorial Foundation), Philadelphia, as of June 3, 1957: (1) $3,582,058 (L), (2) $725,500, (3) $700,500.

Philadelphia Foundation, Philadelphia, as of March 31, 1959: (1) $5,334,823 (M), (2) $204,361, (3) $200,057.

Pitcairn-Crabbe Foundation, Pittsburgh, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $2,996,080 (M), (2) $98,680, (3) $90,352.

Pitcairn (Theodore) Foundation, Bryn Athyn, as of April 30, 1958: (1) $1,405,102 (L), (2) $67,949, (3) $67,600.

Pittsburgh Foundation, Pittsburgh, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $6,869,860 (M), (2) $455,706, (3) $434,642.

Pittsburgh Plate Glass Foundation, Pittsburgh, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $13,135,312 (M), (2) $619,377, all grants.

Presser Foundation, Philadelphia, as of June 30, 1959: (1) $7,987,243 (L), (2) $277,212, (3) $102,816.

Rittenhouse Foundation, Philadelphia, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $1,282,240 (L), (2) $111,608, (3) $43,554.

Robinson Foundation, Pittsburgh, as of December 31, 1957: (1) $1,326,115 (M), (2) $42,164, (3) $42,150.

Rockwell Charitable Trust, Pittsburgh, as of December 31, 1956: (1) $1,745,199 (L), (2) $139,722, (3) $58,722.

Scaife (Sarah Mellon) Foundation, Pittsburgh, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $23,252,472 (M), (2) $2,835,232, (3) $2,792,645.

Scholler Foundation, Philadelphia, as of December 31, 1958, (1) $1,773,551 (L), (2) $51,383, (3) $49,883.

Scranton Area Foundation, Scranton, as of December 31, 1956: (1) $1,293,478 (L), (2) $63,969, (3) $60,550.

Seybert (Adam and Maria Sarah) Institution, Philadelphia, as of December 31, 1956: (1) $1,874,511 (L), (2) $110,948, (3) $105,234.

Smith Kline and French Foundation, Philadelphia, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $1,210,630 (L), (2) $706,117, (3) $706,110.

Thomson (the John Edgar) Foundation, Philadelphia, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $1,783,850 (L), (2) $82,306, (3) $48,823.

Trexler Foundation, Allentown, as of March 31, 1959: (1) $19,451,869 (M), (2) $527,065, (3) $439,737.

Ware Foundation, Philadelphia, as of December 31, 1956: (1) $1,374,823 (L), (2) $48,289, (3) $48,250.

Waterman (Phoebe) Foundation, Inc., Philadelphia, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $10,177,173 (L), (2) $182,106, (3) $164,900.

Westinghouse Educational Foundation, Pittsburgh, as of December 31, 1956: (1) $4,565,977 (L), (2) $869,426, (3) $869,101.

Westinghouse Electric Fund, Pittsburgh, as of December 31, 1956, (1) $1,251,929 (L), (2) $772,042, (3) $768,960.

Wurts (Henrietta Tower) Memorial, Philadelphia, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $1,000,000 (M), (2) $42,019, (3) $38,457.

Wyomissing Foundation, Inc., Reading, as of December 31, 1957, (1) $6,152,594 (M), (2) $140,497, (3) $136,630.

RHODE ISLAND

Harris (The Edward Harris and Abby Metcalf) Foundation, Providence, as of November 19, 1956: (1) $1,393,689 (M), (2) $45,568, (3) $33,025.

Harris (Emma G.) Foundation Fund, Providence, as of January 1, 1957: (1) $1,405,745 (L), (2) $42,672, (3) $30,350.

Howard (The George A. and Eliza Gardner) Foundation, Providence, as of December 31, 1959: (1) $1,170,000 (M), (2) $18,300, all in grants.

Rhode Island Foundation, Providence, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $2,809,824 (L), (2) $116,344, (3) $104,251.

SOUTH CAROLINA

Arkwright Foundation, Spartanburg, as of December 31, 1956: (1) $1,518,298 (L), (2) $47,567, (3) $44,899.

Daniel Foundation, Greenville, as of December 31, 1957: (1) $1,126,006 (L), (2) $85,-134, (3) $74,775.

Gregg-Graniteville Foundation, Inc., Graniteville, as of December 31, 1956: (1) $1,289,-267 (L), (2) $36,123, (3) $13,291.

Self Foundation, Greenwood, as of December 31, 1957: (1) $6,531,114 (L), (2) $399,019, (3) $291,140.

Spartanburg County Foundation, Spartanburg, as of December 31, 1959: (1) $1,502,745 (L), (2) none, (2) $34,819.

Springs Foundation, Inc., Lancaster, as of December 31, 1957: (1) $4,102,780 (L), (2) $221,168, (3) $205,225.

SOUTH DAKOTA

None.

TENNESSEE

Benwood Foundation, Inc., Chattanooga, as of December 31, 1957: (1) $9,839,296 (L), (2) $1,258,449, (3) $1,244,036.

Evans Foundation, Inc., Chattanooga, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $1,222,829 (M), (2) $6,204, (3) $6,000.

Gooch (The C. M.) Foundation, Memphis, as of June 30, 1957: (1) $1,224,854 (L), (2) $90,791, (3) $76,075.

Jarman Foundation, Nashville, as of December 31, 1956: (1) $1,184,333 (L) (2) $116,016 all in grants.

Southern Baptist Foundation, Nashville, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $4,277,196 (M), (2) $175,767, (3) $45,103.

TEXAS

Abercrombie (The J. S.) Foundation, Houston, as of December 31, 1957: (1) $1,-933,634 (L), (2) $43,365, (3) $18,000.

Amarillo Area Foundation, Inc., Amarillo, as of December 31, 1959: (1) $1,147,337 (L) (2) $14,727, (3) $12,763.

Anderson (M.D.) Foundation, Houston, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $37,443,237 (M), (2) $1,893,976, (3) $1,656,730.

Braniff Foundation, Dallas, as of December 31, 1957: (1) $3,915,661 (L), (2) $252,695, (3) $251,700.

Brown Foundation, Inc., Houston, as of June 30, 1957: (1) $1,181,301 (L), (2) $127,-363, (3) $127,350.

Brown (T. J.) and C. A. Lupton Foundation, Inc., Fort Worth, as of December 31, 1957: (1) $2,011,466 (L), (2) $138,235, (3) $122,550.

Buchanan (The William) Foundation, Inc., Texarkana, as of December 31, 1956: (1) $1,-692,184 (L), (2) $1,033,204, (3) $1,007,823.

Caldwell (D. K.) Foundation, Tyler, as of June 30, 1958: (1) $2,186,312 (L), (2) $29,033, (3) $21,056.

Carter (Amon G.) Foundation, Fort Worth, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $16,041,066 (L), (2) $1,532,422, (3) $1,101,993.

Clark Foundation, Dallas, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $1,564,926 (L), (2) none, (3) $50,380.

Clayton Foundation for Research, Houston, as of January 1, 1958: (1) $9,084,668 (L), (2) $270,783, (3) $208,610.

Clayton Fund, Houston, as of December 31, 1957: (1) $1,324,047 (L), (2) $35,275 all in grants.

Cooper Foundation, (Also known as The Madison Alexander Cooper and Martha Roane Cooper Foundation), Waco, as of March 31, 1959: (1) $3,148,426 (L), (2) $167,096, (3) $112,550.

Cullen Foundation, Houston, as of December 31, 1956: (1) $1,373,089 (L), (2) $388,-718, (3) $154,052.

Dallas Foundation, Dallas, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $1,500,000 (L), (2) none, (3) $25,500.

Davis (Hale) Foundation, Dallas, as of year beginning August 1, 1958; (1) $1,405,-975 (L), (2) $170,033 all in grants.

DeGolyer Foundation, Dallas, as of November 30, 1958: (1) $1,465,846 (31 August 1959) (M), (2) $2,050, (3) $1,000.

Dougherty (The James R.) Jr. Foundation, Beeville, as of November 30, 1957: (1) $1,-217,510 (L), (2) $142,328.

Farish Fund, Houston, as of June, 30, 1957: (1) $1,934,302 (L), (2) $111,052, (3) $111,000.

Favrot Fund, Houston, as of May 31, 1957: (1) $1,273,112 (L), (2) $38,223, (3) $35,350.

Fleming Foundation, Fort Worth, as of November 30, 1956: (1) $3,663,285 (L), (2) $311,699, (3) $282,174.

Fohs Foundation, Houston, as of December 31, 1957: (1) $1,500,000 (M), (2) $80,792, (3) $73,454.

Fondren Foundation, Houston, as of October 31, 1957: (1) $2,981,378 (L), (2) $543,466, (3) $543,000.

Hoblitzelle Foundation, Dallas, as of April 30, 1959: (1) $8,088,199 (L), (2) $320,408, (3) $267,159.

Hogg Foundation for Mental Health (formerly the Hogg Foundation for Mental Hygiene), Austin, as of August 31, 1959: (1) $6,500,000 (L), (2) $326,000, (3) $274,864.

Houston Endowment, Inc., Houston, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $35,108,823 (L), (2) $3,287,336, (3) $2,342,328.

Kempner (Harris and Eliza) Fund, Galveston, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $1,525,-411 (L), (2) $98,229, (3) $92,018.

LeTourneau Foundation, Longview, as of May 31, 1958: (1) $3,951,135 (L), (2) $371,-857, (3) $356,000.

Luling Foundation, Luling, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $1,057,121 (L), (2) $16,496, (3) none.

McAshan Educational and Charitable Trust, Houston, as of December 31, 1957: (1) $1,602,117, (2) $178,622 (all in grants).

McManis Mission Fund, Houston, as of December 31, 1957: (1) $1,204,384 (L), (2) $140,073, (3) $133,178.

McMillan (Bruce) Junior Foundation, Overton, as of June 30, 1957: (1) $1,989,-153 (L), (2) $125,044, (3) $30,515.

Navarro Community Foundation, Corsicana, as of December 31, 1957: (1) $1,403,-922 (L), (2) $43,903, (3) $27,203.

Oldham Little Church Foundation, Houston, as of September 30, 1958: (1) $3,114,-596 (L), (2) $156,788, (3) $118,158.

Peyton (The Mary L.) Foundation, El Paso, as of December 31, 1957: (1) $1,710,-336 (L), (2) $32,142, (3) $23,938.

Piper (Minnie Stevens) Foundation, San Antonio, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $4,-586,746 (M), (2) $135,193, (3) $48,753 (grants), $73,053 (student loans).

Rockwell Fund, Inc., Houston, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $2,878,149 (L), (2) $131,318, (3) $130,823.

Scanlan Foundation, Houston, as of December 31, 1956: (1) $2,005,517 (L), (2) $177,889, (3) $105,819.

Schlumberger Foundation, Houston, as of March 31, 1959: (1) $3,929,507 (M), (2) $172,233, (3) $72,650.

Southwestern Medical Foundation, Inc., Dallas, as of December 31, 1959: (1) $3,357,-710 (M), (2) $229,081, (3) $181,262.

Strake Foundation, (Formerly Strake Charities Foundation), Houston, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $1,537,916 (L), (2) $71,000, (3) $67,728.

Texas Educational Association, Fort Worth, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $2,-749,494 (L), (2) $170,900, (3) $146,968.

Welch (The Robert A.) Foundation, Houston, as of August 31, 1959: (1) $50,-698,451 (M), (2) $968,946, (3) $628,853.

West Foundation, Houston, as of December 31, 1956: (1) $2,240,827 (L), (2) $170,-686, (3) $157,600.

UTAH

None.

VERMONT

None.

VIRGIN ISLANDS

None.

VIRGINIA

Camp Foundation, Franklin, as of December 31, 1957: (1) $1,843,527 (L), (2) $60,326, (3) $56,050.

Keesee (Charles B.) Educational Fund, Inc., Martinsville, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $2,378,466 (L), (2) $96,454 (1957), (3) $82,150.

Norfolk Foundation, Norfolk, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $1,272,769 (L), (2) $44,-231, (3) $44,119.

Public Welfare Foundation, Inc., Washington, as of October 31, 1958: (1) $5,163,635 (L), (2) $372,523, (3) $287,023.

WASHINGTON

Boeing Airplane Co. Charitable Trust, Seattle, as of December 31, 1957: (1) $1,067,-718 (L), (2) $458,354, (3) $455,844.

Comstock Foundation, Spokane, as of December 31, 1957: (1) $2,595,108 (L), (2) $43,-285, (3) $23,682.

Medina Foundation, Seattle, as of December 31, 1957: (1) $1,195,170 (L), (2) $109,261, (3) $104,225.

Weyerhaeuser Co. Foundation (formerly Weyerhaeuser Timber Foundation), Tacoma, as of November 30, 1958: (1) $2,432,358 (L), (2) $186,304, (3) $118,168.

WEST VIRGINIA

None.

WISCONSIN

Allen-Bradley Foundation, Inc. (formerly Lynde-Bradley Foundation, Inc.), Milwaukee, as of July 31, 1959: (1) $3,358,551 (L), (2) $344,869, (3) $338,032.

Allis Chalmers Foundation, Inc., West Allis, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $2,860,991 (L), (2) $531,233, (3) $530,929.

Beloit Foundation, Inc., Beloit, as of December 31, 1957: (1) $1,417,014 (M), (2) $70,748, (3) $60,967.

Cudahy (Patrick and Anna M.) Fund, Milwaukee, as of December 31, 1956: (1) $2,-940,934 (L), (2) $30,803, (3) $30,706.

de Rance' Inc., Milwaukee, as of December 31, 1956: (1) $5,230,815 (L), (2) $246,110, (3) $246.000.

Janesville Foundation, Inc., Janesville, as of February 28, 1959: (1) $1,306,627 (M), (2) $43,295, (3) $35,000.

Johnson Foundation, Racine, as of June 30, 1959: (1) $1,230,951 (L), (2) $681,726, (3) $490,075.

Kohler Foundation, Inc., Kohler, as of December 31, 1956: (1) $1,118,916 (L), (2) $186,809, (3) $186,520.

Milwaukee Foundation, Milwaukee, as of December 31, 1956: (1) $1,115,111 (M), (2) $30,148, (3) $26,090.

Nekoosa-Edwards Foundation, Inc. (formerly Nepco Foundation), Port Edwards, as of December 31, 1958: (1) $1,732,393 (L), (2) $79,889, (3) $60,055.

Oshkosh Foundation, Oshkosh, as of March 1, 1959: (1) $1,180,311 (M), (2) nothing, (3) $19,609.

Rennebohm (The Oscar) Foundation, Inc., Madison, as of December 31, 1956: (1) $1,787,153 (L), (2) $32,762, (3) $12,525.

Rutledge (Edward) Charity, Chippewa Falls, as of May 31, 1957: (1) $1,135,406 (L), (2) $60,374, (3) $33,510.

Schlitz Foundation, Inc., Milwaukee, as of December 31, 1956: (1) $2,277,429 (L), (2) $190,199, (3) $175,908.

WYOMING

Whitney Benefits, Sheridan, as of December 31, 1956: (1) $2,083,371 (M), (2) $25,038, (3) $15,000.

THE GENEVA CONFERENCE, 1954 AND 1961

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FEIGHAN] is recognized for 45 minutes.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, on May 12, 1961 we will again confer with the Communist bloc on a cease-fire in Laos. It would be well to review the previous Geneva conference and see what lessons history has taught us.

On April 26, 1954, the Geneva Conference met to discuss the possibility of restoring peace in Indochina.

During July 1954, agreements of cessation of hostilities in Indochina were issued by the Conference.

By mid-August 1954 protestations of violations of these agreements by the Communists began to pour into the International Central Commission.

The President of the United States is going to deal with the same vicious cunning enemy. I believe he has the courage and intelligence to confront them with the facts of their past actions and face up to their usual tactics and methods employed in past conferences.

In addition the President will be faced with the same advisers and policymakers in the Department of State, who led us into this present situation. He should be careful of such advice which when followed ends up in Communist advances. Examples of this thinking are, I quote "we must enter the conference in a spirit of negotiation and not appear intransigent and we should not make strident statements such as the U.S.S.R., Communist China and the Vietminh are coconspirators" unquote. Above all he should not fall into the trap, "that we must consider the sensitivities of our Allies at all costs."

I am sure the President will not let the same people lead us into the same situation with the same end results—more Communist doubletalk, broken agreements and the loss of another country to the Communists.

I wish, therefore to review the agreements of the Geneva Conference of 1954 and especially the long record of Communist truce violations.

VIETMINH VIOLATIONS OF THE AGREEMENTS ON CESSATION OF HOSTILITIES—INDOCHINA

Reasons: The Vietminh has given clear evidence that its activities are a part of Communist world strategy rather than a local Vietnamese movement. The death of Stalin gave Vietminh leaders a perfect opportunity to reassert openly both their allegiance to international Communism and their aim of establishing an integrated Communist regime based on that of the Soviet Union and the Peiping regime.

In an article in "The People's Army," March 1953, General Vo Nguyen Giap, Defense Minister of the Vietminh, quoted President Ho Chi Minh's oath "always to be strictly bound to the Soviet Union and to follow exactly the doctrines of Marx, Engels, Lenin, and Stalin." This was only one of many statements made by top party officials. Viewed in the light of such utterances, and the experiences in China and Korea, the Vietminh can be expected to comply with the tenets of international communism of which cease-fire violations are a part.

History: In Communist doctrine a truce or cease-fire is a means to an end, not the ultimate objective. Therefore, the Communists will violate a cease-fire whenever it appears advantageous to do so. As in China during the political negotiations in 1946 the cease-fire was—and still is—a means of gaining a respite. The respite gives the Communists an opportunity to strengthen their forces or increase subversive activity while their opponent abides by the "cease-fire rules," relaxes his guard, and loses whatever advantage he may have possessed. The period of truce is accompanied by a propaganda barrage of "peace" or "coexistence," while a gradual build-up of Communist forces takes place. Subversive cadres infiltrate non-Communist areas and set up their Communist administrations either overtly or covertly.

The overall program for southeast Asia was formalized in Peiping 11 years ago—1949. At that time and in that place the World Federation of Trade Unions, the WFTU which organizes congresses, meetings and training courses has provided an opportunity for meetings of Communists and sympathizers all over the world. At the meetings they discuss the most effective methods of local application of the directives laid down by the central committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union sponsored what was termed a Trade Union Conference of Asian and Australasian countries. Actually, it was a meeting to set up the usual program of guerrilla warfare and terrorist activity, subversive "united front" arrangements, labor strife and intensive pro-Communist and antidemocratic propaganda.

To maintain a facade of peaceful intentions, the Communists depend largely on infiltration and subversion.

In South Vietnam all conditions for subversion are favorable; in addition the population is faced with constant terror and a powerful military threat from the north.

In such fertile ground the Communists are busy at one of their favorite tasks, that of absorbing and disrupting by politico-subversive methods the functions of a government. Contrary to the provisions and spirit of the truce agreement they have been establishing Communist forms of government in areas under control of the South Vietnam Government, and thus are threatening existence of that government.

POLITICO-SUBVERSIVE CADRES AND GUERRILLA OPERATIONS

Although much publicity has been given to guerrilla operations, the main threat is in the politico-subversive cadres which establish the underground movements. In Laos, Cambodia and South Vietnam, these cadres are guided and controlled by the Lao Dong Labor Party—Communist Party—while the guerrillas are under the control of the Defense Ministry. Thus the guerrillas receive orders from the political cadres whom they support. It has been estimated that 4,000 of these political workers infiltrated South Vietnam and spread throughout the country.

In South Vietnam the combined politico-guerrilla operations of the Viet Minh have three primary missions:

First. Establishment of Communist local governmental control machinery in areas nominally under non-Communist control. This technique enables the Communists to establish "base areas" in support of military operations long before the actual consolidation of the "Revolutionary" government.

Second. Support of military operations.

Third. Intelligence.

The steps in the process of forming Communist underground governments are:

Politico-subversive cadres, organized with great care and detail, with armed (guerrilla) support are sent into the area to establish provincial, county and city governments. Governmental functions are set up. On paper these functions, listed below, give an appearance of benevolence and efficiency but in practice show up the duplicity and sham of the Vietminh, the illusory nature of the benefits they promise, ending in the final subjugation of the population for the benefit of the state.

PROVISIONAL PEOPLE'S COMMITTEE (UNDERGROUND)

Section and duties:

First. Staff member guidance: Selects and recommends persons for appointment in provisional people's committee.

Second. Confidential: Processes important documents; inspects districts.

Third. Finance: Taxes, records government property and issues licenses.

Fourth. Labor: Handles pensions, insurance planning; settles labor disputes, improves conditions, conscripts labor.

Fifth. Health: Inspects facilities; distributes relief planning of medical supplies and sanitation.

Sixth. Purchasing: Purchases monopoly goods for resale to public.

Seventh. Education: Establishes primary level schools; selects, appoints, discharges teachers; inspects schools.

Eighth. Planning: Compiles and maintains statistics and records.

Ninth. Food administration: Maintains food rationing system.

Tenth. Agriculture production: Handles agriculture affairs, provides aid to farmers, taxes farm products.

Eleventh. Livestock production: Improves, immunizes livestock; grants permission for slaughtering.

Twelfth. Propaganda: Explains government policies, conducts indoctrination, propaganda, and agitation.

Thirteenth. Forestry: Maintains conservation of forest.

Fourteenth. Road and building: Maintains road and buildings, community planning.

Fifteenth. General affairs: Miscellaneous affairs not covered in other sections.

Once the above functions take some semblance of order, the Communists immediately begin to establish training courses for all new members, they found "liberation schools" to indoctrinate the population, organize party programs and newspapers for propaganda purposes. While "investigating" the problem of land distribution, the Communists actually start distribution, a favorite Communist tactic, in order to secure popular support. The peasant who yearns to own land is unaware that upon the completion of the communization process he will neither own the land nor the fruits of his own work.

INTERNATIONAL CONTROL COMMISSIONS AND THEIR PROBLEMS

A control commission can only be effective if both sides act in good faith. In Indochina, through its many violations the Vietminh has flaunted the authority of the commissions. It has substantially increased the capabilities of its regular army in North Vietnam and has retained a significant capability for political and paramilitary operations in South Vietnam, Cambodia and Laos. The Vietminh has:

First. Augmented the material strength of its armed forces by shipments of military equipment from Communist China;

Second. Failed to evacuate all military personnel from South Vietnam and Cambodia;

Third. Consistently sought to consolidate administrative and political authority in areas under the de jure authority of the Governments of South Vietnam and Laos;

Fourth. Failed to permit the free movement of refugees; and

Fifth. Failed to observe the cease-fire in Laos.

The Commissions are working under handicaps which are directly due to the provisions of the accord. This was true in China during the cease-fire negotiations; it was true in Korea and now in Indochina. The composition of the Commissions, which includes Communists, makes unanimous agreement almost impossible on certain questions. In China, Korea, and Indochina, the Commissions have the choice of uncritical acceptance of assurances given by the Communists or the almost impossible task of carrying out an effective investigation in an atmosphere of terror and deceit.

II. COMMUNIST REACTION TO EXPOSURE OF CEASE-FIRE VIOLATIONS

The Communists will continue to resort to their usual technique of using a highly organized propaganda machine to accuse others, especially the United States, of the type of violations of which they are guilty. This technique has been successful in the past in propagandizing people under their control as well as in neutral countries. Any confusion works to the benefit of the Communists since they violate the cease-fire deliberately for strategic reasons.

III. REASONS FOR COMMUNIST VIOLATIONS

The Communists' aim is a united Indochina, including Laos, Cambodia, North and South Vietnam, under a Communist government. In a public statement on the ninth anniversary of the Vietminh independence, Ho Chi Minh declared that "victory will be ours." Throughout the speech the goal of unity, independence and democracy was repeatedly emphasized. He reiterated anti-United States and anticolonial sentiments and appealed for united opposition. The speech indicates the Vietminh determination to gain control of all Indochina. He implied that this control will be achieved by political action, but that the Vietminh intends to regroup their army and hold it in readiness for any eventuality.

The Vietminh efforts will continue to take the following shape in the three associated states:

First. Laos: Expanded Pathet Lao Communist forces will continue to consolidate their control over northern Laos and resume attacks on the Lao national army units when it is to their advantage. These will be designed to enlist popular support by chalking up Pathet Lao successes.

Second. Vietnam: The Vietminh will expand underground in the south using their politico-subversive and terror techniques. They will be aimed at having de facto control pass to Ho Chi Minh without too much overt disturbance. If the Communists fail, a swift military attack may be attempted. On December 19, 1946, Ho Chi Minh openly broke the then cease-fire agreement with massacres in Hanoi, Tourane, and Hue.

Third. Cambodia: The Vietminh foothold is the weakest in this area, especially since the strong and successful stand by the Cambodians at Geneva against a Vietminh regrouping area inside the state. But once the Communists control all Vietnam and Laos, Cambodia may be powerless to resist.

IV. CONCLUSION

The International Control Commission has been prevented by Communist delaying tactics and by collusion between the Polish delegation and the Vietminh from investigating and fixing responsibility for major Vietminh violations of the Geneva agreements. Violations may be expected to continue until such a time as the indigenous governments become considerably stronger, the Communists take over all of Indochina by politico-subversive methods or there is a resumption of hostilities.

VIOLATIONS OF AGREEMENTS (JULY 1954) ON CESSATION OF HOSTILITIES IN INDOCHINA

This annex on the violations of the agreements on cessation of hostilities in Vietnam, Laos, and Cambodia presents evidence of the premeditated pattern of the numerous violations committed by the Communists. Pertinent examples were chosen from the compilation of violations in order to illustrate how a cease-fire is one of the instruments of Communist policy. The main points of this Communist cease-fire policy are:

First. Strengthening and regrouping of military forces, articles 15, 17 and paragraphs 4, 12, Joint Conference Declaration—Vietnam; articles 4(c), 13(2), 15 and paragraphs 3, 4, 12, Joint Conference Declaration—Laos; paragraph 3, 4, 12, Joint Conference Declaration—Cambodia.

Second. Establishment of politico-subversive cadres or underground governments, articles 14(a), 14(b), 15—Vietnam; 4(c), 13(2)—Laos; article 4—Cambodia.

Third. Creating an atmosphere of fear and terror by reprisals and impeding refugee travel, articles 14(c), 14d and paragraph 8—Vietnam.

Fourth. Failure to exchange all prisoners of war and liberate political prisoners, article 21.

Article 4, Cambodia, deals with the withdrawal of the foreign armed forces and foreign military personnel from the territory of Cambodia.

Official estimates at the time of the cease-fire agreement held that the number of Vietminh regular and irregular forces in Cambodia totaled 8,000. The Vietminh informed the International Control Commission that 4,050 Vietminh regulars were to be evacuated from Cambodia by October 19, 1954. Only about 2,700 regulars were withdrawn. These evacuees carried a bare minimum of armament far below the actual strength of the units. The Vietminh have intentionally left behind substantial cadres and arms depots for subversive purposes and future armed dissidence.

In Battambang Province the Vietminh had announced an anticipated 450 evacuees; only 250 materialized.

The Khmer-Vietminh forces in Cambodia were not disarmed by the Vietminh by August 22, 1954, as specified in the cease-fire agreement.

Articles 4(c) and 13(2), Laos, deal with the routes for withdrawal of forces of the Vietnamese People's Volunteers in Laos from Lao territory which are to be fixed on the spot by the Joint Commission.

The Vietminh have utilized secret withdrawal routes to avoid detection of abducted Lao personnel. The specific charge against the Vietminh, laid before the plenary session of the International Control Commission on September 29, 1954, was the use of secret routes

in the transport of troops or transport of troops on stipulated routes without notification to the Commission of the exact time in order to avoid inspection.[1]

Articles 14 (a) and (b), Vietnam, state that the conduct of the civil administration in each regrouping zone shall be in the hands of the party whose forces are to be regrouped, and that after transfer and complete evacuation of troops the other party shall assume responsibility.

Provisional assembly areas: Most of the Vietminh areas south of the 17th parallel, that is, the provisional assembly areas for CA Mau, Xuyen Moc, and Plaine des Joncs, have been technically evacuated by Vietminh forces. Repeated and consistent reports reveal that Vietminh military-political cadres continue to retain de facto control of the local administration and to conduct activities designed to maintain the population under Communist control. In the Plaine des Joncs area alone, only an estimated 14,000 Vietminh evacuees have been withdrawn from an announced quota of 20,000.

Articles 14(c), Vietnam; 15, Laos; 6, Cambodia; declare that each party undertakes to refrain from any reprisals or discrimination against persons or organizations on account of their activities during the hostilities and to guarantee democratic liberties.

The Vietnamese Government has formally charged that on July 31, 1954, the Vietminh assassinated Le Van Qui, noncommissioned officer of the regional militia—Bao Chinh Quan—at Ngo Duong Huyen de An-Duong, Kien An Province, North Vietnam. Intellectuals and landowners were forced to wear military uniforms so their forced evacuation with Vietminh troops will go undetected.

Refugees from the Red River Delta asserted that some teachers who had chosen to stay within the Vietminh zones and had declared their loyalty to the Vietminh had, nevertheless, been arrested and thrown into cages for public exhibition. A Vietminh agent was carrying secret orders for the assassination of certain Vietnamese in the Phu Tien area prior to the withdrawal of the Vietminh forces. The marked men were those believed to be strongly anti-Vietminh and possibly aware that the Vietminh was leaving behind cells and arms cadres.

Article 14(d) and paragraph 8 of the Joint Conference Declaration, Vietnam, state that from the date of entry into force of the present agreement until the movement of troops is completed, any civilians residing in a district controlled by one party who wish to go and live in the zone assigned to the other party shall be permitted and helped to do so by the authorities in that district.

[1] The intention of the Pathet Lao Communists in Laos, according to a captured Vietminh document, is ostensibly to conform with the cease-fire agreement but actually to leave cells behind them as they withdraw; to take with them for training and indoctrination as many young Lao as possible; and to build up the Pathet Lao with the intention of ultimately taking over the country. (This document was dated in 1954.)

The Vietminh prevented evacuation of people from North Vietnam by:

First. Intimidation and force: Refugees encounter roadblocks where soldiers refuse them permission to pass, separate children from parents and arrest leaders of groups. Armed Vietminh junks patrol the coastal waters to prevent escape by sea, and departing boats are fired upon.

Second. Barring refugees from transportation: Almost all travel in the Tonkin Delta requires water transportation, but Vietminh officials control passenger boats, ferryboats, and bridges and prevent their use by refugees. Trucks, buses, and bicycle carts are forbidden to carry refugees.

Third. Economic penalties: A would-be refugee is not allowed to sell his property but must forfeit all except that which he can carry.

Article 15, Vietnam, states that there shall take place a disengagement of the combatants, transfer of military forces, equipment and supplies of each party. The two parties shall permit no destruction or sabotage. They shall permit no interference in local administration.

The Vietnamese Government has cited truce-violation incidents such as:

First. The clandestine reinforcement of troops in South Vietnam. Secretary of State Dean Rusk on May 4, 1961, set these troops at a strength of 12,000.

Second. The incitation of popular demonstrations against the authority of the Vietnamese Government and Army.

Third. The organization of guerrilla units below the 17th parallel.

Fourth. The propagation of pro-Vietminh propaganda below the 17th parallel.

Article 17, Vietnam, declares that the introduction into Vietnam of any reinforcements in the form of all types of arms, munitions and other war material is prohibited.

The Joint Sino-Soviet-DRV Supply and Service Command in Nanning, China, has moved large quantities of prohibited war material such as heavy artillery and Soviet rocket launchers to North Vietnam. Since the cease-fire, artillery, including 105 mm. cannon, was sent across the Sino-Vietnamese border. Material received since the armistice represents a substantial increase in the inventory of Vietminh artillery pieces, bazookas and mortars. New items in Vietminh hands include tanks and 88 mm. antiaircraft weapons. Aside from these, military-type aircraft have been sighted at Hanoi.

The Vietminh Regular Forces have been expanded. Reorganization of their forces indicates that up to nine new divisions have been formed, including three artillery divisions and six infantry divisions. These increases are the result of transfers from regional and popular forces. In addition, support elements of existing units are being augmented to include a larger proportion of organic artillery, heavy mortar, and recoilless gun components at divisional and regimental level. The expansion and reinforcement of unit firepower was made possible by continuing large shipments of Chinese Communist supplies.

Articles 21, Vietnam; 16, Laos; 8, Cambodia; deal with the liberation and repatriation of all prisoners of war and civilian internees within 30 days.

The Vietnamese Government has charged that the Vietminh had failed to liberate prisoners of war and civilian internees.

Officials in Saigon have estimated that at the end of hostilities, 55,000 members of the French Union forces were unaccounted for. Of this number 25,000 were of Vietnamese nationality.

The Vietminh returned only 3,795 of the Vietnamese Army personnel captured by them during the war. Although some of the men not officially returned are either still interned as politically dangerous or have been clandestinely released after indoctrination, the major portion has been removed from the category of prisoners of war and integrated into the Vietminh forces.

Hundreds of legionnaires and north Africans were returned to Europe and north Africa via Communist China and the Soviet Union. This method of releasing European POW's to their home country is a prominent aspect of Vietminh POW policies.

Another favorite Communist practice is to sentence large numbers of prisoners of war as war criminals.

Paragraphs 3 and 12 of the Joint Conference Declaration, Laos, state that in their relations with Cambodia, Laos, and Vietnam, the Vietminh will respect the sovereignty, independence and territorial integrity of the above-mentioned states.

As early as August 27, 1954, the Lao Government protested to the Joint Armistice Commission for Laos that Vietminh units in Laos were forcing young men in the villages to join Vietminh forces and move to northern Laos for military training.

Official Laos reports on October 17, 1954, asserted that through threats, intimidation and false promises, the Vietminh had forcibly taken away between 4,000 and 5,000 persons.

As early as January 31, 1955, Vietminh elements crossed the Lao border into Laos to reinforce the Pathet Lao—Communist.

In addition to the above violations of which only a few examples are listed, there have been for 7 years violations of articles 10, 11, and 15c—attacks against Vietnamese Army and militia units—violations of articles 1, 2a, 4d and 19—attacks against Laos National Army units—violations of articles 2 and 4(4)—cessation of hostilities in Cambodia—and violation of article 5—demobilization of Khmer resistance forces.

I hope that we will not let history repeat itself, because if we do, it will mean the loss of Laos, South Vietnam, and then all of southeast Asia.

COMMANDER SHEPARD'S FLIGHT AND THE SPACE PROGRAM

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I want to especially congratulate all the members of the Committee on Science and Astronautics for the fine job which has been done—on both sides of the aisle—in this committee.

I have taken this time to say a few words about the great event that has occurred in the space program over the weekend. Comdr. Alan Shepard, who is from New England, is a real American. I talked to him before he made the pioneer flight down range from Cape Canaveral; I talked to him since. I have never seen a more typical American boy than is Alan Shepard of New England.

Mr. Speaker, I want to pay tribute at this time also to the leadership in the House for supporting this program of space development and for having the vision and the foresight to see a long way ahead what could be done and what would be the important thing in the development of space. We have had the support of the Speaker all the way through. Our majority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts, JOHN MCCORMACK, was chairman of the Select Committee on Astronautics and Outer Space 3 years ago. He and his committee wrote the legislation that laid the foundation for the great American space program. I want to say that the gentleman from Massachusetts was notably interested at that time in the space program and devoted hundreds of hours of personal effort to that end. Since then he has maintained a most active interest in the program under the permanent committee which has been set up by the House of Representatives. The gentleman from Oklahoma, Mr. CARL ALBERT, by the way, presented the resolution to create the permanent Committee on Science and Astronautics. Oklahoma has shown an active interest in the space program. On that committee we have had support from both sides of the aisle. While this country has done a good job, we have had before us the possibility of failure as well as the possibility of the success.

In this flight of Commander Shepard's, I think we have captured the imagination not only of the people of America, but also we have captured the imagination of the peoples of the world. We did one thing entirely different from the Soviets, we gave to the peoples of the world an opportunity to actually see a man go up into space 115 miles above the surface of the earth and the surface of the sea and go down range 302 miles. We gave hundreds of millions of the people of the world the opportunity to see this event unfold before their eyes. I think, therefore, that we have captured the imagination of the peoples of the world.

You ask, What is ahead of us in the space program? Of course, there should be other flights just like this, perhaps with a longer range and a higher trajectory than this flight. There may be two more of those, and then toward the end of the year there should be an orbital flight around the earth.

Of course, when you are dealing with tremendous speeds that go up to 25,000 and 30,000 miles per hour you are apt to have failures as well as successes; and I would in this hour of achievement and of a great success caution the people of the United States of America not to expect that everything that happens is going to be so wonderfully successful as has been Alan Shepard's flight down range from Cape Canaveral. We will have our disappointments, yes; we may have our failures also; but out of it all is coming a determination by the people of the United States of America to move on in the space program to overtake and leapfrog the Russians and get ahead of them in every respect, in every category, and then to develop space first for the security and preservation of the United States of America and free government; and then, second, for the use and benefit and comfort of mankind generally throughout the world.

THE HONORABLE OVERTON BROOKS OF LOUISIANA

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, I should like to take this opportunity to congratulate the previous speaker, the distinguished chairman of the House Committee on Science and Astronautics for his very fine statement, and for the leadership he has provided in the House of Representatives on this very important question. The new members of that committee have been greatly impressed by his leadership and understanding of the importance of space and the exploration of that new frontier. He is to be commended for his statement here this morning.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I should like to join in commending the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BROOKS], chairman of the House Committee on Science and Astronautics. He has certainly given his committee the type of leadership that has produced programs which today are bringing great glory to the entire United States, and I want to join in paying tribute to this committee and its chairman. Mr. BROOKS rightfully deserves the gratitude of all Americans who are today able to experience the pride of knowing that our Nation has successfully launched Commander Shepard into space. This great feat would not have been made possible without the legislation which Congressman BROOKS and his committee steared through the House.

May I also point out it is my sincere hope that the National Aeronautics and Space Administration will forward our scientific data on the successful flight of Commander Shepard to the Federacion Aeronautique Internationale in Paris as quickly as possible with a request that the United States be recognized as the first nation to scientifically support its claim of putting a man in space. The Soviet Union has made no scientific data available to support its claim of putting a man into space, and until the Soviet Union can give such scientific data to the world, we have the right to make the claim on behalf of Commander Shepard and the American people.

HAPPY BIRTHDAY, MR. TRUMAN

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BOGGS). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RANDALL] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Speaker, today I am grateful to have the privilege to join with my colleagues to say "Happy birthday" and to congratulate a great American and an esteemed friend, Harry Truman, on this his 77th birthday. It is a source of continuing pride and inspiration to me that I was so fortunate as to be sent to this Chamber by the good people of the same congressional district which gave to the Nation and to the world one of the greatest statesmen of the 20th century.

It will not be my intention today to once again call the roll on Harry Truman's brilliant accomplishments, which, of course, will grow with even more luster as history unfolds. Rather, I would like to express my deep admiration for the qualities of character and mind embodied in the personality of Harry Truman, which carried him to the heights of greatness as President of the United States and leader of the free world.

Above all else, Harry Truman as President revealed an extraordinary courage and an unusual capacity to rise to unprecedented challenges. He was catapulted into the Office of President with a very minimum of notice and under circumstances practically barren of any ordinary advantage. He came to the Presidency without the benefit of having been briefed on the processes and problems of the executive branch, without having in the Cabinet a single member who was personally devoted, and without knowing for any length of time the people to whom he would have to turn for counsel. The Roosevelt papers reveal that, during the 82 days that Harry Truman was Vice President, the President was not in Washington for the sum total of 30 days. The two men met by appointment only twice. Mr. Truman, himself, estimated that he saw the President only eight times during the year before his death and these meetings contributed only slightly to his preparation for the Presidency. Three weeks after Harry Truman took office, the "thousand-year Reich" surrendered, and 4 months later, Japan. Few men in our history have faced a greater challenge or graver responsibilities. Few men have made a more heroic response.

While Harry Truman on his own had all the hard decisions to make, his quality of courage dominated them all.

This mark of fortitude was demonstrated in his acceptance of the awesome responsibility for the use of the atom bomb; in his confrontation of Stalin at Potsdam; in the faith which carried him to victory in the 1948 campaign against all the predictions of press, prophets, pundits and polls; and in his unhesitating answer to the challenge in Korea, to enumerate but a few of his acts of faith and fortitude. From Harry Truman's burdens and the extraordinary courage he displayed in shouldering them, the great office of the U.S. Presidency gained added strength. Great leaders have various virtues in varying degrees, but the courage to accept responsibility and to act upon it belongs as much to Harry S. Truman as to any President our Nation has ever had.

It would have been impossible to find another man better qualified by virtue of his personal strength to embody and exemplify greatness of democracy of America. Harry Truman shared with Thomas Jefferson an instinctive understanding of the aspirations of the average human being. He did not have to learn how to communicate with the man in the street. Quite frequently as men grow, they grow away from their origins and the associations of their birth and youth. Not so with Harry Truman.

Our former President's belief in the ability of men, given a fair and unconfused choice, to make a wise choice led him to his conviction that all men, everywhere on earth, were worthy of freedom and capable of government. This faith, best expressed in point four of his inaugural address in 1949, became the cornerstone of an inspired humanitarian program which earned for Harry Truman and the United States the gratitude of freedom-seeking men in the far reaches of our planet.

Harry S. Truman's deep feeling for humanity added new dimensions to the Presidency. He was the first President to give this office an enduring peacetime global orientation. Because communism fought everywhere with every means, the Presidency too had to cast its nets wide. "I have been trying," Mr. Truman declared in 1950, "to mobilize the moral forces of the world—Catholics, Protestants, Jews, the Eastern Church, the Grand Lama of Tibet, the Indian Sanskrit moral code—I have been trying to mobilize all these people to the understanding that their welfare and the existence of decency and honor in the world depend on our working together, and not trying to cut each other's throats."

Truman's faith in his fellow men enabled him to provide leadership to a half dozen alliances around the globe. He became an important force in the United Nations, appearing before the U.N. General Assembly and proposing concrete programs for its sessions. He became a principal contributor on the Voice of America which beamed its message to many lands. And he provided succor to the aspirations for independence of Israel, Indonesia, Burma, among other countries.

For this great man, it must be a deep and abiding satisfaction on his 77th birthday to know he enjoys, as former President of the United States, the admiration and respect of the free world for the contributions he has made to the progress of freemen. And it must be a source of equal satisfaction to know that, for his courage and unfaltering devotion to the cause of democracy at home, for his faith and trust in all mankind, today he is one of America's best loved citizens.

I am sure that my colleagues on both sides of the aisle join me in saying, God bless you, Harry Truman, may you and your loved ones enjoy together many more years of health and happiness.

RUMANIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

Mr. WALLHAUSER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. BOLTON] may extend her remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, appropriate ceremonies were held throughout the Nation to mark the occasion of Rumanian Independence Day, May 10. In my own city of Cleveland, numerous friends of Rumania gathered in Carpatina Hall to observe this day, thus renewing historic ties of friendship with a freedom-loving people.

Every effort is being made by the Communist rulers to extinguish the spark of freedom from Eastern Europe. Public observance of Independence Day has been forbidden in Rumania, and celebrations have been shifted to the 9th of May, the anniversary of a Soviet victory.

Despite the dark years of Communist repression, the Rumanian people maintain their resolute courage and steadfast faith in freedom. While they have been under the heel of harsh totalitarianism for many years, they have never ceased in their profound love of liberty. We may be certain that this day will be commemorated in the hearts and minds of all Rumanians.

The city of Cleveland is proud to include many persons of Rumanian descent among its populace, and I am privileged to represent many of them in my constituency. They have contributed substantially to the richness of our community life, and are among our most responsible citizens.

On this anniversary of her independence day, let us unite in the prayer that independence will be restored to Rumania, and her people may again live in freedom and justice.

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Education and Labor and all subcommittees thereof may be permitted to sit during general debate this week.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. WALTER (at the request of Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania), from May 8 to May 22, on account of serving as the U.S. delegate to the meetings of the Intergovernmental Committee on European Immigration to Geneva, Switzerland.

Mr. INOUYE, from May 9 to and including May 11, 1961, on account of an official trip to Honolulu, Hawaii, with Vice President LYNDON JOHNSON.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. PATMAN, for 40 minutes, today and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter and tables.

Mr. FEIGHAN, for 45 minutes, today, and 15 minutes on Wednesday, May 10, 1961.

Mr. RANDALL, for 10 minutes, today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. GATHINGS in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. CRAMER.

Mr. KEOGH in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. BOGGS (at the request of Mr. McCORMACK).

(The following Member (at the request of Mr. WALLHAUSER) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. ALGER in three instances.

(The following Member (at the request of Mr. McCORMACK) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mrs. GRIFFITHS.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on May 4, 1961, present to the President, for his approval, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 1723. An act to amend the joint resolution providing for observance of the 175th anniversary of the Constitution.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 40 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, May 9, 1961, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

879. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary of Defense (Installations and

Logistics), transmitting a report for February 1961 on Army, Navy, and Air Force prime contract awards to small and other business firms, pursuant to section 10(d) of the Small Business Act, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

880. A letter from the Acting Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting the report of the Archivist of the United States on records proposed for disposal under the law; to the Committee on House Administration.

881. A letter from the Postmaster General, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to authorize the waiver of collection of certain erroneous payments made by the Federal Government to certain civilian and military personnel, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

882. A letter from the executive director, the American Society of International Law, transmitting the annual audit of the American Society of International Law for the period April 1, 1960, to March 30, 1961, pursuant to 64 Stat. 869; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. MILLS: Committee on Ways and Means. H.R. 4317. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 and incorporate therein provisions for the payment of annuities to widows and certain dependents of the judges of the Tax Court of the United States; without amendment (Rept. No. 361). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MILLS: Committee on Ways and Means. H.R. 4940. A bill relating to duty-free imports of Philippine tobacco; without amendment (Rept. No. 362). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BUCKLEY: Committee on Public Works. Report on defense highway needs (Rept. No. 363). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BUCKLEY: Committee on Public Works. Report on highway construction practices in Oklahoma (Rept. No. 364). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. COOLEY: Committee on Agriculture. S. 1372. An act to authorize the temporary release and reapportionment of pooled acreage allotments; with amendment (Rept. No. 365). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BARING:

H.R. 6873. A bill to establish the Great Basin National Park in Nevada, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana:

H.R. 6874. A bill to authorize appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for salaries and expenses, research and development, construction of facilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

By Mr. CELLER:

H.R. 6875. A bill to prohibit discrimination in employment because of race, color, religion, or national origin; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 6876. A bill to make the Commission on Civil Rights a permanent agency in the executive branch of the Government, to broaden the scope of the duties of the Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 6877. A bill to amend part III of the Civil Rights Act of 1957; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COLMER:

H.R. 6878. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to impose a duty on shrimps and to provide for duty-free entry of unprocessed shrimps annually in an amount equal to imports of shrimps in 1960; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H.R. 6879. A bill to amend the Civil Rights Act of 1957 to make the Commission on Civil Rights a permanent agency of the United States, to broaden the duties of the Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FASCELL:

H.R. 6880. A bill to provide for more effective participation in the Reserve components of the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 6881. A bill to encourage the establishment of voluntary pension plans by self-employed individuals; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. HANSEN:

H.R. 6882. A bill to provide for one additional Assistant Secretary of Labor in the Department of Labor; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. LANGEN:

H.R. 6883. A bill to amend section 610 of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 to prohibit the serving of alcoholic beverages to airline passengers while in flight; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. LOSER:

H.R. 6884. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that certain State and local employees who have elected (under the divided retirement system procedure) not to be covered under the old-age, survivors, and disability insurance program may have an additional opportunity to elect such coverage; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MACGREGOR:

H.R. 6885. A bill to amend the Agricultural Act of 1956 (70 Stat. 202) to provide donations of surplus food commodities to State and local penal institutions; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. PELLY:

H.R. 6886. A bill to repeal the cabaret tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. POWELL:

H.R. 6887. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, to give its protection to employees of certain large hotels, motels, restaurants, and laundries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. ROGERS of Florida:

H.R. 6888. A bill waiving the limitations of section 142 of title 28, United States Code, with respect to the holding of court at Fort Pierce, Fort Myers, and West Palm Beach, Fla.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. VINSON:

H.R. 6889. A bill to establish a Judge Advocate General's Corps in the Navy; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. CELLER:

H.R. 6890. A bill to provide for the desegregation of public schools, with all deliberate speed, including nationwide first-step compliance by 1963, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. COLMER:

H.R. 6891. A bill to require the expenditure of 75 percent of the funds expended for the conversion, alteration, and repair of naval vessels to be expended with private ship-repair yards; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 6892. A bill to amend the Saltonstall-Kennedy Act so as to establish an additional fund for fishery research programs and fisheries rehabilitation and development projects, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. KEARNS:

H.R. 6893. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Redevelopment Act of 1945 to provide for the preservation of the home of John Philip Sousa, and to protect the homes of residents and the businesses and goodwill of the small businessmen in the vicinity of the U.S. Capitol Building; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mrs. KEE:

H.R. 6894. A bill to provide for the establishment and administration of the Allegheny Parkway in the States of West Virginia and Kentucky and Maryland, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. CELLER:

H.J. Res. 403. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to abolish literacy test qualifications for electors in Federal elections; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.J. Res. 404. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to abolish tax and property qualifications for electors in Federal elections; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HERLONG:

H.J. Res. 405. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANGEN:

H. Con. Res. 297. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that the United States should not grant further tariff reductions in the present tariff negotiations under the provisions of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1958, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROGERS of Texas:

H. Res. 279. Resolution to create a select committee to investigate personnel and procedures in the Department of State of the United States; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to an international exposition in 1966; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of South Carolina, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to take positive steps immediately to alleviate the Communist threat in the Western Hemisphere; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BAKER:

H.R. 6895. A bill for the relief of James S. Cornett; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'NEILL:

H.R. 6896. A bill for the relief of Wong Ngook Yip; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PUCINSKI:

H.R. 6897. A bill for the relief of Maria Zofia Dworzecka; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. SULLIVAN:

H.R. 6898. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Maria Kulikowski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WALTER:

H.R. 6899. A bill for the relief of Youssif Barakat; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ANFUSO:

H.J. Res. 406. Joint resolution authorizing the President of the United States to present in the name of Congress a medal of honor to Comdr. Alan B. Shepard, Jr.; to the Committe on Armed Services.

By Mr. DEROUNIAN:

H.J. Res. 407. Joint resolution authorizing the President of the United States to present in the name of Congress a medal of honor to Comdr. Alan B. Shepard, Jr.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. FLOOD:

H.J. Res. 408. Joint resolution to authorize the Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration to present a medal to Comdr. Alan B. Shepard, Jr., U.S. Navy; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. JOHANSEN:

H.J. Res. 409. Joint resolution authorizing the President of the United States to present in the name of Congress a medal of honor to Comdr. Alan B. Shepard, Jr.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. ROGERS of Florida:

H.J. Res. 410. Joint resolution to authorize the Speaker of the House of Representatives to confer a medal on Alan Barlett Shepard, Jr., commander, U.S. Navy; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H. Res. 280. Resolution providing for sending the bill H.R. 1544 and accompanying papers to the Court of Claims; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

140. By Mr. COHELAN: Petition of Edward H. Brown and others opposing the wholesale stripping of natural growth of trees, bushes, etc., on levees in the delta area of California by U.S. engineers and State water resources board; to the Committee on Public Works.

141. By Mr. GIAIMO: Petition of 82 signers, 81 of whom are from the Third Congressional District of Connecticut, pertaining to President Kennedy's legislative program; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

142. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Charles W. Hancock, Jersey City, N.J., relative to a grievance relating to being denied equal rights under the law; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Results of a Poll of Citizens of the First District of Arkansas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. C. GATHINGS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 8, 1961

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, for the past 2 years it has been my custom, early in the session, to send questionnaires to the citizens of the First Arkansas District seeking their views on national problems and matters of current interest.

The tabulation of the latest poll has been completed and it is my wish to share with other Members the information contained in it. I would like to point out that the response to this effort was highly gratifying and the poll gives an excellent cross section of opinion in eastern Arkansas. Farmers, bankers, wage earners, housewives, and people in all walks of life favored me with their replies to these questions and—in a great number of cases—added to the response by writing detailed letters as to why they favored or did not favor certain questions raised. Nor was the tabulation confined to merely the questionnaires mailed from my office. Arkansas newspapers printed copies of the questionnaire which many people clipped, answered, and mailed to me. Area radio stations publicized the questions and cooperated in the effort. The interest in their Government and in the problems that face our Nation by Arkansas citizens has resulted in a definitive and a significant expression of opinion.

The poll results are as follows:

	Percent		
	Yes	No	No opinion
1. Do you endorse the proposal to increase minimum wages to $1.25 per hour?	20	77	3
2. Do you approve or disapprove the expansion of the public housing program?	45	41	14
3. Do you favor medical and health care for social security beneficiaries financed by increased social security taxes?	32	64	4
4. Do you favor Federal aid for education for school construction and teachers' salaries?	37	59	4
5. The Post Office Department has an annual deficit of more than $500,000,000. Do you favor increasing postal rates to eliminate it?	55	40	5
6. Do you believe we should pay as we go in the building of the Interstate Highway System instead of going further into debt even if an increase in taxes is necessary?	79	15	6
7. The Secretary of Agriculture believes in increasing the prices received by farmers through higher supports coupled with acreage controls to keep production in line with demand. Do you agree with him?	50	44	6
8. Do you approve a food stamp plan under which needy persons would be issued certificates to buy surplus foods through regular business channels?	54	36	10
9. Our Government has warned the Russians "Hands off the Congo." Do you approve or disapprove this U.S. policy even though serious consequences could result?	78	9	13
10. Do you favor the passage of a law establishing the Peace Corps on a permanent basis to enable Americans to assist in U.S. aid programs in underdeveloped countries?	47	32	21

Is Dictatorship America's Future?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 8, 1961

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, the continuing concentration of power in the hands of the Executive at the expense of the legislative branch of government is a threat no American should overlook or condone.

If a gasoline motor could run without a carburetor, it would advance the efficiency of that motor for the carburetor to be taken out.

What is the use of having a Congress, either/or, for that matter, a Constitution—if an administration persists in running without them?

That, in essence, is the revolution which is going on today.

The Central Intelligence Agency is spending hundreds of millions of taxpayers' dollars every year. How many Americans, how many Congressmen—elected by their fellow Americans—know what the CIA does do or does not do?

A costly organization which might well involve this Republic in global conflict, the so-called Peace Corps, is very much in existence. Did the elected Congress create this mid-20th century children's crusade? No. It was established by Executive order.

More recently, the area development bill's conference report, containing a financing clause which bypasses the legitimate action of the Appropriations Committee, was approved by the House. This back-door financing method is rapidly becoming the rule, rather than the exception.

Congress has already given up its constitutional controls over the tariff. It is being heavily pressured to relinquish its controls over appropriations by giving the President an item veto.

Secretary of Agriculture Freeman has proposed a bill which would relieve Congress of the need for ever acting again on important aspects of American

agriculture. This, in my opinion, is the first instance of a free man advocating a return to the slavery of the Dark Ages.

I serve notice that I will continue, that I will step up my fight on this insidious attempt to undermine and destroy Congress and the Constitution.

I speak for myself. I commit no other man.

Oh yes, there are still some individualists in Congress. But, as a current writer has so well put it, "The trouble with today's individualists is that they are getting harder and harder to tell apart."

I welcome others to join me in this conflict. Still, if need be, I will fight alone. I hope it will never come to be a one-man battle. Still—if it should be—I will be proud to fight my own "Algerian" counterrevolution.

Partisan Nominations Held Without Effect on Judicial Attitude

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 8, 1961

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, in the preliminary discussions which accompanied the recently passed bill increasing the number of judges in the U.S. courts, some commentators sought to make political capital from the fact that all of the appointments under this bill would be made by a Democratic administration.

The basis of this argument was that such appointments would necessarily be objectionable because they would be made under the auspices of a political party.

One of our colleagues the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MONAGAN], in a letter to the New York Times skillfully and effectively demolished this argument. I feel that the rebuttal which he made is important enough to be brought to wider attention than that of the readers of the letters column of the New York Times and I append Representative MONAGAN's letter herewith:

PARTISAN NOMINATIONS HELD WITHOUT EFFECT ON JUDICIAL ATTITUDE

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

When one considers the history of judicial appointments to the Federal bench nothing could be less founded in fact than Prof. Robert Dixon's contention in his recent letter that partisan nominations lead to judicial partiality.

Without going so far as to advocate purely political designations, one must conclude that a review of past nominations clearly demonstrates that there is little connection between the nominal political affiliation of an appointee and his approach to the legal questions with which he deals as a member of the judiciary.

Justice Black is perhaps the greatest example of the fallacy of this argument. When he was named to the bench his nomination was criticized as being a threat to civil liberties. A former member of the Klan, he was opposed on the grounds that he could not, because of his former associations, exercise impartiality in the consideration of constitutional cases in the field of civil rights.

ACCUSATION OF CONSERVATIVES

Yet today Hugo L. Black is the archprotector of civil rights, a Justice who is accused by some conservatives of desiring to strike down without discrimination all laws directed at the elimination of subversion and the restraint of freedom of expression.

Harlan L. Stone was Attorney General under President Coolidge and was named to the bench as a Republican. Yet many of his opinions—notably his dissent in the Agricultural Adjustment Administration case—rank as landmarks in the liberal approach to constitutional questions.

Earl Warren, a Republican Governor of California, and a candidate for Vice President on the Republican ticket, is the author of the liberal opinion in *Brown* v. *Board of Education*, a milestone in liberal opinion in the field of racial discrimination.

Oliver Wendell Holmes, Jr.—sounded out in advance by Theodore Roosevelt, and nominated as a Republican Justice—gravely disappointed the President who named him. In the National Securities case, he was described by the ebullient Chief Executive as being a judge "with a backbone like a banana" and went on to become a darling of the liberals and an outstanding proponent of freedom of legislative action in the field of social legislation.

CRITICISM OF LIBERALS

Felix Frankfurter, a leading critic of the course of the judicial process in the Sacco and Vanzetti case, is today criticized by some as being hypertechnical and overconservative in civil liberties and free speech cases which reach the Supreme Court.

From these examples, it can be clearly seen that there is little connection between a man's political affiliation or his prior station in life and the attitude he takes when, as a member of the Federal bench, he deals with questions of great import.

His prior party allegiance may qualify him for nomination under our system. But when he is a member of our great Federal Court, relieved of obligation and sworn to the impartial administration of justice, he usually deals with the matters which come before him on their merits and in what he considers to be the best interests of the country.

JOHN S. MONAGAN,
Member of Congress.
WASHINGTON, *March 27, 1961.*

Polish Constitution Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HALE BOGGS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 8, 1961

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, May 3 last week was the 170th anniversary of Poland's Constitution Day. It is celebrated each year as a national holiday to commemorate that date when the Polish Diet enacted a constitution to place the power of the nation in the hands of the people. Poland was a frontrunner among the nations of Europe in asserting the right of men to be free and to chart their own destinies; and although liberty has been wrenched from the Poles by Soviet Russia, the love of freedom—the desire to restore liberty to Poland—still lives in their hearts. Someday, Mr. Speaker, the will of the Polish people will prevail, and they will realize the true destiny of their country—which was sounded on May 3, 1791, with the passage of a constitution inspired by our Declaration of Independence and the French proclamation of the rights of man. Two years ago I visited Warsaw to attend the 48th annual Interparliamentary Union Conference, and I sensed then the fact that the Poles yearn again for freedom. If there is a weak link in the Soviet chain of satellite nations, I think Poland is it. The peoples of free Europe and of our own Nation join the Poles in holding forth the hope that they soon will enjoy liberty under a government truly responsible to the will of the people. It is because the torch of liberty is held so close to the hearts of the Polish people that I call upon my colleagues in the Congress to remember Polish Constitution Day and to cherish their hope for freedom.

Major Aspects of World Crises—The Challenge of Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, May 8, 1961

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, yesterday, I was privileged to review major aspects of world crises in an address over radio station WGN, Chicago.

I ask unanimous consent to have the text of the address printed in the RECORD.

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

EXCERPTS OF ADDRESS PREPARED FOR DELIVERY BY HON. ALEXANDER WILEY, REPUBLICAN, OF WISCONSIN, OVER RADIO STATION WGN, CHICAGO, ILL., MAY 7, 1961

Friends, the world—and we, as Americans—today are faced with serious issues which affect our progress, our survival, and the future of mankind.

The establishment of peace—or at least a climate in which differences among nations—can be accommodated or negotiated—still remains as the No. 1 challenge.

If this can be accomplished successfully, the world may progress to new, unparalleled heights of good living for all people.

If we fail, however, the erupting conflicts could well wreak catastrophe upon humanity.

In such tumultuous, complex times, then, the grave questions which require realistic answers include:

Can we stop the Reds without a global war; can we create machinery for resolving the great differences between East and West; can we encourage respect for, and adherence to, international law—not tolerate lawlessness, as now committed by the Communists?

Today, Mr. Khrushchev and his henchmen—now controlling about 1 billion people, or one-third of the earth's population—are throwing more manpower and resources into battle for attaining the ultimate goal of communism: that of world conquest.

What can we do about it?

First, as a leader of the free world, we have a great responsibility for providing not only

the military power, but also the political-economic-ideological leadership to combat the Red offensive.

Second, the free world alliances—NATO, SEATO, ANZUS—need to assume a greater role of leadership in their areas of the world.

This includes:

Creating military forces adequate to combat Communist penetrations by force; developing more effective programs to meet the nonmilitary needs of the people—particularly the less-developed have-nots.

Third, we need to take a new analytical look at the role of the United Nations in world affairs.

This would involve the following:

1. Providing a United Nations military force to more effectively meet obligations in troubled areas.

2. Take measures to assure that the members meet their financial and other obligations—not shove off more of the burden on Uncle Sam.

3. Stop the Communists from using the U.N. as an international forum for propaganda.

Time after time, the United States and other non-Communist nations find themselves—unjustly, in many cases—as defendants against false and irresponsible charges by the Reds.

This should be stopped.

Unless we fight back more effectively, however, we can expect to fail—in the future, as in the past—to win battles in the court of world opinion.

NEEDED: GREATER NATIONAL UNITY

Now, how can we, as individual citizens, best face these challenges?

At this time in history, we need greatness, unity, dedication, and leadership and followership, to win the global battle against communism—as well as to fulfill the growing domestic, peaceful needs of a fast-expanding population.

In these critical days, there is no time for:

Unwarranted political sniping; headline seeking, at the cost of national prestige or policy; for defeatism or passitivity; or isolation or disillusion.

Rather, this is a time for stiffening our backbone, for reinvigorating the moral and spiritual, as well as the manpower and material strength of the Nation.

Then, we need to take a new, hard look at our domestic and foreign policies. The purpose would be to determine how or where these may be failing to effectively meet the challenges.

The new administration has had its baptism of fire, in Cuba and Laos. The results are today's headlines—regrettably not favorable.

Nevertheless, the task now is to learn a lesson; to revamp, as necessary, our policies; and to go forward in a united effort to meet the global threat to our security and freedom.

Struggle for Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARTHA W. GRIFFITHS

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 8, 1961

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, May 3 marks a day of importance to millions of Poles throughout the world, for on this day in 1791 the Polish Constitution was officially adopted.

To the Polish people of that year and to the generations that have followed, this document remains as a symbol of liberty and independence. It remains in the hearts and spirit of the Poles even though officially it came to an end a little more than a year later. Under circumstances that have followed a recurring pattern in Polish history, the full fruits of independence were never fully savored.

Russia, always an ominous threat to Polish independence and fearing a united Poland on her western front intervened with military might and forced the Poles to abandon the constitution they had sworn to uphold. Since then Poland has faced a series of partitions and divisions which have tried and tested the Polish dream of a free and united Poland. That dream has not been forsaken.

We in the United States have always felt a strong bond with the Polish people. Some of the outstanding figures in our own struggle for independence were Polish. The names of Kosciusko and Pulaski are as much a part of our history as those of Nathaniel Green and General Gates.

The Polish Constitution was based on the same principles and beliefs as that of the United States and in 1791 only 2 months after the May 3 constitution was proclaimed, George Washington himself acknowledged the stride toward liberty that Poland had made.

Today the same bond remains between our countries. For once again we stand behind Poland as she struggles for freedom and unity. Although Russia has attempted to subjugate this country, the Polish People's Republic is far from a docile Communist satellite. The real Poland of today is a paradox—an example of Communist orthodoxy and Polish individualism.

And it is this individualism plus the proud and courageous spirit of the Poles that we in the United States recognize and admire. It is this spirit that carried the Poles through the ravages of World War I, saw them recoup their strength after the Germans had invaded in 1939, and finally it is this same courage, bravery, and spirit that would not permit them to be crushed under the Russian tanks that rolled into Poznan.

The hope of Poznan has not been fulfilled but the hope itself remains and will continue to live. The paradox of Poland will not endure forever and the Communist system will never completely transform Poland. No one yet has been able to destroy the Poles ability to survive as Poles.

Mobilization of Republican Resources for the Future

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. GLENN BEALL

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 8, 1961

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, if we are to preserve the two-party system we cherish so deeply, Republicans and Democrats alike must speak out freely on their political philosophies and their goals.

One of the most forthright, forceful, and definitive discussions of the position and aims of the Republican Party was presented recently by Senator LEVERETT SALTONSTALL at a dinner sponsored by the GOP organizations of Baltimore City. Senator SALTONSTALL's address was extremely inspiring and thought provoking, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

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

ADDRESS BY U.S. SENATOR LEVERETT SALTONSTALL AT THE COMBINED REPUBLICAN ORGANIZATIONS DINNER MAY 3, 1961, LORD BALTIMORE HOTEL, BALTIMORE, MD.

We are gathered tonight to mobilize our resources for the future, to consider what we've got to do for Republican victories in the months and years immediately ahead, and to dedicate ourselves to the job of doing it. The glamour and the recognition for political effort comes during campaign time. But the rewards come only when the preparation is done thoroughly every day of every month of every year—when the spotlights are turned elsewhere. Politics is not a part-time job.

What is the current status of the Republican Party? What disadvantages do we have to overcome? What factors do we have basically working in our favor?

Nineteen hundred and sixty saw us lose the national elections for President and Vice President. After 8 years of sound performance under President Eisenhower, the Republican Party lost the White House. The House and Senate are still under the control of the Democrats by large margins.

But in losing the White House we won a majority of votes in more than half the States and more than half the congressional districts. We lost the Presidency by 112,000 votes—Vice President Nixon carried 26 States to the 23 won by Senator Kennedy. Nixon won 49.9 percent of the two-party vote and 49.55 percent of the total vote. In the Senate we elected three new Republicans and all who ran for reelection. In the House we find 44 new Republicans—only 3 who sought reelection failed, and we won a net gain of 21 seats. We picked up two more governorships and made a net gain of approximately 300 State legislature seats.

We were beaten in the big cities which dictate the electoral vote. But one of the most striking examples of Republican power is found in our party's performance in winning last fall's so-called independent vote. The Democrats went into the elections with a tremendous advantage over us in the "hard core" party vote—in the number of registered Democrats over registered Republicans. The incredibly close result means that we won this independent vote in a big way.

The fact that Senator Kennedy only won by sixteen one-hundredths of 1 percent in the popular vote leaves him without a clear-cut mandate from the American people. The American voter repudiated neither the 8 years of Republican leadership nor its platform and candidates of 1960. Our party improved its position at the polls following consecutive losses in 1954, 1956, and 1958. As Columnist Roscoe Drummond has pointed out, Senator Kennedy ran behind his party as its strength was receding while Vice President Nixon ran ahead of his party as it was on the upswing.

Now these statistics are of limited value. We didn't win, we lost. We lost a heartbreaker, and we are now, emphatically, the "out-party." But to overlook some of the heartening aspects of the last election would be foolish, particularly when they speak well

for the future. The position of the Democrats is not without worry and danger. As Senator THRUSTON MORTON, our national chairman, recently said:

"In many respects I commiserate with the Democrats. They are in an unenviable position. They have come to power at a time when the public mind is strongly influenced by vivid memories and deep appreciation of those good Eisenhower years—years of peace and record prosperity.

"I would suggest that the Democrats will find little comfort or magic in the campaign image which projected them as would-be rescuers of a nation on the brink of disaster. Our ailments must not be minimized. The Nation must be informed, but it need not be informed in a manner which gives aid and comfort to those bent on destroying us. Any balanced assessment of the national economy, freed of political frenetics, will underscore the enduring potency of the great gains which the new administration inherited."

We have great leadership within the Republican Party which over the forthcoming months can clarify its energy and purpose for the benefit of all the people. You know the quality of your Republicans here in Maryland. President Eisenhower has sustained his massive public popularity and respect. Former Vice President Nixon spoke in Greenville last night and appears in New York tomorrow night. Within a week's time, he will also visit Chicago, Des Moines, Detroit, and Columbus. In March alone, Chairman MORTON delivered over 30 major addresses in many areas of the Nation. Senator BARRY GOLDWATER is so much in demand for speaking dates that he is booked up solid for well over a year. The minority leadership of Congress is applying Republican principles to the legislative arena with vigor. And throughout the Nation in State capitols we find strong, dynamic leadership from Republican Governors. Nelson Rockefeller of New York, Mark Hatfield of Oregon, and my own Gov. John Volpe are obvious examples. Let's add right now the name of former Labor Secretary James Mitchell, who has an excellent chance of becoming New Jersey's next Governor in the fall.

So we have strong men of proven capability to lead us, who, through their ideas and their experience, give the broadest possible representation of the American people, men of differing shades of political philosophy united behind the conviction that the Republican Party, in principle, purpose and performance, can best serve the Nation and her citizens.

Finally, the greatest resource of the Republican Party is the American people themselves. This is as it should be. Today American citizens want moderate action by Government. They have demonstrated their alliance with the middle of the road rather than with the far left or far right. They want to avoid extremes, trusting in balanced use of public and private resources. This desire for moderation is best met by Republicans, not by the Democrats. We, as a party, traditionally advocate the creative balance between extremes, steady performance over the long haul, and a close relationship between principle and practice.

Now it has been suggested that the fortunes of our party for 1962 and 1964 lie in two missions: developing strong, attractive candidates and building a strong organization—door to door and street to street, precinct to precinct and town to town. I agree. But I would like to discuss first what is absolutely fundamental to all of this—what we stand for. We must, in a meaningful contemporary context, vigorously demonstrate the vitality, applicability, and long-term validity of our principles, and we must do it right now. The best candidates and the most powerful organization mean nothing unless the beliefs that justify their existence are kept strong and vital and are boldly articulated.

While the ease of communication by telephone, radio, TV, and even through space, has brought the world closer together, the greatest practical problem which the Republican Party faces is one of communication. We must make clear to the average citizens of America, the man and woman on Main Street, what we stand for. As Republicans what we need to do most of all is to identify ourselves, as a party, with them in terms of personal interest, economic interest, and national interest. We have not been sufficiently convincing. We have not identified our fundamental nature as a party with their best interests. During a time characterized by the similarity of party platforms, by the desire on the part of each party to appeal to the whole political spectrum, and by the increasing tendency to obscure party arguments by the direct appeal of a candidate's individual personality, we must make clear what we stand for—what we have to offer that the Democrats don't.

Sometimes people ask me what I am, whether I'm a conservative or a liberal. I answer that I'm a Republican. Period. What do I mean by this; what do I regard as the basic differences between our two parties?

First of all, the Republican Party stands for the freedom of the individual—not in the abstract—but in the real sense. We do not hedge this principle. We do not cover it up with other immediately popular, emotional or more expedient ideas. We believe in advancing the genuine dignity of the individual in the most profound manner, to offer the most thorough opportunity for his growth and advancement physically, intellectually and spiritually.

Our concept of American Government is that it be committed to preserve individual reliance, individual vitality and individual resourcefulness within the framework of a Federal system equipped to deal efficiently with the great national and international problems that give us such anxiety today. The Government simply cannot answer all our dilemmas. If it attempts to play that role, the individual citizen's capacity to solve his own problems, to make decisive judgments with respect to them, will diminish, and soon he will be incapable of participating in the democracy of his society. He will lose his initiative, his energy and his courage, and, above all, his self-respect. Policies, programs, institutions which tend to interpret the role of Government as solving all of the individual's problems for him are first of all impractical, secondly, will gradually imprison him, and thirdly, are just plain disrespectful to the ideal of his freedom.

We think in terms of that individual. The Democrats think primarily in terms of groups of individuals or even the state itself. Real reliance on the freedom of the individual enables us as Republicans to consider more deeply the overall national interest, to disassociate ourselves from special interest groups. Our party has traditionally striven to represent the whole rather than the special interests of various groups, to advance the common purpose over often contradictory and divisive ends. We intend to pursue the common bond for the common good, rather than indulge for emotional gain in hostile in-fighting among classes and categories of people. Such activity saps the spirit of community loyalty, mutual helpfulness, and finally the ability to act in unity as a free people. The Democrats simply do not have as strong or consistent a record in this regard as do we.

Let me emphasize two more beliefs which are closely related to this conviction about individual freedom and which express differences between the two parties rather clearly. One is that the Republican Party emphasizes the principle of voluntary rather than compulsory participation in Federal aid programs, while the Democrats do not. The other is that we stress the concept of equality of opportunity among our citizens rather than the more recent "everyone gets the same deal" tendency to emphasize automatic equality per se, in which our Democratic colleagues frequently indulge.

Now the second major principle that we as Republicans stand for is a government close to the people. I have always liked to think of government starting from the family itself, and moving out to the community, to the State institutions and finally to the Federal level in Washington. The Democrats appear to believe now—though if you read Thomas Jefferson you will quickly find that this was not always the case—that it should work approximately the other way 'round.

The Republican concept of government's role emphasizes that State and local government must remain strong, that unless there is vigor, responsibility and purpose at the levels of government closest to the people themselves there can be no real governing "of, by, and for the people." The functions of institutions at the sub-Federal level may certainly change—they should never remain static—but they must always exist. Here we see how the Republican concepts of individual freedom and government by the people are combined for the benefit of all. Without the opportunity to participate in self-government, the individual cannot be alert, informed, and able to influence the course of events about him. Without the presence of State and local institutions which are easily accessible to him, that opportunity is lost.

A related idea to the Republican belief in government close to the people is the conviction that private enterprise must be the ally of government, not its adversary; whereas the Democrats often seem to make private enterprise the whipping boy. We want to move forward to meet the grave new problems before us, and at the Federal level of government, without at the same time undercutting the open, free system upon which we really depend. We believe that this can be done. We believe that it must be done—or else we must radically revise our whole system of life in the United States. This is not to say that we can tolerate the violation of the law by business and industry any more than we can in the case of a labor union or an individual citizen. When business is found in any way lacking in public integrity it must be immediately and strongly called to task.

These two fundamental beliefs, individual freedom and partnership government, must be put across to the people by us who believe in them. It is from these two basic convictions that flow the ideas which have characterized Republican leadership over the past 8 years. From them President Eisenhower drew the policy that problems are not solved by dollars alone and that problems must be approached on a long-term rather than short-term basis, for instance. It is on these two basic convictions that I believe the victory and the survival of the Republican Party depend. We must market them. We must make them real.

How do we do it? Attractive candidates, money, topflight organization. You have good candidates, and you're coming up with more, of young blood. Encourage them. Tonight you are engaged in a money-raising effort. That is essential if your candidates are to win and your work is to succeed. It will succeed if the candidates encourage the workers and the workers have financial backing.

I was a candidate last autumn. Tonight I am here as a Senator from Massachusetts, which as you know is our new President's home State, too. Our statewide organization, which we had been working on for well

over a year before the election, was a major factor in my reelection. We had a highly productive volunteer operation with a powerful emphasis on youth and great enthusiasm that did wonders. Other than that I did my best to get around the State as much as I could—again, starting the fall prior to the election to establish early momentum—to meet as many voters and their families as possible. I ran what is referred to as a "positive" campaign, that is, concentrating on my own experience and service and the kind of record I had developed in the Congress. On the other hand, particularly in the last few weeks before election day, I did not hesitate to fight back hard to counter attacks made by my opponent and do some punching of my own when this was clearly called for. Like all campaigns, it involved some fun, considerable exasperation, but above all—on the part of everyone concerned—hard, hard work.

Tomorrow, your good Senators GLENN BEALL and JOHN BUTLER, Congressman MATHIAS, and I will again take up our imperative responsibilities as members of the "loyal opposition." This is a delicate task, which must attempt to strike the dynamic balance between hard criticism when it is called for and solid support when it is merited. Without dissent—which in this case is the minority party in Congress—there is dictatorship. So we must be vigilant on the broadest plane in defense of the national interest. This involves the condemnation of reckless decisions by the administration, the spelling out of better courses, the backing of sound action when it is taken. We must keenly appraise the promises and performance of the Democrats in the official positions of leadership in the executive branch, for our constitutional system demands it.

Above all, the loyal opposition must develop programs of its own, to deal in our terms rather than exclusively with regard to theirs. We cannot strike a clear, dynamic image unless this is done. Many of the new administration's programs on the domestic front are continuations or enlargements of the Eisenhower policies. We can claim credit for these when they are ballyhooed as Democratic accomplishments. But we must move beyond them, building rather than standing on that record, as Dick Nixon has so well said.

On foreign policy, we will largely stand with the President, although never failing to bring our own ideas to bear in counsel with him and his advisers. On domestic issues, where the security of our country is not immediately at stake and where the philosophical differences between us are more striking, we must oppose the administration wherever its programs contradict our principles, and give those principles a new vitality with specific recommendations which embody them. We will not obstruct for its own sake; we will not rubberstamp in any event. I hope that we will be of some help to you here in Baltimore and Maryland in our mutual endeavor. I'm sure you will help us.

Thank you very much.

Washington Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 8, 1961

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following newsletter of May 6, 1961:

WASHINGTON REPORT

(By Congressman BRUCE ALGER,
Fifth District, Texas)

MAY 6, 1961.

At the end of the first 100 days of the Kennedy administration we find U.S. prestige apparently at its lowest in history and our domestic programs merely an extension and acceleration of the New Deal-Fair Deal programs, which the President admires, but which many consider proven failures. Worldwide Russian leaders are accelerating their Communist subversion, stimulated by Kennedy's failure to follow firm talk with firm action. Bipartisan harmony to show the world U.S. 'unity of purpose' fails on two counts, at least: (1) Our purpose is not clear, thanks to contradictory programs; (2) past mistakes are not only buried from view, such as the Cuba fiasco, but so, too, are the lessons we might have learned. Our contradictory programs are daily delineated on the House floor. This week's crop includes (1) the minimum wage final version; (2) Federal aid for water pollution; (3) $9 billion tax increase to highway users.

The minimum wage House-Senate conference was a capitulation by the House Members. The Speaker selected as House conferees (POWELL, ROOSEVELT, DENT) Members committed to the dollar volume view already voted down by the House. The House had endorsed the interstate commerce principle as the basis for Federal participation in wage setting. The Senate bill embraced the dollar volume view and it prevailed contrary to the legislation passed by the House. Once again we witnessed the House views flouted by the Senate and the administration. So now we will have a minimum wage forced on our people based on $1 million gross and $250,000 of goods crossing State lines—with some businesses exempted. It is apparent that some of the exemptions were politically motivated, such as laundry workers and cotton gin employees, in an effort to secure more Members' votes in support of the administration plan. Despite a determined Republican stand, the bill passed 230 to 196—30 Republicans voted for it; 57 Democrats against. Federal Government wage setting must and will be accompanied by direct or indirect Federal price control—neither of these is compatible with a free, private enterprise system—there's the basic contradiction. In other words, it's unconstitutional.

The water pollution bill doubling the amount of Federal aid for construction of local sewage disposal plants passed 307 to 110. The bill provided $1 billion total at $100 million per year—a doubling of amount in a program only 4 years old. What business the Federal Government has in this, I don't know. Stream pollution, which everyone disapproves, can be prevented in other ways (State compacts, for example). The construction of sewage plants is a local matter. Here again is the basic contradiction—Federal intervention in a local-State matter.

The highway taxes were increased $9 billion without House Members even demanding a record vote (only 24 arose, not a sufficient number). It was late in the day (6 p.m.) and, also, the Members don't want to appear to be against highways, even though disapproving somewhat the increase of taxes. I opposed it for several reasons, including (1) taxes are high enough now, on motorists, truckers and all related industries which pay taxes as highway users—$1.6 billion of highway users excise taxes annually now go into the General Treasury beyond the amounts spent on highway construction; (2) as alternatives, we can either cut spending on welfare programs or stretch out the construction timetable.

The omnibus judgeship bill was probably our most ignominious action of the week. Instead of 35 or 59 additional judgeships (last year's maximum declared needs) or even the 70 passed by the House (see Newsletter, Apr. 22), the Senate version was adopted providing 73 new judgeships. The actions of Members of both Houses is quite transparent. Many have hopes for such an appointment, a lifetime job. The House leadership, under the Speaker's guidance, can receive the credit and blame for our legislative accomplishments to date.

Worldwide, meanwhile, we are losing ground in the Communist-free world contest. Daily Cuba is importing the sinews of war—oil, weapons, and Russian technicians. Every hour is irretrievably lost to the United States which must mount the offensive to free Cuba. When will the American people demand action? The State Department only now has released a study of Cuba, acknowledging officially and warning the American people of the socialism and communism the American people have recognized for months. Our inaction now, following our earlier mistakes, is almost unbelievable. In Laos, Africa, Vietnam, Berlin, Mexico, South America, we face Communist subversion. We know that under present policy a temporary slowdown will not prevent a later takeover. Day by day, we see the showdown coming closer. It will be with Russia, not just with Cuba, Laos, Congo, Vietnam or other peripheral areas. So what are we doing? Meanwhile, we learn that supposedly patriotic union leaders and members have struck again and again at our missile sites pushing up wages to fantastic amounts of $400 to $700 weekly; legalized blackmail, you might call it. It's beginning to look as though our Nation, the leaders and/or the people, is suffering from mass hypnosis or sickness, making sensible conduct as the free world's leader an impossibility. Foreign aid to our enemies and neutrals is a leading example of this sickness. Our lack of firm action another.

The astronaut's successful flight, fully publicized, was a tremendous success for the United States way of life over Russia's secrecy and propaganda. Uncommitted nations may well be influenced to recognize (and emulate) the advantages of our way of life which combines a free society with military might, a happy and tough combination (if we don't sell ourselves short).

Duval Engineering & Contracting Co.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM C. CRAMER
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 8, 1961

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, on April 19 of this year I voiced, on the floor of this great body, my opposition to the awarding of a Government contract to the Duval Engineering & Contracting Co., of Jacksonville, Fla., for the construction of a Saturn rocket complex at Cape Canaveral. My objections to this company's receiving any Federal Government contract was founded on the basis of proven fraud perpetrated by two of its supervisory employees who, before a Federal district court, were found guilty of fraud against the Federal Government in lightloading asphalt on the Mayport Naval Base under a construction contract awarded to the Duval engineering firm.

At that time, I pointed out that the Federal district judge who tried them concluded that they were taking the rap for the management of the company and this was borne out by the fact that they are still employed by Duval. At that time I also pointed out that Duval was removed from the State of Florida's bidding list because of fraud committed against the State as well as making payola to State employees a common practice. I further cited the conclusion of the Federal district judge concerning Duval's philosophy which, in the words of the court, was "to cheat the Government if you can."

On April 21, in spite of my objections, in spite of the Federal court's conclusion, in spite of two convictions, in spite of Duval's removal from the State of Florida's bidding list, and in spite of their record of fraud perpetrated against both State and Federal Governments, the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers awarded this company a one-quarter million dollar construction contract for construction of the Saturn complex at Cape Canaveral. May I point out that this company was denied a State contract, on which they were low bidders, the same day they received the Federal contract.

Following the awarding of this contract, I held a meeting with four representatives of the Corps of Engineers at which time I requested an explanation for their awarding this contract before thoroughly investigating my revelations, I having notified them about the highly questionable activities of this company 2 days in advance of their awarding the contract.

I received the Corps' reply today and it reveals that they have no intention of withholding the contract.

Paradoxically, I also received today a copy of a letter sent to the Governor of Florida, Hon. Farris Bryant, by the senior U.S. district judge who was assigned to and tried the Duval case, the Honorable Albert L. Reeves, of the western district of Missouri. Judge Reeves said:

U.S. DISTRICT COURT,
WESTERN DISTRICT OF MISSOURI,
Kansas City, May 2, 1961.

Re Duval Engineering & Contracting Co.,
Jacksonville, Fla.

Hon. FARRIS BRYANT,
Governor of Florida,
Capitol Building, Tallahassee, Fla.

DEAR GOVERNOR BRYANT: While holding court in Jacksonville, I tried a criminal case involving short loading on the part of the employees of the above-named company. They were both properly convicted for the reason that habitually, and almost daily, they caused a shortage of concrete designed for the runways of a Government airport.

It was obvious from the testimony that the acts of these employees were mere symptoms. The contracting company was performing a Government contract. Because of the extreme shortage in concrete loading, and because the Government knew about it, the company made a refund on the basis of a shortage of 451 tons; this, however, did not cover the entire shortage. From the testimony of witnesses, including the president of the contracting company, it appeared that the Government had not only been defrauded on the basis of a greater shortage than was accounted for, but that the employees were acting for the contracting company and were simply obeying orders. They did not profit—the company did.

I considered that the treatment of symptoms was of no value in the enforcement of the law, and granted probation to the two employees.

An effort should be made to remove the cause of wrongdoing and such an effort would reach fruition by denying an unworthy contracting company the right to be awarded Government contracts under any circumstances.

It is for these reasons that I commend the authorities in the great State of Florida for denying Duval Engineering & Contracting Co. any further contracts. Companies of this character and repute should be taught that fair dealing is not only proper, but necessary in doing business with municipalities.

I take occasion to congratulate you on the splendid executive work you are doing in a great State.

Sincerely yours,

ALBERT L. REEVES.

This letter certainly evidences the degree of concern in this matter by the judiciary and is, to be sure, a highly unusual statement for a district judge to make. Obviously, he is incensed at what he believes to be a great miscarriage of justice, and I most emphatically concur with him. I believe this letter to be most significant in that Judge Reeves is probably the man most familiar with the case, having tried it recently.

In light of this mounting evidence against Duval, I can see no alternative but to have the Corps of Engineers revoke this contract. And, in light of the fact that, since 1957, Duval has been awarded nearly $18 million worth of Federal-aid highway contracts, I will repeat my request that the Roads Investigating Subcommittee, on which I am ranking minority member, thoroughly investigate these projects in order to find out if the Federal Government has been defrauded on this $18 million worth of Federal-aid highways.

Senator KARL E. MUNDT, ranking minority member of the Senate Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations, presently conducting hearings on defense contracts, has already taken the lead in that body having requested an explanation from the U.S. Corps of Engineers concerning Duval's being awarded this Government contract.

"Youth Wants To Know"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 8, 1961

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, April 16, Secretary of Labor Goldberg appeared as guest on Theodore Granik's award winning television program "Youth Wants To Know." This was the premiere showing over WABC–TV, channel 7, in New York City and the program received wide acclaim. It may be interesting to note that Secretary Goldberg had the following to say at the conclusion of the program, "This is the most inquisitive and best informed panel that I have appeared before since I took my office."

Mr. Speaker, WABC–TV is to be congratulated on bringing this excellent program to the great metropolitan area of New York City. A special word of praise should go to Mr. Joseph Stamler, vice president and general manager of the station, and Mr. Al Hollander, channel 7 program director, as well as all other personnel associated with making this fine program possible.

As a Member of Congress from the borough of Brooklyn in the city of New York, I am proud and delighted to note that the Hotel St. George, the largest hotel in the city of New York which is located in Brooklyn, is presenting this program over WABC–TV and I should like to pay special tribute to Milton Kestenberg, president of the Hotel St. George Corp., for pioneering in this public service effort.

Without objection, Mr. Speaker, I should like to include in the RECORD a complete transcript of Secretary Goldberg's appearance on "Youth Wants To Know" at the conclusion of my remarks:

"YOUTH WANTS TO KNOW," SUNDAY, APRIL 16, 1961, THE HONORABLE ARTHUR J. GOLDBERG, SECRETARY OF LABOR, GUEST

Mr. BARBER. Ladies and gentlemen, welcome to "Youth Wants To Know." Our guest is Secretary of Labor Arthur J. Goldberg.

Secretary Goldberg is faced with many problems concerning the economic health of our country, but none is more urgent than the unemployment problem. Last month the number of unemployed represented 6.9 percent of the Nation's work force, a 20-year high for the month of March. Recently Secretary Goldberg said that within the coming year, the U.S. economy must turn up 10½ million more jobs. We will have our first question for the Secretary in just a moment.

[Announcement.]

Mr. BARBER. Mr. Secretary, it is a pleasure to welcome you to "Youth Wants To Know."

Secretary GOLDBERG. Mr. Barber, it is a pleasure to be with this panel, one of the most informed and inquisitive panels in Washington.

Mr. BARBER. Thank you. Now let's begin our questioning with Jerry.

Question. Secretary Goldberg, what indications of an economic upturn do you see currently?

Secretary GOLDBERG. Jerry, there are some signs of an economic upturn, but I want to warn that a few swallows don't make a spring or even a summer. And steel production has moved up and that is helpful. It has moved up several percentage points over the last period. As a result of the weather, construction activities have moved up. And then retail sales although they are not what they should be, are beginning to respond. Maybe they are responding to the fact that all of our women, those of us who are married, maybe some of your dates, went out and got some Easter hats and we have had a little upturn in retail sales as a result of Easter business, and finally there is a slight upturn in the amount of hours worked in our Nation's factories. Not enough to bring a 40-hour week, but a little benefit over the period that existed during the last several months.

Question. Do you believe then that certain parts of the Kennedy antirecession program may prove unnecessary?

Secretary GOLDBERG. Oh, no. We need all of the recession program and I just left the President and we were discussing whether or

not it was not necessary to have further programs. That is a matter which is under study in the administration at the present time.

Question. Mr. Secretary, what can be done about this hard core unemployment, and what is being done during this administration right now?

Secretary GOLDBERG. Well, first of all, on the hard core of unemployment which some people call structural unemployment, the Congress of the United States has before it right at the present moment in conference an area redevelopment bill. This bill is designed to promote business opportunity and job opportunities in the areas which have been hit by chronic unemployment—structural unemployment as some economists call it.

Question. How would you furnish this so-called feed money to badly depressed areas where they haven't money to start over again?

Secretary GOLDBERG. Well, the bill before the Congress which I hope Congress will enact in the next few days after they get through with the conference, provides for loans and grants of several hundred million dollars to enable these communities to develop businesses that will replace the businesses that have ceased to grant full employment because of technological and other developments.

Question. Mr. Secretary, we have been talking about quite a few recession measures. I think one of the important things to consider is the cost of these measures. Exactly how much is this going to cost the Government?

Secretary GOLDBERG. Well, this is hard to say, but the Kennedy administration has been very conscious of cost considerations. Now, for example, our unemployment compensation extension bill, the temporary unemployment compensation extension bill, that is going to cost about a billion dollars and that is a very substantial sum of money by anybody's reckoning. But we have imposed a tax on employers starting in 1963 to take care of the cost of that program.

So the Kennedy programs have been based upon realistic considerations and also based on sound fiscal responsibilities.

Question. But sir, if there is any increase in taxes at all, which you say will be necessary to finance these programs, is this a good measure in times of a recession, and won't this aggravate the economic situation?

Secretary GOLDBERG. Not necessarily. It depends on how you impose your tax. In this particular situation we are granting the benefits in the next 12 months, but we are postponing the tax for 2 years. In that way we think we have an ideal prescription. We meet the problems of the recession. We do not add to the tax burden at the same time. We hope by that time that we will have recovered from the recession and then it is appropriate to collect the taxes that will pay for the program that we put in during times of recession.

Question. Mr. Secretary, if local areas are willing to sacrifice, can't they solve most of their unemployment problem?

Secretary GOLDBERG. Well, local areas are doing a fine job. Take Scranton, Pa., for example. They have a great community effort. They have a great State effort in the State of Pennsylvania, headed by their fine Governor, Governor Lawrence, and Mr. Batt, their commissioner in this area. But this problem is more than a local problem. We need a working partnership between local government, National Government, community groups, labor people and management people to try and solve this problem.

Question. Since you cited the example of Scranton, Pa., couldn't other areas similar to this and in similar conditions solve this problem, thus making it not necessary for the Federal Government to intervene?

Secretary GOLDBERG. I wish they could. But the taxing powers which are basic, here, to a sound antirecession, and in fact a recovery program, have been really exhausted by many of the States and localities. They have reached the maximum power to tax. They are unable to cope with the magnitude of the problem which is becoming nationwide, by themselves.

Let me give you a figure: We have classified—I want to refer to the figure—101 major labor market areas of about 150, now, with a substantial labor surplus. This means that throughout the country, north, south, east, and west, we have a problem of substantial unemployment. And this means that we have a national responsibility as well as a State and local responsibility to deal with this subject.

Question. Mr. Secretary, don't you think it would be a great burden on many of our country's employers to pass a bill to raise wages and at the same time encourage them to hire more people?

Secretary GOLDBERG. Well, the amount of tax we have imposed for example for unemployment compensation is four-tenths of 1 percent additional tax. That is a very small tax. But because it is a small tax spread largely over all the employers in the country, we are able to raise a billion dollars, and a billion dollars is very important for the relief of people who have been unemployed many long periods. We have 1,800,000 people right now who have been unemployed for 15 weeks or more.

Question. Well, don't you think it will be kind of a burden to ask them to raise the wages and then hire these other people and raise their wages to the same wages the other people working with them get?

Secretary GOLDBERG. Are you dealing now with our minimum wage law?

Question. Yes.

Secretary GOLDBERG. Well, that is another subject. First we were dealing with taxes. On taxes we have imposed a very modest tax and we hope by the time that that tax takes effect we will have substantial business recovery in the country. If we do there will be an adequate profit base to take care of that tax.

Now on minimum wage, the studies of our Department indicate that when we raised the minimum wage last time in 1955, which took effect in 1956, we expanded employment opportunities rather than contracted unemployment opportunities. Now we think it adds up to improvement in the economy rather than retrogression in the economy.

Question. Mr. Goldberg, would you consider a 3 percent unemployment rate the normal rate, and would you work strongly to lower this rate?

Secretary GOLDBERG. I think 3 percent is a high rate of unemployment. It is hard for me to accept the concept that any man who wants to work should be denied the opportunity to do useful and fruitful work.

Now it is true that there will always be a certain margin of unemployment in the country. This is because we are a tremendous country, this is because some people will be changing their jobs, this will be because some factories will be adjusting their product, so I suppose, and this is a very reluctant admission for me to make, that we have to live with a certain amount of unemployment.

Now some countries believe that 2 percent is a high rate of unemployment. When the President mentioned 4 percent, and Mr. Heller, the Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers, mentioned 4 percent, they were not talking about desirable goals, they were saying we immediately or in the near future have to move the rate of unemployment down from 6.9 to 4 percent as the first measure of our achievement. They were not saying that 4 percent was the ideal goal for unemployment. Four percent is too high an unemployment rate.

Mr. BARBER. Mr. Secretary, at a recent news conference did you not use the figure 4 perdent, even though we would have a business upturn this year, the unemployment rate still would be 4 percent?

Secretary GOLDBERG. I said that unless Government, labor, and management did what they ought to do in this area, as I looked at the future employment and unemployment figures, I was very fearful that we would have several million jobs that we have to provide—about 7 million—and still leave the rate of unemployment at 4 percent. And I mention this, not as a desirable situation, but as pointing up the challenge of the problem that lies ahead.

Question. What percentage rate would you be satisfied with, of unemployment?

Secretary GOLDBERG. Personally?

I would like to see everybody who wants to work and has the capacity to work fruitfully employed and I would not like to deal with this in percentage terms. I don't like to play the numbers game.

Question. I mean practically, not ideally.

Secretary GOLDBERG. All I would say is that we ought to strive toward the goal of bringing down unemployment to normal cyclical unemployment and normal employment of transitional people in the work force.

I have mentioned that in some countries this is regarded to be 2 percent. Ours is a larger country and maybe there has to be a little more play in the joints. But I would certainly believe personally that 3 percent is the top rate in the area that we are discussing.

Question. Secretary Goldberg, shouldn't Government play only a position of leadership in solving our problems while management and labor supply the action?

Secretary GOLDBERG. No, I don't agree with that. I think the great action that has to be taken in the country is of course in the private sector of our economy. I have repeatedly said that the best answer to unemployment are jobs at decent American wages in private industry. But Government has a responsibility in this area as well as industry and labor and the responsibility was written into our Constitution and first in our preamble when we said we had to provide for the general welfare, and secondly in the powers of Congress. When Congress was empowered to tax, to promote the common defense and the general welfare of the United States.

Question. Mr. Secretary, in a recent 11-point proposal for migrant workers, one point was that a collective bargaining program be established for farm workers. How could this be done for this generation without further education and possible corruption?

Secretary GOLDBERG. Well, first of all I just testified yesterday on migrant farm labor. This is a sadly neglected area in our economy. These are the forgotten people of the country. They not only do not enjoy the benefits of collective bargaining, they often do not have adequate housing. They have inadequate education. They have inadequate health. They employ child labor. They do not have registration of contractors who deal in migrant labor. So that what we have to deal with first, since this is a sadly neglected area in our society, our first measure, and yesterday I appeared in support of first measures, but to see to it that on the farms no child works. I exempt from that family farms because the family environment protects against too much heavy labor and too much hazardous labor.

But I believe it ought to be a consensus in the United States as it is in industrial employment, that children less than 14 years of age do not work on the Nation's farms. We ought to house the migrant laborers adequately. We ought to see to it that a public group is created to watch over them. We ought to see to it that crew leaders do not

exploit them. We ought to see to their education.

These are what I regard to be priority measures in the area of migrant farm labor.

Question. Mr. Goldberg, could not the local, possibly the State, governments handle these problems that you have mentioned better than the Federal Government?

Secretary GOLDBERG. No, I don't think so, and as a matter of fact I have received letters from the States indicating that they need the help of the Federal Government in this area. For example, we have crew leaders. About nine States have enacted laws regulating crew leaders who recruit migrant labor. Six of the nine States have been in touch with me and they have said, "While we have regulated crew leaders, to evade our regulations crew leaders will take migrant labor to other States which do not regulate farm labor and protect them." So you see, since they move across States lines, the constitutional test of interstate commerce is fully met, and we have a national responsibility to see to it that these citizens are afforded real protection.

Question. How can the Federal Government move into this area which is obviously unorganized? The union representatives haven't even been able to unionize these workers. To have collective bargaining, you have to have this type of organization.

Secretary GOLDBERG. The Federal Government can move in by doing what they did for people when they enacted the Fair Labor Standards Act which originally some of the unions opposed.

The test for the Federal Government and for State governments is not whether unions support it or oppose it. The test is what is in the national interest and what is in the interests of people. The fact that unions either do or do not organize the migrant laborer does not excuse Government from its responsibility to provide minimal standards, just as we have in the Fair Labor Standards Act, for wages, for children, and so on in that area.

Now immediately in the migrant labor area we have not come to the wage problem. We are trying to deal with the elemental things: Health, hygiene, education, housing, crew leaders and matters of that type.

Question. Secretary Goldberg, at present under the Mexican labor program there are thousands of jobs on American farms being filled by Mexican citizens. Shouldn't Americans fill these jobs and therefore help to alleviate the farm problem?

Secretary GOLDBERG. I am now dealing with proposals on the Mexican farm labor program. One of the tests of the program, which is written into law and which will be written into the new law, is that domestic labor is not available to do the job. Only then do I and will I certify that foreign labor, Mexican labor, or labor from other countries is admissible for the purpose of doing farm labor.

Question. Mr. Secretary, getting back to domestic migratory laborers, after the season is over and they pick their crops, they are then, shall we say, dumped in northern cities: Baltimore, Buffalo, New York. Whose responsibility is that now, the Federal Government or the State or local?

Secretary GOLDBERG. Unfortunately under present laws this is the responsibility of local governments and you have correctly portrayed what happens. The average farm laborer of the migrant character works 100 to 130 to 170 days a year and then he has unemployment unless he is able to get employment in factories or other areas.

I think this problem, which is the problem of sending hundreds of thousands of people across State lines in interstate commerce, is a problem which commands national attention.

Question. Well, now if he doesn't get into other employment, Mr. Secretary—Senator WILLIAMS I think says he makes about $790 a year. That means he must with his family go on the local welfare rolls. Do you see any chance for the Federal Government giving more money to areas impacted with migratory workers? The welfare aspects?

Secretary GOLDBERG. Senator WILLIAMS has been one of our great leaders in the area of trying to protect migrant labor. As pointed out, this statistic that you mentioned, seven hundred and some dollars, we have to add to it and I am sure he would agree—he agreed with me yesterday when I testified—that they earn in nonfarm employment a few hundred dollars more. The total is about $930, but that can't support a family. So that is true that when we advance standards, despite the common conception we are always increasing costs, that does not necessarily follow, because we are not going to allow these people to starve. And so cost exists in one area or another. The best way to do it is to do what has been done in the distressed areas bill and the area redevelopment bill, where we are now making provisions to encourage the employment of rural labor as well as industrial labor.

Question. Mr. Goldberg, now that there are approximately five and a half or six million people unemployed and continually more being let off their job because of automation, how do you see that we can employ these people and what types of jobs do you think we can fit them in?

Secretary GOLDBERG. You have put your finger on a very important problem. I have estimated that next year we will have to create, if we have full employment, 10½ million jobs. I have estimated that even if we had 4 percent unemployment we would have to create 7 million jobs.

Now part of this is, we hope, the programs we have advanced already will help. We hope to create better opportunities for business so that private jobs can be created. And we are giving our continuing attention right now, the President and his advisers, to the whole question of whether or not the programs we have thus far advanced are adequate to realize our goal of reasonably full employment in the country.

Question. Mr. Secretary, are our present laws adequate to deal with the gangsterism and corruption in our labor unions?

Secretary GOLDBERG. Well, we have a new set of laws which was enacted about a year ago. It has been my philosophy first of all that laws don't solve all problems, any more than the Ten Commandments solved all of our moral problems in the country. Before I will be ready to go to the Congress for additional laws in this area, I want to study the laws that have already been entrusted to me. After I do so, if I am of the opinion as a Government official in charge of this area that existing laws are not adequate, I will not hesitate to go to the Congress for additional legislation.

Question. Mr. Secretary in relation to the Communist problem, why has it been necessary for the Federal Government to enact laws preventing members of the Communist Party to hold office in a labor union?

Secretary GOLDBERG. Well, because this has been the theory of the Federal Government, and I must say with considerable justification, that Communists do not enter labor unions for the purpose of really working in labor unions, but that they enter labor unions for the purpose of carrying out the functions of the Communist Party.

I have had some experience in this area, when I represented the CIO and participated in the expulsion of the Communist unions. And I must say there is considerable validity to this position of the Government.

Question. Secretary Goldberg, in a recent news story of last week it was rumored that Mr. Reuther is rather upset with the President, saying that he has paid far too much attention to foreign affairs and has not put enough attention on the domestic problems of job opportunities and the unemployed.

What answer would you have to that?

Secretary GOLDBERG. First of all it is highly natural and understandable that our President should at the moment be devoting his prime attention to the great questions of survival. This is the question which is involved in foreign affairs, but I must say in all fairness to the President and with due respect to my friend Walter Reuther, I have never had any difficulty going to the President and discussing with him important questions of domestic policy. I have just, 45 minutes ago, finished a 45-minute discussion with our President on the whole area of employment and unemployment.

Question. Sir, William Morton of the Federal Reserve Board said that productivity should be increased and the gain should be passed on to the consumer through lower prices rather than to the unions through—to labor through higher wages or management through higher prices. Don't you agree with this?

Secretary GOLDBERG. Well, I hope the consumer and labor and management benefits from our increased productivity. One of the things we must remember in the country always is that we believe in not a stationary standard of living but we believe in advancing our standard of living. And we have many people in the country who still do not enjoy an adequate standard of living.

Question. Mr. Secretary, here is a theoretical question—utopian one, I guess: We have Mr. Stevenson at the U.N. seeking peace, we have diplomats in Geneva seeking peace. If we did get peace and then a demobilization of the people in the Army, just how would they be absorbed in the labor movement?

Mr. BARBER. Excuse me. I am very sorry to tell you that we will not have a chance to hear the Secretary's answer because we are almost completely out of time. I am sorry, Mr. Secretary.

Secretary GOLDBERG. I am sorry, too, because this was a very good question, but after Korea we had full employment without a tremendous armament budget. I am confident we can achieve it.

Mr. BARBER. Now we will have a final word from our guest in just a moment after this very important message.

[Announcement.]

Mr. BARBER. Secretary Goldberg, thank you very much for being our guest.

Secretary GOLDBERG. It is a great pleasure and I ought to correct myself. I said "after" Korea to you, Tom. I meant before Korea. I am delighted to share these thoughts with you and this bears out that this is the most inquisitive and best informed panel that I have appeared before since I took my office.

Mr. BARBER. Thank you, Mr. Secretary, very much.

Farm Cost Prices as Compared to Prices Received for Farm Products

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. C. GATHINGS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 8, 1961

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, earlier in the session, acting under authority granted by House Resolution 86, Representative HAROLD COOLEY, chairman of the House Committee on Agriculture, directed the Subcommittee on Equipment, Supplies, and Manpower to inquire into

the cost of farm production and to study the impact of the cost-price squeeze on American agriculture.

Since that time hearings have been held in Washington, in Memphis, Tenn., and in Sioux City, Iowa. On Monday, Tuesday, and Wednesday, May 15, 16, and 17, the committee will hold additional hearings here in Washington to fill in the picture of the situation as outlined earlier by farmers and spokesmen for their organizations in all fields of agriculture.

That this inquiry is vital to American agriculture is evidenced not alone by the statement by Secretary of Agriculture Orville Freeman that such a study is the most important facet to a solution of our agricultural problems but by the truly startling attendance of farmers at our field hearings. In Memphis the hearings had to be scheduled in the Memphis Civic Auditorium to provide for the large group who attended. In Sioux City, as in Memphis, many farmers had to file statements because of the large numbers waiting to counsel with the committee. At Memphis farmers from throughout the Midsouth were in attendance. In Sioux City the committee heard farmers and livestock men from Kansas, the Dakotas, Nebraska, Illinois, and in many other sections of the midwest Farm Belt.

Members of the subcommittee have worked diligently to gather the pertinent information on this vital problem. I wish to commend each of them for their vital contributions to this inquiry. Members of the committee are JOHN L. MCMILLAN, of South Carolina; WATKINS M. ABBITT, of Virginia; CLARK W. THOMPSON, of Texas; FRANK A. STUBBLEFIELD, of Kentucky; HAROLD B. MCSWEEN, of Louisiana; CHARLES M. TEAGUE, of California; DELBERT L. LATTA, of Ohio; PAUL FINDLEY, of Illinois; BEN REIFEL, of South Dakota; and Dr. A. FERNÓS-ISERN, of Puerto Rico. Chairman HAROLD COOLEY and Representative CHARLES HOEVEN, both as ex officio members, have made excellent contributions to the work of the subcommittee as have other members of the full committee. And, we have enjoyed the assistance of interested Members who are not assigned to the Committee on Agriculture but who recognize the vital aspects of the problem and the work underway.

We have employed the talents of the Honorable John Mac Smith, of West Memphis, Ark., who has served as the general counsel for the inquiry. He has worked long and hard at the task assigned the subcommittee by the Congress.

As a means of better acquainting Members with the scope of this study, at this point it is proper to place in the RECORD a copy of the memorandum submitted to the committee last March 14 by the general counsel, John Mac Smith.

Much information—not only statistical, but in the nature of human problems as presented by the farmers and their families—has been submitted to the committee. More information of great significance is expected at the additional hearings. From this great compilation of information and comment by farmers and agricultural interests, it will be the task of the subcommittee to bring forth to the House Committee on Agriculture, and through that committee to the Congress, those recommendations and proposals that will seek to counter this erosive impact of the cost-price squeeze on our farming families and the farming communities of the Nation:

MARCH 14, 1961.

Memorandum to: Hon. HAROLD D. COOLEY, chairman, Committee on Agriculture, U.S. House of Representatives; Hon. E. C. GATHINGS, chairman, Subcommittee on Equipment, Supplies, and Manpower, Committee on Agriculture, U.S. House of Representatives; Hon. CHARLES B. HOEVEN, Committee on Agriculture, U.S. House of Representatives.

From: John Mac Smith, general counsel, Subcommittee on Equipment, Supplies, and Manpower, Committee on Agriculture, U.S. House of Representatives.

Subject: Investigation and survey relative to farm cost prices as compared to prices received for farm products.

Pursuant to your direction, I have made a preliminary study in regard to the survey and investigation relative to the above subject to be made by the Subcommittee on Equipment, Supplies, and Manpower, Committee on Agriculture, U.S. House of Representatives, and I am pleased to submit the results of that study to you.

I. AUTHORITY

A. The basic authority for the survey and investigation on the part of the subcommittee is House Resolution 86, 87th Congress, 1st session, which was agreed to February 9, 1961.

B. In addition, Hon. HAROLD D. COOLEY, the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, U.S. House of Representatives, has directed that the Subcommittee on Equipment, Supplies, and Manpower, proceed immediately with the survey and investigation in order that a prompt but accurate report as to the conditions relative to the subject be submitted at the earliest practicable date so that appropriate action may be taken.

II. NEED FOR THE SURVEY AND INVESTIGATION

A. The consumer has a distorted understanding of farm income and farm conditions, which redounds to the detriment of the farmer.

1. By reason of information which has been furnished over recent years to the news media the farmer has been pictured day after day as constantly at the public trough, and the primary cause of the rise in the price of consumer goods.

Chairman COOLEY stated the condition accurately and succinctly in his remarks in the House of Representatives, 86th Congress, 2d session, on September 1, 1960, when he said that there had been over the years "a design and calculation to inflame consumers against farmers."

2. This misunderstanding as to the farm problem must be corrected, and the consumer must be apprised as to the true farm condition. Actually, the farmer isn't getting anything like his equitable share of the price which the consumer is paying, for example: the consumer pays approximately $3.94 for a broadcloth shirt, and of this amount the farmer receives 28 cents; thus, if the farmer gave the cotton for the shirt the consumer would still have to pay $3.66 for the shirt. (S.P. 119, Agricultural Extension Service, the University of Tennessee, August 1960.) This is only one example of the disparity in prices received by the farmer and prices paid by the consumer, and similar figures, can be furnished as to every article processed from a farm product, which the consumer purchases. Despite this fact, the consumer constantly reads, hears, and sees the farmer as the ward of a beneficent Government. It is believed the survey and investigation can do much to correct the false pictures of the farmer in the event the survey and investigation is thorough.

B. The true picture of the farm problem must be presented to Congress and the general public.

1. The real need, however, for the survey and investigation is to point out to Congress and to the general public the sorry plight of the farmer who is being crushed out of existence by the squeeze between rising cost prices and falling prices for the products which he produces. I quote from a few of the letters and telegrams which Representative GATHINGS has received since the publication of news items in regard to the investigation of farm machinery costs.

"Unless we have help like you are going to give us, in 3 more years the farmers will begin to fall by the wayside like a bunch of flies in a DDT bomb.

"This section of the United States is very dependent on farming and this action is long overdue. As you well know, the cost-price squeeze has been working us over. If some of it can be alleviated through this investigation, then you have certainly performed a great service for this section as well as the country as a whole.

"This investigation is long overdue, and I hope and pray your committee will not only get the true facts, but better still will find some solution to a very serious problem affecting (farm machinery) dealers and the farmers they serve."

"I think the investigation of farm machinery, spare parts, and maintenance is justified and you are to be commended for pushing it."

"The cotton farmers of the State and Nation * * * most interested in your attempt to lower cost of machinery. Not many years ago 10 bales of cotton would buy one heavy-duty farm tractor, and it now takes 40 bales of cotton."

"I know 15,000 to 20,000 people directly and indirectly who make their living farming and these farmers are trying to hold up a great burden by paying $10,000 for a combine and $20,000 for a cottonpicker. What is very alarming to me is that some of our best farmers are giving up and hoping that they can get someone else to rent their land. If prices keep going up as they have been, the whole situation is in danger of collapse and will fall in on top of labor and the manufacturers."

2. The economic position of the American farmer is tragic when it is noted that his net income has dropped from $17.3 billion in 1947 to $11.6 billion in 1960, which is an income reduction of more than 30 percent. It cannot be argued that the 1960 recession was in anywise responsible for this miserable condition for the farmer received even less in 1959, that figure being $11.3 billion (Economic Report of the President, January 1961).

What was happening to the cost prices of the farmer while the price he was receiving for his products was plummeting to new lows? Between the years 1946 and 1960 the farmer's cost for farm machinery more than doubled; his cost for motor vehicles increased 87 percent; the cost of fertilizer increased 25 percent; and his interest, taxes and wage rates increased 45 percent ("Agricultural Prices." U.S. Department of Agriculture, Oct. 15, 1960).

3. Unless the farm income is increased or the farm costs are reduced, the future of a large segment of our society is confronted with immediate tragedy.

III. WHAT CAN BE ACCOMPLISHED BY THE SURVEY AND INVESTIGATION

A. A forum will be offered to the farmer and the manufacturer.

1. The farmer will be given an opportunity to tell his own story. This is a story of pathos, a story when told by the farmer rather than by someone for him, will appeal to the spirit of fairness and equity which have always been characteristic of the American people. When a true word picture is painted by the farmer himself it is entirely possible that prejudice on the part of the consumer will, to say the least, be dissipated.

2. The manufacturer likewise has a story to tell, for he has been beset by increasing costs. However, he has had the means by the use of public relation experts and paid advertisement to tell his story to the public. Regardless of this, he should be made welcome to tell his story before the subcommittee with the same degree of welcome as will be extended to the farmer.

It is possible, although not probable, that the manufacturer may come to the conclusion he is pricing himself out of the farm market, and should make some concessions as to price relative to the articles he is selling to the public. This hope is based upon the fact that the two largest farm machinery manufacturers showed a substantial decrease as to earnings in 1960 by comparison to the 1959 earnings, as follows:

	Per share
International Harvester:	
9 months, July 1959	$4.12
9 months, July 1960	2.51
Estimated earnings in 1960	3.25
Deere & Co.:	
9 months, July 1959	5.99
9 months, July 1960	1.33
Estimated earnings in 1960	2.45

3. Congress will be furnished an accurate and complete report upon the plight of the American farmer in order that its membership may take such action as may be deemed appropriate to remedy this situation.

IV. RECOMMENDATIONS

A. The cooperation on the part of the executive branch of the Government should be requested. A copy of this memorandum may be made available to the Secretary of Agriculture in order that he will be advised as to the intended survey and investigation.

B. Preliminary hearings should be held in the farm areas.

1. It is suggested that a hearing be arranged in the cotton section, preferably Memphis, Tenn., and also a hearing be arranged in the grain section, preferably Sioux City, Iowa.

2. These local hearings should attract numerous farmers who are unable to come to Washington for hearings. The local witnesses who have an important statement upon the subject of the investigation could then be invited to the hearings in Washington.

C. Manufacturers and processors should be contacted.

1. Manufacturers and processers of farm machinery and other products used by the farmer should be contacted and their story obtained. It is believed these companies will send representatives to Washington, if representatives are not here on a permanent basis, for informal discussion, thus eliminating the expense of trips for this purpose. Representatives of these firms should be invited to the Washington hearings.

D. Government and other lending agencies should be contacted.

1. It is believed that a substantial portion of the credit extended to farmers is extended by Government lending agencies. As indicated the rise in interest is an important cost factor to the farmer, and these agencies will, no doubt, be willing to cooperate.

2. Insurance companies and other companies making mortgage loans to farmers should be contacted in order that interest costs to the farmer may be explored.

E. Farmers' organizations should be contacted.

1. The Farm Bureau, Farmers Union, National Grange and other farm organizations should be fully advised and their assistance requested.

V. CONCLUSION

This memorandum, as above stated, is preliminary as to nature, and as the survey investigation proceeds additional memorandums will be furnished.

White Paper on Cuba

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 8, 1961

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, the State Department white paper was summarized in a recent newspaper article which is here included as a condensation:

UNITED STATES PUTS CUBA IN RED BLOC

(By Robert Young)

WASHINGTON, May 2.—The United States today designated Cuba a member of the Communist bloc and declared that the government of Premier Fidel Castro has taken on aspects of the Hitler and Mussolini dictatorships.

The State Department said it appears that Castro considers Cuba "further along the Communist road" than some of the other countries in the bloc dominated by Russia and Red China.

The Department issued a long statement in response to Castro's May Day actions proclaiming Cuba a Socialist state, abolishing elections and clamping new restrictions on the Roman Catholic Church.

ON WAY A LONG TIME

The Department said Castro's planting Cuba solidly in the sphere of international communism should come as no surprise because Castro has been heading into the open embrace of the Sino-Soviet bloc for some time.

The statement, made public by Lincoln White, State Department press officer, advised the American people not to be confused by Castro's use of the word "Socialist" rather than "Communist" in describing Cuba's form of government.

The Department noted that only Russia and Czechoslovakia call themselves Socialist republics in this stage of their projected development toward communism, whereas the other satellite countries in the Communist bloc, including Red China, describe themselves as people's republics.

TRAGIC FOR CUBAN CITIZEN

"It would therefore appear," the statement said, "that Castro considers Cuba farther along the Communist road than some of the other countries in the bloc."

In reference to Castro's declaration that Cuba was abandoning the free elections he had promised in favor of people's mass meetings, the State Department commented that the Cuban citizen under the Castro regime is in really a tragic situation. Even Russia has so-called elections, although there is no real choice among candidates, the statement continued, so again Castro seems to have gone the other members of the Communist bloc one better.

"The Cuban has but one choice; namely, to say 'si,' and even that not in a duly-constituted election but in a contrived mass meeting," the Department said.

A SHRUG MIGHT BE DEATH

"The average Cuban is in trouble if he so much as shrugs his shoulders. He is in real trouble—he can be put in jail or put to death—if he says 'no'."

The State Department asserted that Castro's election-substitute, mass meetings, "sound very much like Hitler and Mussolini's mass gatherings."

The Department quoted Jose Marti, Cuba's 19th century "George Washington," as warning that the socialist idea is dangerous in two ways.

Marti, a Cuban national hero, said socialism introduces a "confused foreign doctrine" and permits ambitious men to rise in the world, "to stand above the crowd by faking arrogance and fury and by pretending to be impassioned defenders of the underprivileged."

My concern is not in criticizing the findings which appeared to be accurate, but the fact that this report is many days, if not weeks or months, late in being released. Indeed, the American people, I feel sure, had reached these conclusions long ago, and now the State Department assessment so belated is almost comical in its pronouncements. It would be comical if it were not so tragic, our conduct as Cuba went communistic. The tragedy is in two parts. First, that American lives and property were taken and the United States did nothing to protect them. Such protection is clearly within our rights, and the failure to act becomes patently an admission of weakness, vascillation, and indecision in the eyes of our neighbors in the world. No one, then, would have contested our right to invade Cuba, as we have done some 30 times in Latin America to protect our citizens against the threat of loss of life or property. The tragedy was our failure to act immediately when we clearly had the right.

Second, the tragedy is compounded and made the grounds for additional loss of life and property by our second failure to act to prevent a greater Communist buildup in Cuba. Why, oh why, does our Government let the precious hours and days slip away while Castro beefs up Cuba's military might for the showdown which most assuredly will come and most assuredly must and will be lead by the United States.

I, for one, am appalled at our failure to act, and over the condoning of our mistakes and/or our inability to learn from our mistakes which results from our alleged bipartisan harmony to show the world a unity of purpose. My undying belief is that the United States should protect by force of arms when necessary the lives of her citizens and their property when jeopardized unfairly and illegally by any other nation. I shall never agree to a weak and supine policy underlying our foreign aid and our foreign relations as they exist today. It is late, but I suggest and I pray that it is not too late for tough action, not just

tough talk. We must tell the world our terms in maintaining freedom and justice and peace. Terms which preclude Communist subversion and our pronouncements firm and clear should be overtly backed up by military power and our willingness to use our armed strength. Only as we get tough can we prevent world war III. A weaker policy will surely bring on the holocaust.

While I am just one voice, I am sure a majority of the American people would rather risk their lives now than to invite Communist enslavement by appeasement. The showdown is approaching. Every American citizen and every nation must now go through an agonizing reappraisal, freedom or slavery, if communism's total conquest of the world is to be stopped in its tracks and driven back.

SENATE

TUESDAY, MAY 9, 1961

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

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

Eternal God, who turneth Thy face toward those who work Thy will in the world, as on yet another day we take anew the cup of our freedom, crimsoned with great cost, may we be gratefully mindful of its sacred meaning. As those lifted to pedestals of public office, may we be reverent in its use. Make more worthy in faith and uprightness the hands of those who hold it high in trust for all.

Keep us faithful when others falter; keep us still pursuing when others give up the quest; keep us hopeful when our fairest dreams seem as but mocking mirages of the desert; keep our integrity unsullied when the siren songs of selfish expediency assail our ears, as we labor on with valor for the enthronement on earth of Thy reign of law and love, of equity and righteousness, nor ever doubt the final triumph of Thy redemptive purposes for all men.

We ask it through riches of grace in Christ Jesus our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, May 8, 1961, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

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

REORGANIZATION PLAN NO. 4 OF 1961, RELATING TO FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT— (H. DOC. NO. 159)

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Government Operations:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith Reorganization Plan No. 4 of 1961, prepared in accordance with the Reorganization Act of 1949, as amended, and providing for reorganization in the Federal Trade Commission.

This Reorganization Plan No. 4 of 1961 follows upon my message of April 13, 1961 to the Congress of the United States. It is believed that the taking effect of the reorganizations included in this plan will provide for greater efficiency in the dispatch of the business of the Federal Trade Commission.

The plan provides for greater flexibility in the handling of the business before the Commission, permitting its disposition at different levels so as better to promote its efficient dispatch. Thus, matters both of an adjudicatory and regulatory nature may, depending upon their importance and their complexity, be finally consummated by divisions of the Commission, individual Commissioners, hearing examiners, and, subject to the provisions of section 7(a) of the Administrative Procedure Act (60 Stat. 241), by other employees. This will relieve the Commissioners from the necessity of dealing with many matters of lesser importance and thus conserve their time for the consideration of major matters of policy and planning. There is, however, reserved to the Commission as a whole the right to review any such decision, report or certification either upon its own initiative or upon the petition of a party or intervenor demonstrating to the satisfaction of the Commission the desirability of having the matter reviewed at the top level.

Provision is also made, in order to maintain the fundamental bipartisan concept explicit in the basic statute creating the Commission, for mandatory review of any such decision, report or certification upon the vote of a majority of the Commission less one member.

Inasmuch as the assignment of delegated functions in particular cases and with reference to particular problems to divisions of the Commission, to Commissioners, to hearing examiners, to employees and boards of employees must require continuous and flexible handling, depending both upon the amount and nature of the business, that function is placed in the Chairman by section 2 of the plan.

By providing sound organizational arrangements, the taking effect of the reorganizations included in the accompanying reorganization plan will make possible more economical and expeditious administration of the affected functions. It is, however, impracticable to itemize at this time the reductions of expenditures which it is probable will be brought about by such taking effect.

After investigation, I have found and hereby declare that each reorganization included in the reorganization plan transmitted herewith is necessary to accomplish one or more of the purposes set forth in section 2(a) of the Reorganization Act of 1949, as amended.

I recommend that the Congress allow the reorganization plan to become effective.

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *May 9, 1961.*

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting the nomination of Elmer W. Disspayne, of Tennessee, to be U.S. marshal for the Middle District of Tennessee, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (S. 912) to provide for the appointment of additional circuit and district judges, and for other purposes, and it was signed by the President pro tempore.

LIMITATION OF DEBATE DURING MORNING HOUR

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

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

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the Flood Control-Rivers and Harbors Subcommittee of the Committee on Public Works was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and the Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights of the Committee on the Judiciary were authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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